



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 2022

No. 52

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, March 24, 2022, at 1 p.m.

Senate

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 2022

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Hear our prayers, mighty God. Be merciful and answer. Today, look down from Heaven upon us as we pray for the Ukrainian people.

Lord, we are not worthy to stand in Your presence, but You know the heartache we feel for our brothers and sisters in Ukraine. When their enemies attack, we remain confident that the battle is still in Your hands. Lord, continue to use our lawmakers as instruments of Your peace.

We pray in Your sovereign 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 23, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable ANGUS S. KING, Jr., a Senator from the State of Maine, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore

Mr. KING 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—MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to H.R. 4521, a bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on Monday, I explained that the thinness of Judge Jackson's appellate record makes this week's Judiciary Committee hearings all the more important. Well, we are 2 days in. Judge Jackson is receiving a calm, respectful process, unlike the treatment that Senate Democrats typically inflict on Republican Presidents' nominees.

But, unfortunately, thus far, many of Judge Jackson's responses have been evasive and unclear. She has declined to address critically important questions and ameliorate real concerns.

First and foremost is the simple question of Court packing. The far-left fringe groups that promoted Judge Jackson to this vacancy want Democrats to destroy the Court's legitimacy through partisan Court packing or unconstitutional term limits. She was literally the Court packers' pick for the seat, and she has repeatedly refused to reject their position.

Both of the liberal legal giants, Justice Ginsburg and Justice Breyer, had no problem—no problem—defending the Court and denouncing Court packing. Both Ginsburg and Breyer denounced Court packing. As sitting Justices, they commented freely on the subject. The Justices knew that expressing a

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1717

clear view and defending their institution was not—I repeat, not—judicially inappropriate in any way.

But Judge Jackson has refused to follow in the footsteps of Ginsburg and Breyer. She refuses to rule out what the radical activists want. She told Senator KENNEDY that she does have an opinion on Court packing, but it is “not a strongly held opinion,” and, in any event, she wouldn’t tell Senators what it was.

But the nominee made sure to quietly signal openness—openness—for the radicals’ position. She told Senators she could see both sides of the Court-packing debate. Where Justices Ginsburg and Breyer slammed the door, Judge Jackson leaves it open. She even told the Committee:

I would be thrilled to be one of however many Congress thought appropriate to put on the Court.

“ . . . thrilled to be one of however many Congress thought appropriate to put on the Court.” “[H]owever many”? I am not sure Judge Jackson’s secret opinion on Court packing is as secret as she thinks it is.

Judge Jackson also displayed a remarkable lack of candor during basic questions about judicial philosophy. When asked about judicial philosophy, the nominee tried to punt by simply restating the most basic elements of a judge’s job description. She said she looks at the facts and treats litigants fairly. That is not explaining a judicial philosophy. That is just rewording the judicial oath. It is, basically, a non-answer.

These are pivotal questions. They require clear responses, and previous nominees had much less trouble providing them. A year and a half ago, now-Justice Barrett gave the Committee an intellectual master class in her textualist and original judicial philosophy. She described her interpretive approach in great detail. She helpfully compared and contrasted her philosophy with past and present Justices to provide Senators with points of comparison. But Judge Jackson either cannot or will not do any of that.

Senator SASSE said that in his meeting with the nominee more than 2 weeks ago, he asked the judge to compare and contrast her own thinking with Justices Breyer, Sotomayor, and Kagan to give Senators a point of reference. At that time, the judge apparently told the Senator that she needed to think about it but would get back to him. He followed up yesterday, and Judge Jackson said actually she had been too busy to give it any thought.

She could not or would not even supply a clear summary of just the philosophy of Justice Breyer. Justice Breyer is Judge Jackson’s former boss for whom she clerked. He has written entire books detailing his judicial approach, but Judge Jackson either could not or would not describe it.

In one jaw-dropping moment, Judge Jackson tried to dodge questions about constitutional interpretation by claim-

ing that she does not have enough experience—does not have enough experience.

Here is what she said:

I would say, just as an aside . . . that while I have been on the bench for nine-plus years, the issue of constitutional interpretation in that sense doesn’t come up very often. It comes up to the Supreme Court for sure, but it doesn’t come up very often in the lower courts.

In other words, at least in that moment, a nominee for the U.S. Supreme Court tried to tell the Committee that her professional experience had not prepared her—not prepared her—for an in-depth discussion of constitutional interpretation.

The White House and Senate Democrats keep saying Judge Jackson’s district court experience is perfect preparation for the Supreme Court, but it sounds like the nominee herself may actually disagree with that.

Let’s be very clear. If Judge Jackson truly feels she lacks sufficient experience with constitutional interpretation, then the Senate certainly should not confirm her. But if she does not actually feel that way, then she owes the Senate much more candor about her approach.

For decades, liberal activists have preferred judges who do not limit themselves to applying the text of our laws and our Constitution, but rather make new policy from the bench.

Sure enough, Judge Jackson spent all day yesterday trying to explain what amounts to a passionate policy disagreement with existing sentencing guidelines for certain horrible crimes. In a number of instances, she has given out sentences far, far below the sentencing guidelines and far below the government prosecutors’ request. In cases ranging from child exploitation to fentanyl trafficking, she has used every possible ounce of discretion to essentially remake sentencing policy from the bench.

Under questions from Senator COTTON, Judge Jackson said it would be inappropriate for her to comment on the proper durations of criminal sentences as this was a policy matter for legislators and not judges. But at other times, she justified her own past leniency by explaining that judges have huge amounts of discretion and latitude on sentencing criminals. Either subjective questions about sentencing are fair game for the judicial branch or they are not. Certainly, the nominee cannot have it both ways.

Today, Judge Jackson will have another chance—another chance to defend the institution of the Court, like Justices Ginsburg and Breyer had no trouble doing; another chance to give Senators a clear explanation of her judicial philosophy, like Justices Gorsuch and Barrett had no trouble doing; another chance to explain whether and how her clear policy views on the merits of sentencing criminals will continue to impact her judicial judgment.

The Senate and the country will be watching.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote occur immediately following my remarks.

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

RUSSIA

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on PNTR, as President Biden begins the most important foreign trip of his Presidency, the best thing the Senate can do this week is pass PNTR legislation to land another devastating blow on Putin’s economy.

Over the past few weeks, Republicans have complained that President Biden hasn’t acted quickly enough against Putin. Yet for the past few days, they have stymied swift action on PNTR, despite the fact that the House approved it 424 to 8, with Leader MCCARTHY supporting it.

In particular, the senior Senator from Idaho has sought to amend the bill to include an oil ban. We are willing to work with Senator CRAPO to address his concerns, but there are a few reasons we should move quickly with PNTR.

First, President Biden has already implemented a ban on Russian oil and gas. So passing this legislation is not a priority the way PNTR is. Second, there remain serious questions about whether the proposal from Republicans would delay the ban on buying Russian oil for a period of time. This is a consequence no one wants. Senator MANCHIN brought this up when he saw the language, and it is something that we have to make certain that this proposal isn’t weaker than what the President has put into effect. Third, showing unity, particularly at this time when the President is meeting with our European allies, is especially important.

Finally, the House is not in session. Any changes we make to the PNTR legislation delays enactment by at least a week.

There is no reason—absolutely no reason—to change what the House has already approved on PNTR and delay action by a week or more. Again, Democrats are willing to work with Senator CRAPO on this issue if he can agree to let this process move forward.

So let me say it again. PNTR has already been approved overwhelmingly by the House, and it is the most logical next step in the fight against Putin’s barbaric war, and the Senate should thus act. Republicans who complain of

delay are the ones who are delaying. The Senate has been most effective when working quickly and in unison to support the President and our European allies against Vladimir Putin. Passing PNTR with overwhelming bipartisan support is another chance to do just that.

INSULIN

Mr. President, on insulin, yesterday I held a handful of conversations with colleagues from both sides of the aisle on one of the most confounding problems facing millions of Americans—the skyrocketing cost of insulin. Making insulin more affordable is a top priority to Democrats, so right now, there are bipartisan talks underway by Senators SHAHEEN and COLLINS to cap insulin at \$35 a month and make changes to drive the cost down in a comprehensive way.

I intend to put a proposal on the floor as soon as we can after Easter. There should be nothing remotely partisan about making sure Americans don't go broke to manage their diabetes. So Democrats are eager to work wherever we can on legislation that will cap insulin at \$35 a month and give millions a long-overdue break at the pharmacy.

It is reported that at least one in four insulin users has to ration their use of insulin because they can't afford it. The exponential spike in the cost of insulin is truly one of the most frustrating trends of the past two decades. This is a drug with no patent on which millions of Americans rely to manage their diabetes. Today, a 40-day supply of insulin can exceed \$600 a month—a prohibitive and downright immoral price that makes no sense at all.

Over the past few weeks, a number of my colleagues, including Senator WARNOCK, Senator SHAHEEN, Senator MURRAY, and Senator COLLINS, have worked assiduously on proposals for bringing down the price of insulin, bringing it back down, as part of our larger effort to lower costs for American families. The latest bipartisan effort will combine elements from Senator WARNOCK's and other proposals, and it has my enthusiastic backing because lowering the cost of insulin is so important.

I commend my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working on this issue in good faith. Bipartisanship has been the kindling for a number of recent Senate accomplishments, and insulin should be another issue where we deliver.

In addition, incidentally, while we are talking about cost-cutting, we are having hearings this week on a number of issues relating to high cost. Senator CASEY, in the Aging Committee, is leading a hearing on home care and the high cost there today. Senator CARPER is leading a hearing on clean energy and national security and the high cost of energy. In Agriculture, Senator STABENOW had a hearing yesterday on the cost of rural childcare, rural elder care, and healthcare.

H.R. 4521

Mr. President, on the competition bill, today the Senate will take another step to advance major, bipartisan legislation to increase American jobs and lower costs for American families. For over a year, both parties have worked on competitiveness legislation built around two goals: Create more American jobs and lower costs for American families. In the case of Senator YOUNG and myself, the effort has stretched back many years. The House and Senate passed legislation to achieve these goals separately, so the best way now to send a final product to the President's desk is by entering a conference committee with the House. We are now working towards that end and jumping through a number of procedural hoops to get that done.

The majority of us want to see this legislation reach the President's desk. We want to see costs go down for families, see more manufacturing jobs here at home, see greater relief for supply chains, and we want to revive America's unparalleled innovation machine that fueled our economy for so much of the 20th century.

The past month reminds us that our country is vulnerable when we import too many goods from a single country—particularly, in this case, semiconductors. The war in Ukraine is a perfect test case. Some of the most important resources for making chips, like neon gas, come precisely from Ukraine.

We need to make more of these products here in America instead of overseas so we can lower costs, shore up our supply chains, and preserve our national security. For that reason alone, the Senate is moving ahead on this important competitive legislation.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. President, finally, on SCOTUS, the Supreme Court, yesterday Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson offered a 13-hour master class of why she deserves to be the 116th Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court. She was simply impressive. It was clear to anyone watching that Judge Jackson's brilliant legal mind was running in high gear. She remained measured and poised and thoughtful as she worked through yesterday's grueling series of questions.

Over the course of the day, Judge Jackson affirmed that she will approach her role on the Supreme Court with prudence, a respect for precedent, and by serving in the same mainstream fashion as the great Justice whose seat she would fill.

At times, the judge also displayed one of her greatest strengths: her grace and poise even during moments when a handful of Republicans asked intentionally misleading questions—questions which even their fellow Republicans found uncomfortable. Republicans tried to land a blow, but Judge Jackson kept her cool. By the end of the day, it was obvious why the judge's nomination has won the support of everyone from law enforcement to con-

servative judges, to scores of peers throughout her career. I expect she will reach final confirmation by the end of this work period.

Now, even as the judge continues her testimony today, the Senate will also be busy confirming scores of other judges to important positions across the Federal bench. I am proud to say that last night, the Senate confirmed its 50th judge under President Biden, and by the end of tonight, we could reach as many as 58 total judges. But doing that is going to take a lot of focus and patience, just as we required last week. I will once again ask my colleagues that in order to move through tonight's votes quickly, we should stay in our seats or as close to the Senate floor as possible.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION

The ACTING PRESIDNET pro tempore. Under the previous order, the question is agreeing to the motion to proceed.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. 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.

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 100 Leg.]

YEAS—66

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

NAYS—31

| | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Barrasso | Hawley | Rubio |
| Blackburn | Hoehn | Sanders |
| Boozman | Hyde-Smith | Scott (FL) |
| Braun | Inhofe | Scott (SC) |
| Burr | Johnson | Shelby |
| Cotton | Kennedy | Sullivan |
| Cramer | Lankford | Thune |
| Cruz | Lee | Toomey |
| Ernst | Lummis | Tuberville |
| Fischer | Marshall | |
| Hagerty | Paul | |

NOT VOTING—3

| | | |
|-------|---------|---------|
| Casey | Manchin | Shaheen |
|-------|---------|---------|

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). On the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, the America COMPETES Act, the yeas are 66, the nays are 31.

The motion is agreed to.

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

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

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.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 5002

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I call up amendment No. 5002.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5002.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

(The amendment is printed in the RECORD of March 22, 2022, under "Text of Amendments.")

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5003 TO AMENDMENT NO. 5002

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have an amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5003 to amendment No. 5002.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

At the end, add the following: "This Act shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5004 TO AMENDMENT 5003

Mr. SCHUMER. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5004 to amendment No. 5003.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 2, strike "1 day" and insert "2 days".

AMENDMENT NO. 5005

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have an amendment to the underlying bill at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5005 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 5002.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

At the end, add the following: "This Act shall take effect on the date that is 3 days after the date of the enactment of this Act."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5006 TO AMENDMENT NO. 5005

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5006 to amendment No. 5005.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 2, strike "3 days" and insert "4 days".

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 5007

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to commit H.R. 4521 to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment.

Mr. SCHUMER. The clerk will report. The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] moves to commit H.R. 4521 to the Committee

on Commerce, Science, and Transportation with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 5007.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

At the end, add the following: "This Act shall take effect on the date that is 5 days after the date of the enactment of this Act."

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5008

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have an amendment to the instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5008 to the instructions of the motion to commit.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 2, strike "5 days" and insert "6 days".

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 5009 TO AMENDMENT NO. 5008

Mr. SCHUMER. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 5009 to amendment No. 5008.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 1, strike "6 days" and insert "7 days".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Madam President, as President Biden begins the most important foreign trip of his Presidency, the best thing the Senate can do this week is pass permanent normal trade relation legislation so we can land another devastating blow on Putin's economy. In a few moments, I will ask the Senate for consent to do just that.

Last week, the House passed legislation revoking Russia's normal trade relations with the United States by 424 to 8—424 to 8. The vast majority of House Republicans backed it, including Leader MCCARTHY and the Republican leadership.

Here in the Senate, my friend, the senior Senator from Idaho, sincerely believes that we should amend the bill by including an oil ban. I don't believe we should do that. As I said earlier today, there are four reasons why we should move forward quickly on PNTR and then have a separate discussion on the oil ban.

First, President Biden has already implemented a ban on Russian oil and gas, so passing something the President has already done is not even remotely as urgent as passing the PNTR first, especially because the President is leaving today and meeting with our European allies. What could be better than a united Senate putting further sanctions on Russia as the President meets with our European allies, where he has done a very good job of bringing them together?

Second, there is still some disagreement, including with the administration, about how to best draft an oil ban proposal. There are some who worry that the proposal that my friend from Idaho is pushing would actually delay the ban on Russian oil compared to the President's proposal. This is a consequence no one wants.

Third, it is so important we show unity right now as President Biden meets with our European allies. Swift Senate action, combining Democrats and Republicans with one voice supporting PNTR, would do just that.

Finally, the House is not in session. Any changes we would make to the PNTR legislation by amendment delays enactment by at least a week. There is no reason—absolutely no reason—to change the PNTR legislation the House has already approved and delay action.

Now, again I repeat: I am, Senator WYDEN is, and all we Senate Democrats are willing to work with Senator CRAPO on this issue, if he can agree to let the process move forward.

So let me say again, PNTR has already been overwhelmingly passed by the House. It is a very important and logical step in the fight against Putin's barbaric war. We should move the House bill ASAP.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 7108

So, Madam 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 consideration of H.R. 7108, which is at the desk; that there be 4 hours of debate equally divided; and that no amendments be in order; that upon the use or yielding back of the time, the bill be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the

table without further intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Idaho.

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

I rise to address Ukraine's perilous situation. There is broad agreement in this Chamber and in the House of Representatives that America's response in all areas to Russia and Belarus's aggression against Ukraine must be comprehensive and strong.

Leveraging the benefits of the U.S. trade relationship with Russia is just such a response that will add to the pressures on Putin to rethink his actions in Ukraine and punish him for what he has already done.

On March 8, the Democratic and Republican leadership in the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means reached an agreement on precisely that type of response. The bicameral, bipartisan agreement is called the Suspending Normal Trade Relations with Russia and Belarus Act, and its provisions include banning Russian energy imports, including various forms of petroleum, natural gas, and coal; moving Russia and Belarus to the same pariah trade status as North Korea and Cuba; providing the President additional authority to raise tariffs on Russia and Belarus even further; calling on WTO members to take similar actions to deprive Russia of its trade benefits; and sending a crystal-clear message to Russia's dictator, Vladimir Putin, that he will never see these trade benefits restored until he reverses his aggression, stops threatening our NATO allies, and recognizes the right of the Ukrainian people to live freely.

None of this is controversial, and all of it is necessary.

Yet only a day after the deal was made and with neither warning nor explanation, the House split the energy ban from the trade status provision and bifurcated the two measures further by imposing separate standards on Putin's actions in Ukraine before any President can think to restore these trade benefits to Russia without congressional approval.

Each bill passed by over 400 votes, but the House decided to only transmit the bill on Russia's trade status, its permanent normal trade relations, or PNTR piece, even though it had passed more than a week after the energy ban.

The important point is that our House colleagues on both sides of the aisle agree both restrictions need to happen. Some may wonder why the urgent need for the congressional energy import ban after President Biden provided one in his Executive order.

Speaker PELOSI was asked just that question when she put the new House version of the import ban up for a vote, and she stated, correctly, to her House colleagues: "You're here to legislate."

Absolutely, that is why we are here. And our legislative response—more es-

pecially its certification requirements—must deliver an unmistakable message to Putin: no relief until you stop your aggression and recognize Ukraine's inalienable right to live free and choose its leaders. The energy ban and its trade status revocation are complementary, and they must work together.

While President Biden's Executive order to ban Russian oil was a positive step, the Senate and House need to impose tough conditions on Putin's treatment of Ukraine to be met before any President seeks an end to the energy import ban. These conditions are like those Congress had done in the bipartisan CAATSA legislation, which we negotiated when I was the Banking Committee chairman during the Trump administration.

Enacting a Russian oil ban will demonstrate to the Ukrainian people and our NATO allies that Congress is committed to cutting off Russia's funding for its war effort.

Many of our allies, including in Europe, are debating whether to adopt an energy ban against Russia. By the U.S. Congress acting definitively and with certainty through our congressional action, our allies will all be more encouraged to take similar stands against Russian energy exports, which account for over a third of Russia's budget.

I seek to continue our bipartisan tradition by introducing text that is as close to the original deal as possible, except in two respects, that respond to the points made by our majority leader—both made to facilitate our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

First, I am making a single technical correction, made at the request of Senators MANCHIN and MURKOWSKI, to comport with the timeline of the President's Executive order regarding the oil ban so that no delay such as was mentioned as a possible problem will exist. This edit is necessary to avoid that delay, and it solves that problem.

Second, I have revised the certification criteria that would allow the restoration of trade benefits to match exactly what the House passed. The original deal provided that benefits could not be restored until Russia withdrew its forces and stopped posing an immediate threat to NATO allies and partners. To secure bipartisan support, I yielded to what the House passed: that Russia need only reach an agreement with the President to withdraw its forces rather than have definitively withdrawn them and that Russia not pose a threat to NATO members as opposed to NATO members and their partners.

Again, this is to match what the House has requested. Mind you, I have many colleagues on my side who would like to do many more things, and I agree with their requests. But on the trade front, I am willing to make these concessions to get this done.

My view is that we should act quickly. I agree with the majority leader on

this. We must do it together, and we must do it today. There is no reason to wait for another revenue bill to come from the House before we act. So let us mark the bravery of the Ukrainian people by passing the strongest legislation we can, today, in the trade space.

Accordingly, I am asking the Senator to modify his request to take the firm, comprehensive action against Vladimir Putin that circumstances require. I would like to ask that the Senator modify his request to make it in order for the Crapo substitute amendment, which is at the desk, to be considered and agreed to and that the Senate vote on the passage of the bill as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, reserving the right to object to the request from the Senator from Idaho, it is my understanding that the Senator's modification would not include provisions that were included in the House-passed legislation that modifies the global Magnitsky sanction regime.

I just would like to speak for a moment, if I might. There is no question that we stand with the people of Ukraine against the unprovoked attack by Mr. Putin. We are inspired every day by the courage of the Ukrainian people and by their inspirational leader, President Zelenskyy.

The United States has shown leadership, and I congratulate the Biden administration. We have led the free world in providing defensive lethal weapons to Ukraine to defend itself. We have provided humanitarian assistance, joining the global community, including dealing with 3 million Ukrainians that are now refugees in other countries and 10 million that have been displaced as a result of Mr. Putin's unprovoked attack.

And we have led on sanctions. We have led in getting the global unity to impose sanctions against not just the Russian sectors, but also against individuals. And when Mr. Zelenskyy spoke before the Members of Congress, he specifically mentioned the importance of these sanctions; and he asked us to expand those covered by the sanctions to include the enablers, those that are enabling Mr. Putin—the oligarchs—to be able to fund his aggression against Ukraine.

So what did the House send over to us? In their bill, they sent over a global Magnitsky modification. It is identical to legislation that was filed by Senator PORTMAN and myself that included the revocation of PNTR for Russia, along with the global Magnitsky. First and foremost, it removes the sunset that is in the legislation that would sunset this year.

Mr. Zelenskyy asked for us to be resolved in being willing to stand up to Mr. Putin, that it would take some time. A clear message is that we remove the sunset on the global Magnitsky statute. And we know how difficult it is to get legislation passed in this body.

It also expands the global Magnitsky to include the enablers—exactly what Mr. Zelenskyy asked us to do—those that enabled—the oligarchs that allowed him to be able to finance this. The language that is included in here is very similar to the language that was included in President Trump's Executive order. This is critical legislation.

Now, let me just tell you how appropriate it is that it is included in a PNTR bill—because the first Magnitsky sanction bill—and Senator WYDEN was very important in getting this done—was included in the original PNTR bill for Russia, and we were able to get it done at that time.

We then made it a global Magnitsky, and my partner on that was the late Senator McCain. It has always been bipartisan. My partner now is Senator WICKER. The two of us have joined forces to make sure we get it done now. It is critically important in order to impose banking restrictions on those that are targeted under the global Magnitsky, as well as visa restrictions on being able to travel.

How important is it? Ask Mr. Usmanov, who is one of the principal oligarchs to Mr. Putin, who solves Mr. Putin's business problems. Guess how he solves those problems? Well, his yacht has now been confiscated in Germany. That is how important these sanctions are and how we have to move them forward.

So, if I understand my colleague's request, it would deny the opportunity for us to act on the global Magnitsky, which Mr. Zelenskyy has specifically asked us to do. We would lose that opportunity. We would be sending this bill back to the House that is not in session, which means there will be a further delay in repealing PNTR for Russia, which is something we need to do now, today. We can get it to the President for signature today under the majority leader's request.

And as the majority leader has indicated, I support the energy ban—I support the Russian energy ban. President Biden has already taken steps to do that. And I agree with my colleague from Idaho. I would like to incorporate that in statute, but there is no urgency to do that as there is on repealing PNTR and the global Magnitsky. That is the urgency. That is what we need to get done today. That is what we can get to the President this afternoon under the majority leader's request, and that will be denied if my friend from Idaho's request were granted.

So, for all those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the modification.

Is there an objection to the original request?

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, reserving the right to object and just briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. I would like to say to my colleague Senator CARDIN, I believe we could easily work the global

Magnitsky legislation into whatever we do today. I don't believe there will be objections to moving ahead on that. It is not included in what I submitted because that was not a part of the original four-corners agreement which I am proposing. I think that could be added.

I also have colleagues on my side of the aisle who have other items they would like to see discussed because the idea we are talking about here is to move ahead with no amendments on legislation that is major. And I am willing to discuss that as well, but I believe we need time to work this out.

We can get this done today. And even though the House is not in session today, our passage of global legislation on this entire issue would send a powerful message that the House could affirm when it does come back into session next week.

So I will still need to object, but I will commit to my colleagues on the other side that I will work with you today to try to iron out these differences. I need to have assurances that these other pieces that, for some unexplained reason, the House has not been willing to put into this package can be put into a package that will pass. And if we can get to that point, we can move today.

So I commit that I will work with you; but at this point, I must object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I thank my colleague from Idaho. I know he sincerely wants to move forward. The best way to send a message is pass the House bill, get it to the President, and have him be able to sign it while the European allies and we are meeting.

But I am disappointed, though, that we were unable to take quick action now, but I very much appreciate what Senator CRAPO has said now. And Senator CRAPO and I had a good discussion this morning. We agree. We want to get to a bipartisan resolution to this legislation.

So Senators WYDEN, CRAPO, and my staff are going to work throughout the day on language related to the oil ban and the other issues that Senator CRAPO talked about that we could consider separately. We would then move to pass PNTR separately, which we hope we can pass today or certainly tomorrow.

So I am committed to getting this issue resolved and very much appreciate my friend, the Senator from Idaho's willingness to discuss it so we can work out something that both sides can accept.

Mr. CRAPO. I thank Leader SCHUMER.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, let me pick up on what both of my colleagues have just said. Senator SCHUMER and Senator CRAPO have both said

how committed we are to getting this worked out today. And as Senator SCHUMER said, under his leadership, the Finance Committee—the chair and the ranking member—that is what we are going to be working on so that this actually happens.

And I want to make sure everybody understands what that means. It means that while the President is in these crucial discussions right now in Europe, the Senate—in the most expedited way, which is to pass the House legislation today—would revoke permanent normal trade relations with Russia.

And here is why that is so important. Vladimir Putin's inhumane conduct means that Russia has forfeited the right to the benefits of the international trade order that was established after World War II. And what the Senate can do by passing the House bill today would amount to the harshest economic consequences in a generation. Let me be specific about that.

When we pass that legislation that came over from the House here in the Senate, it would immediately trigger a significant increase in tariffs on Russian-made products. Adding to that, the proposal also includes authority for the President to raise tariffs even higher in the future. These tariffs would directly level a significant set of restrictions on Putin's circle of oligarchs, who export everything from chemicals to plywood. This is an absolutely essential step in ensuring that Russia is a pariah state.

So to wrap up, apropos of the comments from the distinguished Senate majority leader and our ranking member—and the President of the Senate has worked with him as well—we had a good discussion over the last half-hour that is going to focus on getting passage of the House bill done today. And as Senator SCHUMER, Senator CRAPO, and I have all noted, those discussions have been ongoing, but we are going to step it up so we can get this done today and send the House bill to the President's desk by close of business today.

With that, Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I wanted to join in the comments made by the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee, which I currently sit on, and my distinguished colleague on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who is the author of the Magnitsky Act.

I just hope—I came loaded for bear to the floor because I thought we were going to have a different result, but I am optimistically going to expect that we are going to have a resolution because, look, there are burnt bodies in the streets of Ukraine. There are mass graves to bury the dead. There are Ukrainians who are melting snow in order to drink water to survive. So it is truly mind boggling that we cannot get this legislation passed that eliminates

Russia's preferred trade status and reauthorizes the Magnitsky Act.

We see that Putin's actions are not only creating a horrific set of circumstances in Ukraine; they are creating a severe shortage of wheat across the Middle East and North Africa, bombing maternity hospitals and theaters housing children, causing the worst refugee crisis in Europe in decades.

While we have long called out Putin's thugishness, his unprovoked and devastating attack on Ukraine has united the world in its resolve to levy severe repercussions for Putin and his cronies. So we must revoke this preferential trade status immediately. I think we should do the same for Belarus, which continues to provide a launching pad for Putin's war.

But, certainly, not including Magnitsky makes no sense. Now, it makes no sense when last week I came to the floor and asked for unanimous confirmation of a key number of nominees at the State Department and USAID that are at the heart of helping the United States help Ukraine on coordinating sanctions, on our USAID Director for that part of the world, on the Assistant Secretary for refugees—millions of Ukrainian refugees. We should have these people in place to do the job.

But we also have to have the law that is going to expire in place that Putin hates. He hates it. It is named after someone he was trying to eliminate. We have to continue to expand our options for keeping the pressure on Putin's regime and those who enable him. Reauthorizing Magnitsky is a critical part of doing just that.

With Magnitsky sanctions, we can hold human rights abusers to account. We can call out their unacceptable and appalling acts, and we can hand the President a powerful tool to sanction those who profit off the Russian people and exploit state assets.

But if we don't act, Magnitsky provisions will sunset later this year. Putin shouldn't be able to think: I can wait it out. He should know that the law is going to continue and the sanctions that have been levied under Magnitsky will continue to be levied and enhanced.

He wants to see this law go away. His oligarchs and top officials would breathe a sigh of relief. Allowing Magnitsky sanctions to expire would send exactly the wrong message at the most critical time.

This bill not only extends these tools; it sharpens them. This reauthorization would expand sanctions to cover other serious human rights abuses, giving the President the power to sanction a broader array of conduct.

So we have to get this done today. We have to revoke normal trade relations with Russia. We have to send an unequivocal message that Putin's cronies cannot and will not act with impunity. They will pay a price, and we must show the world that whether

human rights abusers are in Moscow or Minsk, America stands up for our values and our principles, and we put them into action wherever they are attacked. That is what this effort is all about.

I do hope that before this day is out, we will see this passed on the Senate floor. There is no excuse not to get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me thank the chairman on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for his incredible leadership on this issue and so many others.

I want to point out that our committee has already approved this language. This is already approved. This is not something that is new to this body. We have been debating this for some time. It has been the United States and the U.S. Senate that have taken the leadership to provide tools to go after human rights abusers. We were the first to act, but, as a result of our action, Europe has now acted, the UK has acted, and Canada has acted. So we have provided global leadership. It is one of the strongest tools we have against human rights violators, and our No. 1 target today is Mr. Putin and what he has done.

So we have a chance to really show our leadership—continued leadership—in this area.

I am also encouraged by Senator CRAPO's assurances that we are going to try to get this done today. We want to get this bill to the President. We want to have it clear that we reauthorized it in a way that would be effective moving forward.

On one last point, if I might, no one knows exactly what happened in the first summit meeting between President Putin and President Trump, but the reports were that probably one of the very first issues that was raised by Mr. Putin was global Magnitsky sanctions, how it is so sensitive to him.

A clear message against Mr. Putin is the passage of the reauthorization and, as the chairman said, fine-tuning of the global Magnitsky statute. I hope we can get that done today. I thank my colleagues for their comments.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, Tax Day 2022 is fast approaching. Americans around the country are prepping their tax returns.

If you talked to most Americans, I don't think you would find that the IRS is their favorite government Agency and with good reason. The Agency

has gained a reputation for poor taxpayer service. The last tax filing season was particularly miserable for taxpayers. “If you call the IRS, there is only a 1-in-50 chance that you’ll reach a human being,” noted a headline in the Washington Post last April.

The national Taxpayer Advocate noted in her 2021 report to Congress:

Calendar year 2021 was surely the most challenging year taxpayers and tax professionals have ever experienced—long processing and refund delays, difficulty reaching the IRS by phone, correspondence that went unprocessed for many months, collection notices issued while taxpayer correspondence was awaiting processing, little or no information on the Where’s My Refund? tool for delayed returns. . . .

And bad customer service isn’t the only thing tarnishing the IRS’s reputation. The IRS has also gained a reputation for mishandling the confidential taxpayer information it has access to. In fact, the IRS was recently subject to a massive leak or hack of private taxpayer information—information that somehow ended up in the hands of advocates at ProPublica, an outfit that promotes progressive causes and went on to publish taxpayers’ private information last June. Months later, neither the Treasury Department nor the IRS has provided meaningful followup about the data breach, much less any accountability.

Who could forget the IRS scandal during the Obama administration when the IRS targeted a number of organizations based on their political beliefs? Nor did the IRS inspire confidence a few months ago when it announced it would start requiring taxpayers to submit biometric data in order to access certain IRS services.

Fortunately, after Republicans on the Senate Finance Committee and others weighed in, the IRS abandoned its plans to allow the harvesting of taxpayers’ biometric data, but it was a concerning instance of government overreach from an Agency notable for repeated mishandling of private taxpayer information.

The IRS was a frequent subject of discussion in regard to the Democrats’ so-called Build Back Better plan. It would have been nice if this was because Democrats had proposed a real plan to improve taxpayer services and increase Agency accountability. But, no, what they proposed in their Build Back Better plan was a massive increase in funding for the IRS—\$80 billion—essentially doubling the size of the Agency without any plan for ensuring improvements to basic taxpayer services.

I am hard pressed to imagine why anyone would contemplate handing a massive budget increase to the IRS without simultaneously prioritizing a plan to substantially increase accountability and improve taxpayer services. But, of course, Democrats weren’t interested in improving taxpayer services. Their main interest in handing the IRS a supersized budget increase was to increase tax collections to raise

revenue to help pay for their partisan tax-and-spending spree.

It is the same reason why they included a provision, until widespread public opposition forced them to remove it, that would have allowed the IRS to examine the details of Americans’ bank accounts. Under one version of this provision, the IRS would have been able to sift through the bank records of any American with just \$600 in annual transactions—\$600. In other words, the IRS would have been able to look through the bank records of just about every American and find out just how much you spent on Starbucks or your last doctor’s bill or that new pair of running shoes.

Republicans are not opposed to enhancing resources for the IRS if needed to improve taxpayer services, but any enhanced resources for the IRS must be paired with serious reform, including measures to improve customer service, ensure that existing resources are being used optimally, and promote smarter and more effective audits.

I am a cosponsor of Senator CRAPO’s Tax Gap Reform and IRS Enforcement Act, which would codify additional protections for taxpayers against IRS overreach.

Among other things, the legislation would help ensure that the IRS is not able to target taxpayers for their political and ideological beliefs, and it would prohibit the kinds of bank reporting requirements that Democrats sought to impose in their Build Back Better spending spree. It would also take steps to increase IRS expertise and improve the audit process. It would improve the information that we have on the tax gap, which is the difference between taxes owed and taxes paid.

Reducing the size of the tax gap and improving enforcement of our tax laws is something we should look at, but any effort has to be balanced with taxpayer responsibilities and taxpayer rights. Vastly increasing the size of the IRS without any new accountability or Agency oversight, as Democrats wanted to do with their Build Back Better spending spree, would be more likely to result in increased harassment of law-abiding taxpayers than in a meaningful reduction in the tax gap.

Just in case anyone thinks I am exaggerating about harassment, I would like to note that a provision in the House version of Democrats’ reckless tax-and-spending spree would repeal a measure requiring written approval of a supervisor before an IRS agent can assess any penalties. The provision was intended to prevent overreaching IRS agents from threatening Americans with unjustified penalties. It is hard to imagine why Democrats would try to repeal this measure if they were not trying to pave the way for much more aggressive IRS pressure on American taxpayers.

In her 2021 report to Congress, the National Taxpayer Advocate noted that “there is no way to sugarcoat the year 2021 in tax administration. From

the perspective of tens of millions of taxpayers, it was horrendous.”

Taxpayers deserve better. They deserve an efficient and accountable IRS and timely and effective customer service, and Congress should focus on giving it to them. I hope to be able to move away from Democrats’ intrusive and reckless Build Back Better IRS proposals and toward bipartisan efforts to reform the IRS and ensure the taxpayers can reliably depend on the Agency.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UKRAINE

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, since Russia’s brutal invasion of Ukraine, Vladimir Putin has been shocked by two things: He has been shocked by the courage and the resilience and skill of the Ukrainian army and the resistance by the Ukrainian people.

He has also been shocked by the way President Biden has unified the world and put together this broad, effective coalition. Think about this: Countries like Germany and Sweden and Finland, even Switzerland, have never been involved in these kinds of international operations. They are all on board, all working with us on weapons and on humanitarian assistance and on sanctions.

The President’s team has done an extraordinary job in mustering the strength of this allied coalition to impose a broad range of powerful, punishing sanctions. We have cut off huge portions of their banking, finance, and business sectors from the Western financial world. We have shut down access to their monetary reserves—what Putin considered his war chest. We have sanctioned their central bank, their large commercial banks, and their sovereign wealth funds.

We have cut off their ability to finance their debt. We have blocked key sanctioned banks from the SWIFT financial messaging system. We are shutting down their borrowing privileges at international institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund.

We have gone after Putin personally and the oligarchs who prop up his regime. We have gone after their intelligence entities and defense firms and others supporting them and supporting the war effort.

We have sanctioned disinformation agents, freezing their assets, cutting off their ability to propagandize Putin’s lies.

Together with our allies, we have begun to go after their lucrative energy sector. We shut down the Nord

Stream 2 gas pipeline. We imposed a broad ban on Russian oil and gas and coal coming to the United States. We have cut off all new American investments into their oil and gas sector, and our big oil and gas firms have withdrawn in droves.

We have cut off the sophisticated technology Russia's refining industry needs and other technologies that have powered their industrial efforts.

In all this, we make it clear: Russia cannot invade its neighbors, cannot kill civilians, cannot expect to benefit from being part of the international economic order.

And again, this has been the leadership of President Biden and the State Department and the Defense Department and the Commerce Department and others and strong leadership that has pulled everybody together. The fact that we have put together this coalition so quickly, again, with countries that really haven't, since World War II, participated in anything like this—again, Sweden and Finland; Germany for the first time; Switzerland, which has been a neutral country since way before even you were born, Mr. President. So this has been a long time that these countries that were neutral are coming to the fore and making a difference for us.

Putin's mistake will set back a generation or more. It will sever its main economic, political, and diplomatic ties with the West and countries around the world which want to have nothing to do with Putin and his regime.

In Brussels tomorrow, the President is set to announce a major new wave of powerful sanctions, including against hundreds of members of the Russian Parliament, the duma, and other elites who have enthusiastically supported this brutal war.

He will intensify American efforts, along with our allies, to impose further sanctions on any defense or intelligence or other Russian firms that have in any way supported this invasion, either directly or indirectly. Our goal is to reach everybody that has been part of Putin's machine, of Putin's war crimes.

Every day, large teams at Treasury and the Department of Justice work with our allies to find and freeze and seize the assets of the oligarchs and other Russians who have supported Putin's war machine—their yachts, their mansions, their overseas bank accounts. There will be no place to hide. All of that is vital. We can always do more.

Russia should not have free and unlimited access to America's economy or to the global economy. The President has committed already—and one of the reasons we are here today—to end permanent normal trade relations with Russia so that they aren't permanent.

We need to do our part to give the President the 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.

We should not delay this another day.

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

Even before this war, we knew that Russia, along with China, cheats on the rules of trade. They subsidize their industries, and they pollute the environment to gain an unfair advantage in the global market. My State, Ohio, knows all too well about being forced to compete with countries that cheat.

If we don't remove this now, Russia will continue to use its status to position their industries in the global market, hurting American companies in the process.

It is not a partisan issue. I introduced a bicameral, bipartisan bill with Senator CASSIDY of Louisiana to remove Russia's permanent normal trade relation status. We did that almost a month ago. There is bipartisan support to do this quickly.

I have worked with my colleague Senator CRAPO from Idaho on many Russian sanction efforts over the years. I know we share the same goals.

I am hopeful there is a path forward in getting this done today. He is arguing that an oil ban should be included in this, even though the President already issued an Executive order on this that is already in effect.

I hope we can work out our differences quickly so we can send a clear, strong, unified message to Russia and to the world: Countries that invade another sovereign nation will not ever have free and unrestricted access to our economy. They will not be able to finance that invasion by continuing to cheat the rules on trade.

It is time to come together to end permanent normal trade relations with Russia.

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

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

GAS PRICES

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, if you know anything about Michigan, you know we love our cars. We put the world on wheels, and we have been keeping Michigan moving ever since. But recently this love affair has hit a rough patch.

Nearly everyone in Michigan drives—to work, to school, and to the lake on the weekends, and it is getting warmer and warmer to be able to do that. And high gas prices have made this Michigan way of life a lot more expensive.

I am thinking of the driver who uses his own car to deliver meals and other essentials to families in Detroit. Gas prices have gone up so much, he is barely breaking even. I am thinking of the student who drives 40 minutes every day to attend classes at Michigan Tech in Houghton. She is training for a great career, but the price at the pump is cutting into the money she needs to pay her tuition and her rent. And I am thinking about farmers. Fuel is absolutely essential to power our tractors and produce fertilizer and keep the world fed.

But income is tight even in the good times, and in the tight times, the folks who grow our food can struggle to fill their own refrigerators.

High fuel prices hurt Michigan families, our businesses, and our economy. And that is why it is so frustrating when oil and gas companies make choices that keep prices high to boost their own bottom lines.

It is true that part of the reason gas prices are so high is because demand is so high. Thanks to President Biden and Democrats in Congress, our economy came roaring back from COVID-19. Now, with all the challenges of the supply chains and the cost issues we are dealing with—but the foundation of our economy is strong, and that is a good thing.

But a roaring economy requires energy, and production isn't keeping pace. It is not that we don't have enough oil. In fact, the United States is the world's largest oil-producing country. And we could be producing more. There are currently 9,000 approved oil leases that the oil companies aren't even using. Yet the oil companies have made a conscious decision to hold back production, to raise prices, and pad the pockets of their shareholders. One CEO even admitted as much last month when he said that his company is "capturing value from higher prices for gas."

Let me translate that. "Capturing value from high prices for gas" really means taking money out of your pocket and my pocket and putting it into the pockets of their shareholders.

It is working for them. His company's revenue nearly tripled during the fourth quarter, and they are not alone. In fact, the 25 largest oil and gas companies raked in \$205 billion in profits last year—\$205 billion in profits last year—while price-gouging now at the pump.

And they used that money to buy back \$40 billion of their own stock and pay their shareholders and top executives \$50 billion in dividends. And they are not particularly eager to pass on any savings to anybody else, unfortunately.

It is interesting. The last time a barrel of oil was \$96, gas was \$3.62 a gallon. Last week, a barrel of oil was again \$96, but this time gas was \$4.31 a gallon.

What is the difference?

Well, the truth is, they set the price based on what they can get away with,

arguing a global economy and supply and so on, a supply which they determine, and they set the price with what they think they can get. And that is called price-gouging right now; taking advantage of situations around the world, our willingness to sacrifice to be part of supporting the Ukrainians and what is happening.

And instead of doing their part to maybe say: OK, \$205 billion in profits last year, pretty good. OK. Maybe we can, like, do our part here—instead, the prices at the pump go up and up and up, and it has got to stop.

A single mom of three in Michigan is standing at a gas pump right now with a knot in her stomach, watching her bill go up and up and her monthly budget for everything else go down.

So that is the problem. What is the solution?

First of all, the Senate Commerce Committee is calling for the CEOs of the major oil companies to testify before the committee, and I am really looking forward to that hearing and what they have to say for themselves on why. I want to thank the chairwoman, Chairwoman CANTWELL, and the committee for their leadership.

Secondly, I introduced the Gas Prices Relief Act with a number of my Democratic colleagues. This gas tax holiday is immediate relief—yes, short term, but it would save Michigan drivers nearly \$650 million at the pump this year.

I also think it is about time to stop subsidizing these oil companies that are doing just fine on their own. They don't need our tax dollars to subsidize them anymore. For more than 100 years, Congress has given major, permanent tax benefits to the fossil fuel industry. This decade, they have received \$35 billion in fossil fuel-related tax breaks. Do the American people really need to keep subsidizing an industry whose pollution is responsible for creating the global climate crisis, all the while enjoying record profits and picking people's pockets? The answer is no. Yet our Republican colleagues stand with the oil companies over and over again.

I just came from an Environmental and Public Works Committee meeting on this very topic and heard over and over again the rationale for letting the oil and gas companies keep doing what they are already doing with no accountability and no real effort for us to move in the direction of clean energy where we need to move.

Most importantly, it is time to shift to new clean sources of energy. For more than 100 years, scientists have known that burning fossil fuels creates carbon pollution that builds up in our atmosphere, and that traps heat. It just stays there. For more than 100 years, we just kept on burning fossil fuels anyway. And the industry has spent billions trying to convince us it is not really happening. We really aren't seeing the climate change. No, this isn't happening. Don't look up.

Well, it is time for a change. We can start by using more homegrown and cleaner burning biofuels to save consumers money. It is time to allow the year-round sale of E15—a change I have encouraged the administration to make. According to the Renewable Fuels Association, E15 is 10 to 15 cents per gallon less than standard gasoline and cleaner.

There is no time like the present to accelerate our shift to clean energy production, which I know the Presiding Officer cares deeply about and has been a leader in, and the use of electric vehicles. We know that part of that is moving to clean energy electricity—power as well as electric transportation. Both are very, very important.

Buying an amazing Michigan-made EV means you can drive right on by the gas station. You don't even have to stop. That is what I am looking forward to. You don't even have to pay attention to what is on the sign—won't matter.

The exciting thing is, we can take action to make this happen more quickly by ensuring that electric vehicles are affordable for more families and, critically, that they are built right here in America—not in China, not somewhere else around the world, in America—and I am laser-focused on making that happen.

The good news is, we will tackle the climate crisis at the same time because the transportation sector is the single largest source of carbon pollution.

Shockingly, a few weeks ago, a fossil fuel executive said this about his industry:

You've made a promise to be more disciplined about getting cash back to shareholders with these dividends. The question is, are you going to keep your promise? Or are you going to be patriotic?

Hmm. It is pretty clear whose side the oil companies are on, and it isn't the side of the American people. It is time for them to stop price-gouging and try a little patriotism.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

PUTIN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, tomorrow will be 1 month since Putin started his war in Ukraine. Every day, we get a chance to see that war being fought on our TV, so I want to tell you what I have seen in 1 month of viewing the war in Ukraine or what I have heard from people who report on that war in Ukraine.

Putin is a child killer.

Putin kills hospital patients.

Putin is a bully.

Putin kills elderly people.

Putin kills pregnant mothers and their babies.

Putin has uprooted at least 10 million people.

Putin deliberately shells residential areas.

Putin shells shopping centers.

Putin shells apartment buildings.

Putin destroys historic buildings.

Putin bombs theaters.

Putin bombs hospitals.

Putin destroys cultural heritage.

Putin threatens world peace.

Putin silences dissent.

Putin threatens nuclear war.

Putin starts war to boost his popularity.

Putin jails his political opponents.

Putin jails citizens speaking against the war.

Putin twists history.

Putin is consumed with power.

Putin feeds off corruption.

Putin is acting like a true Nazi.

Putin kills to feed his ego.

Putin lies to his own people and the world.

Putin admires Stalin.

Putin acts like Stalin.

Putin forcefully deports civilians, like Stalin.

Putin is intentionally starving Ukrainian civilians, like Stalin.

Putin is destroying families.

Putin reintroduced mass graves to Europe—no different than the executions of 20,000 Polish generals and soldiers at Katyn Forest in 1940.

Putin lies to mothers of Russian soldiers.

Putin poisons with impunity, particularly people whom he considers traitors.

Putin came to power by bombing Russian apartments and blaming Chechens.

Putin is still KGB.

Putin lied before invading Ukraine's Crimean Peninsula.

Putin lied about Russian troops in the Donbas.

Putin lied that he would not invade the rest of Ukraine.

Putin lies that NATO had anything to do with his decision to invade.

Putin thinks Ukraine isn't a real country.

Putin thinks other Eastern European countries belong to Russia.

Putin thinks Ukrainians are lesser people than Russians.

Putin is afraid of his own people.

Putin imprisons political opponents.

Putin is afraid of Ukrainian democracy.

Putin got rich by stealing from Russians.

Putin is destroying his own country.

Putin has damaged the global economy.

Putin uses banned weapons against civilians.

Putin kidnapped Ukrainian mayors.

Putin tries to assassinate Ukrainian President Zelenskyy.

Putin has troops fire on humanitarian corridors.

Putin is in bed with organized crime.

Putin supports America's enemies.

Putin has made the Russian Orthodox Church a tool of state power.

Putin oppresses religious minorities.

Putin has forced labor camps for prisoners.

Putin has people who support him or just follow orders or who are afraid to speak up, just like Hitler did.

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. WARREN. 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

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson, President Biden's nominee to be an Associate Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court.

Judge Jackson brings an exceptional level of experience to the bench. After serving for nearly 8 years on the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Jackson has more trial court experience than any sitting Supreme Court Justice and more than almost any Justice in a century. She will also be only the second sitting Justice to have served on all three levels of the Federal judiciary.

Judge Jackson's nomination is historic. If confirmed, she will be the first Black woman to sit on the Supreme Court, bringing a long overdue representation to the Bench. After serving as an assistant Federal public defender in Washington, DC, Judge Jackson will also be the first former Federal public defender to serve on our Nation's highest Court.

It matters that someone nominated to sit on our Nation's highest Court has represented people other than corporate clients. It matters that someone nominated has had real experience with people who can't afford lawyers. It matters that someone nominated has had real experience in fighting for the public interest.

The Sixth Amendment of our Constitution grants criminal defendants the right to have the assistance of counsel in their defenses, but it wasn't until 1963, in *Gideon v. Wainwright*, that the Supreme Court unanimously ruled that the Constitution required State courts to appoint lawyers for defendants who could not otherwise afford one.

Now, some Republicans have complained about the very idea of having a public defender on the Supreme Court, but their objections run squarely afoul of the meaning of the Constitution. This fundamental constitutional right to counsel is safeguarded by the work public defenders do every single day. Public defenders are literally on the frontlines of helping America live up to our constitutional ideals. Every American who supports and defends the Constitution should welcome a Supreme Court Justice who has worked so hard to turn our constitutional ideals into reality.

When asked about her work as a public defender, Judge Jackson said:

Every person who is accused of criminal conduct by the government, regardless of wealth and despite the nature of the accusations, is entitled to the assistance of counsel.

Judge Jackson restates a foundational constitutional point, one that she has lived—up close and personal.

Public defenders understand better than anyone that none of us should be defined by the worst thing we have ever done. Everyone, regardless of who they are or what they have been accused of, deserves a lawyer. Our legal system, as imperfect as it may be, strives to deliver equal justice under law. It is only because of the commitment of public defenders, civil rights attorneys, and legal aid lawyers that we can aspire to achieving that ideal.

That is why we need Judge Jackson's expertise on the Supreme Court, and that is why, for a long time now, I have called for prioritizing professional diversity on our Federal bench.

For far too long, our Federal judiciary has been dominated by those who only have experience representing the wealthy and well connected, but what about those who don't have money or influence? We need more judges with experience in representing the voiceless and the disadvantaged. The make-up of our Federal and State courts has never fully reflected the American people. Over time, this lack of representation has formed cracks in the foundation of our legal system—cracks that weaken public trust and threaten the legitimacy of our institutions.

A diverse judiciary matters. Judges—all judges—draw on their past personal and professional experiences when analyzing the law and reviewing the facts of individual cases. Judges who have experience as public defenders, civil rights attorneys, and legal aid lawyers are well equipped to understand the circumstances that bring everyday Americans into courtrooms. It is that background that strengthens public trust and that reinforces the legitimacy of our judicial system.

Supreme Court Justice Elena Kagan said it best:

If the court doesn't have legitimacy with the American public, it can't do all that much. All kinds of different people should be able to look at the court and say, "I see somebody there who looks like me, who thinks the way I do, who has experiences of the kind that I had." And that's the kind of thing that gives the court public legitimacy.

Justice Kagan is right. Our judiciary will, undoubtedly, be made stronger because of Judge Jackson's confirmation to the Supreme Court.

It is not only her work as a public defender that informs Judge Jackson's experience. Prior to joining the bench, Judge Jackson served first as an assistant special counsel and, later, as the Vice Chair of the U.S. Sentencing Commission. These experiences give her deep insight into the sentencing guidelines and enhance her ability to think critically about our criminal legal system's impact on ordinary people.

Judge Jackson's first stint on the Commission inspired her to become an assistant Federal public defender in order to gain practical, firsthand in-

sight into our criminal legal system. Her work in the trenches, representing those without means or power, provided Judge Jackson with an invaluable perspective into our system of justice, and it gave her the opportunity to effectuate the fundamental right to counsel, which is outlined in our Constitution.

I look forward to supporting her confirmation, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UKRAINE

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I returned to the United States Sunday night after leading a bipartisan Senate delegation visit to Poland and Germany. Ten Senators—Republicans and Democrats—traveled together to demonstrate America's unwavering support for the freedom-loving people of Ukraine and affirm the strength of the world's most powerful alliance.

I will never forget an engagement with Ukrainian civil society leaders. This group of passionate, strong women demonstrated Ukraine's spirit and their will to fight. They delivered a very clear message to the United States. They said that Ukraine can win, but they need more lethal aid delivered now.

Our bipartisan delegation departed with the conviction that the United States, Ukraine, and the free world have the will and the means to stop Vladimir Putin's tyranny. I am here on the Senate floor today to state my belief that Ukraine will beat back Vladimir Putin's bloody invasion. They will throw the Russian army out of their country, and they will declare victory over this lawless criminal incursion.

Folks, Ukraine can win this war. When the shooting is over, the Russian military will be broken, and the Russian economy will collapse—consequences brought about by Putin's chosen isolation and rejection of the free world. He and his cronies, their futures are not bright either. Putin's propaganda media machine will break down. He will be marked by the international community as a war criminal and, I predict, will be held accountable by his own people. His best days are behind him. Freedom will win.

Most of us thought these outcomes were improbable just a few weeks ago. The President's policymakers circulated intelligence assessments in the first days of the invasion which concluded unequivocally that Ukraine didn't stand a chance. They predicted Putin would topple Kyiv within 3 to 5 days. Tomorrow marks 1 month since the start of the war. The Russian military is disorganized and demoralized.

Four separate divisions are all competing for logistics resupply.

Putin knows he is losing, and he is panicking. He jailed his deputy chief of intelligence, and his military is burning the bodies of their Russian casualties. Russia's manpower and ammunition are tapping out while, on the other side, Ukraine's forces are hanging tough.

The weapons the United States and our allies and partners provided are being deployed with lethal proficiency. The frontlines have been frozen for over a week, and Russian casualties are greater than 1,000 a day.

Ukrainians are intercepting unclassified calls and eliminating Russian field commanders. Most crucially, the Ukrainian people are ready to fight to the last man. The Russian army is a force of teenaged conscripts, subjects of an authoritarian war criminal whose delusions of grandeur about the old Soviet Union drove this invasion. The Ukrainian army is made up of free citizens who chose freedom over Russian tyranny. Putin's invasion doesn't change Ukraine's choice, and they will not go quietly.

Given all of this, has the United States shifted its strategy? Do we believe we can help make a Ukrainian victory a near certainty? We all know why we must come to Ukraine's aid. This body's memory is not that short. The United States is an agreement-bound partner with Ukraine. We entered into an agreement. We are their partners.

In 1994, Ukraine dismantled and surrendered its nuclear armament entirely in exchange for our security guarantee—the protection of the world's greatest superpower. Our agreement resulted in a prosperous Ukraine and made the world a much, much safer place.

Before Vladimir Putin attempted to snuff it out for good 3 weeks ago, the American people and the world benefited from the breadbasket of Europe's vital agricultural sector and energy production. Ukraine has been an invaluable economic and security partner for nearly 30 years.

Putin is not only testing that agreement today in the streets of Kyiv, Mariupol, and Kharkiv, he wants to break freedom's momentum all around the globe. Folks, we can't allow that to happen. We must not.

If it has not been made clear enough already, an unshakeable commitment to allies and partners keeps Americans prosperous and our families safe. Authoritarians—whether it is the Taliban, Vladimir Putin, Xi Jinping, the terrorists who rule Iran—they cannot dictate terms to our security and our economy. We still are the world's superpower 28 years after we made a security agreement with Ukraine. America cannot be pushed around.

We also know how we can come to Ukraine's aid. Congress just passed \$14 billion of support for Ukraine, which included nearly \$2 billion of lethal

weaponry. That aid—those weapons and that logistical support—must flow right now. I fought for a provision in the aid package that allows the President to draw down on pre-positioned military equipment, and I will be ensuring he follows through and gets these weapons into Ukrainian hands. There is no excuse for American inaction.

The Commander in Chief now has the authority to transfer pre-positioned weapons and logistical support, including as many as 40 Soviet-style helicopters purchased for Afghan security forces, to the Ukrainians. America's commitment to Ukraine and our NATO allies demands we expedite the delivery of weapons and capabilities to Ukraine. Any delay due to the fears of escalation is reflective of a doctrine of appeasement that will only further embolden our adversaries.

Pentagon Press Secretary John Kirby said recently that success for the U.S. mission in Ukraine is, at the end of the conflict, a free and independent, sovereign Ukraine.

Folks, I wholeheartedly agree with this sentiment, but if that is our mission, America has to provide more support to enable Ukraine to win this war. We cannot hold back. The U.S. mission in Ukraine must go beyond ensuring the country merely has the means to defeat itself—defend itself against Russian aggression, defeat the Russians. Now is not the time to be risk-averse.

This administration did little to deter Putin's march on Kyiv, an invasion set in motion as early as April 2021. President Biden lifted sanctions on Nord Stream 2, framed the United States-Russia relationship as stable and predictable as late as June of last year, and canceled European Command military exercises calling them “too provocative.”

Public opinion, Congress, and even European nations have hammered, begged, dragged, and pushed the Biden administration to action. From economic sanctions to the Russian oil ban, the administration has led from behind and from a position of weakness.

Take the Polish MiG debacle; three Sundays ago, Secretary Blinken gave Poland a green light to transfer MiG fighter jets to Ukraine. The following Tuesday, the White House did a flip and rejected the transfer of planes out of fear Putin would see the move as escalatory. Forty-one Republicans joined my letter voicing displeasure to the President for his failure to act. Letting an adversary define your military's rules of engagement, letting the aggressor dictate the boundaries of our response is not just a folly, it is suicidal.

The administration crossed their fingers and hoped Putin would play nice. Well, folks, we know Putin. He didn't play nice, and deterrence failed. But the failure of this administration's doctrine of appeasement doesn't mean Ukraine will lose the war.

I commend actions taken to shore up the NATO alliance following the inva-

sion, but our Commander in Chief must now lead and give Ukraine the means to win. If he is to continue being the most powerful man in the free world, he must act as such.

Delaying the loss of Ukraine to Vladimir Putin is not a strategy. Success is not a Russian-occupied Ukraine. Success is not a protracted insurgency. Success is a free, independent, and sovereign Ukraine. Defending freedom in Ukraine is defending freedom everywhere. Authoritarianism cannot prevail in this conflict.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Madam President, I would like to thank my fellow Senator, Senator ERNST from Iowa, for leading the delegation trip that we took this past weekend, the bipartisan delegation. It was most informative, impactful, and she did a wonderful job leading that. I was proud of the efforts.

I am here to join my colleagues today to discuss the invasion—the unjust and immoral invasion of Ukraine by Vladimir Putin—in light of the trip that we just took to Germany and to Poland. In a way, I am kind of hesitant to do so, not because there isn't a lot to say or a lot to share but because of the powerful words that some of the Ukrainians whom we met implored us, which was: Enough talking. It is time to act.

I could not agree more. But out of deep respect for them, I would like to take a moment to make sure we all understand why we have to act and why we must act now.

As Americans, you realize this when you talk to—we did, certainly, when we were talking with Germans and other Europeans. We don't have the same perspective sometimes that Europeans have who faced World War II. One of the most powerful comments conveyed when we were meeting with German officials was that their new generation who has heard for decades about the atrocities from their parents and their grandparents—they were told this would never happen again. And yet what we see is that it is happening again.

This is an unjust war, and there seems to be no level of atrocity that Vladimir Putin is unwilling to commit. Putin overestimated his ability, his army, his ability to conquer. “This must be over in 3 days,” according to him. He overestimated his own abilities, and he grossly underestimated the will of the Ukrainian people and the will to not just live but to live freely.

On top of this, Putin has also failed to understand the commitment of the free world—of NATO—to stand up for freedom. We certainly saw that over the last several days.

We, in our Nation and in our history, know that freedom is worth fighting for, and it is also worth defending. Generations have done this in our past and will do this in the future. We believe this to our core.

We also believe that the deliberate and evil bombing of hospitals, targeting supply routes, and killing civilians are the actions of war criminals.

But in the face of all of this evil, we see hope. We see hope from the Ukrainian people; we see hope from the Ukrainian leadership; we see hope from the Ukrainian military; and we see hope in our own military forces as a part of NATO, including all nations of NATO as well as the generosity of people around the world, the nongovernmental organizations we saw helping at the refugee center, and, most especially, the Polish people. We saw them stepping in militarily. And on the humanitarian side, we saw an incredible outpouring. We saw this firsthand at the refugee center.

Poland has now taken in over 2 million people into their country, which is more than the entire population of my State. During our trip, as I said, we visited the refugee center where Ukrainians are going first to be processed as they are leaving and having to flee their country. After this, they end up not at another refugee center but most likely in somebody's home or a friend's. That is the level of care and support that they are receiving. And that is the level of care and support that they deserve as a tribute of their willingness to fight and defend their freedom. Many of these women and children—mostly women and children—are leaving their husbands and their homes behind.

Ukraine is united. As we were told, Ukraine will fight to the last man. May it never come to the last man because the free world must help. Make no mistake, the United States of America has chosen a side. We side with freedom. We side with the people of Ukraine.

Just a few weeks ago, Congress passed \$14 billion in support for Ukraine and Central European allies amid Putin's unprovoked war. It is critical to get these funds and equipment to them now because time is of the essence.

As an example, Congress took an extra week to pass this package. When you are there on the ground talking to the leadership who are trying to push back on Putin, a week is a lifetime—a week is a lifetime. So we cannot afford to hesitate or to cause inaction.

In our efforts to get them funds—lethal aid—and to oppose sanctions on Russia, we must act now and keep acting.

Madam President, as you know—you were on the trip, as well—we met with diplomats and generals, representatives from many of our executive branch Agencies, NGOs, brave soldiers, including many from our home States. But I will never forget the words of a woman we met named Katarina, whom we met at the refugee processing center. She said, in desperate tones, she didn't want to leave Ukraine. She didn't want to leave her home. She wants to live in freedom and peace, but she has a 6-year-old and 8-year-old who

are constantly hearing the sirens of bomb alerts, the sounds of bombing—just the violence. She had no choice. She had to leave to protect her children.

Let's do what we can, as much as we can, and as fast as we can—and that last part is critical—to return freedom to Ukraine and justice to those who do not respect the sovereignty of nations. This is really what we owe every child in Ukraine, in Germany, in Poland, and in the United States.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, on February 24, approximately 1 month ago, Vladimir Putin launched an unprovoked and unjustified war against his neighbor, the free, democratic, and sovereign nation of Ukraine.

The bipartisan Senate delegation visit to Europe led by Senator ERNST that I joined over this past weekend was truly extraordinary. It has reinforced my already strong belief that the United States must do all that it can to provide lethal aid to the courageous Ukrainians fighting for their families and their freedom, as well as to provide the humanitarian assistance necessary to ease the suffering of the Ukrainian people.

The Presiding Officer was on this trip, as well.

Like the Senator from West Virginia, who just spoke, my most memorable conversation was with a young mother named Katarina, who had two children, one age 8 and one age 6, with her. I met her at the Polish refugee welcome center. It was only a few miles from the Ukrainian border.

She said to me:

I want to live in peace. I want to be back in Ukraine, but I have to keep my children safe.

She was weary-looking but determined to keep her children safe. This young mother and her two children were leaving the only country she had ever known. She left her husband behind, not knowing when or if she would see him again—all in order to keep her children safe.

We have only to watch the scenes of what Putin is doing to try to destroy Ukraine and to break the will of its people. He has bombed apartment buildings, schools, theaters, shelters, humanitarian corridors. He has bombed a maternity hospital. What does that tell you about this man, this war criminal? What more do we need to know?

The only way that we can end this humanitarian crisis is to provide Ukraine with the weapons, supplies, ammunition, and other assistance that they need to bring to an end this Russian war of aggression. We must provide, without further delay, the Ukrainians with the MiG fighter aircraft that have been held up by this administration and which Ukrainian President Zelenskyy has requested. We

must ensure that Ukraine receives additional anti-aircraft defenses, including the S-300, whether directly from our stocks or those of our allies.

We must ensure that the Ukrainians have the means to fight and defend their people from these ongoing atrocities ordered by Putin. And we know of—we saw firsthand—their extraordinary bravery, their determination to fight for their country, to put everything they have on the line.

Every moment, every hour, every day counts. We do not have time for endless debate and delay that costs the lives of innocent Ukrainians. As the Ukrainian leader told us, the administration must stop telling Putin what America will not do. It must say what we will do.

The administration should also make every effort in collaboration with Congress, when necessary, to ease the process of allowing Ukrainians with family members here in America to come stay with them until it is safe to return home. I know many Mainers are eager to help.

Finally, I want to acknowledge the terrific American soldiers that we met, including several from the great State of Maine. Many of them left their families with days' or even hours' notice over the past few weeks. They rapidly deployed to Germany, Poland, and other NATO allies to deter Russia's aggression and defend these NATO members from any Russian threats. Each of these members of our military were motivated, patriotic, and impressive, and I am so grateful for their service.

I have read that President Biden is considering stationing our troops close to the frontline to send an unmistakable message to the Russians on a more permanent basis, and I hope that he will indeed do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, it is a privilege to be here on the Senate floor speaking to Kansans and to Americans, to Vladimir Putin and to Ukrainians, and to the rest of the world, our allies, our friends, and our adversaries. It is a privilege to be here with the opportunity of speaking with one voice.

As we know, that does not happen frequently enough in the U.S. Senate, but the Presiding Officer was on this trip with us to Eastern Europe and to the Ukrainian border, and my colleagues here on the Senate floor—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents; Members of the U.S. Senate, together—saw what we saw and resolved what we resolved together.

I am so pleased that that is the case. Particularly our adversaries, but clearly our allies, as well, must know that this is not a Democratic or Republican issue. It is an American issue. It is a world issue. It is something about freedom that transcends any of the differences that we have here in the United States or in the U.S. Senate.

And every day matters. While it is important for us to bring our report

home to our colleagues and to our constituents about what we saw, what we heard, and what, most importantly, we felt, it is important that we act.

Remember the Ukrainian citizens who told us: It is OK to proclaimate. It is OK to have a statement. It is OK to pass a resolution. But what we need is action.

Every day matters in the fight against Vladimir Putin's unprovoked, unjust, and immoral invasion of Ukraine.

To any of the people who say Ukraine is at fault here, I cast all doubt about that. That is not the case. What is happening in Ukraine, what is happening in Eastern Europe, and what may happen beyond the borders of Ukraine is the result of an evil man named Vladimir Putin.

The United States—this administration—must stop telling Putin what we won't do. Don't ever tell our adversaries: We are not going to do this.

It makes absolutely no sense.

But we do need to do what we said we will do and even more.

Our slow bureaucratic march to provide aid is not keeping up with the Russian forces. I dread when I get up in the morning, each morning, before, but especially after, I returned from the Ukrainian border. I dread turning on the television to see what the latest news is and what the sights are from Ukraine, only to find more onslaught, more death, more destruction.

Every minute, every day matters. We have delayed ourselves in providing financial sanctions and in imposing financial sanctions. We were slow in energy sanctions, and we were slow in getting a defensive military package in place. But we are moving now.

This Congress has reached its conclusions about the importance of these things. This administration has acted, but the things that we have promised, apparently, still have not in total reached Ukraine.

How difficult it must be to be a Ukrainian, knowing that something is coming from the outside world to help? While I get up and dread the news of the day, every moment in their lives has to be the expectation, the hope that something is going to arrive today to bring this incursion, this massacre, this death and destruction to an end.

If you are a parent in Ukraine, it is not about what you see on the nightly news, on the morning news. It is about how am I going to save my children's lives today? What is going to occur in a few moments? And our answer can't be: It is coming. We will be there later.

It has to be: We are there now.

The defensive military package includes Stinger anti-aircraft systems, Javelin anti-armor weapon systems, tactical unmanned aerial systems, grenade launchers, firearms, ammunition, and body armor and helmets. But they must be delivered. They mean nothing on a list. They mean nothing on a piece of paper that says we are shipping these things, on a bill of lading. They

mean nothing en route to Ukraine. They mean something when they are in the hands of the Ukrainians that we know to be committed, brave, persistent, undeterred.

You know in visiting, the Senator spoke about the military men and women we have seen from our own country and what an inspiration they are and how much we appreciate their service and their sacrifice and their families back here in Kansas and across the country.

Our military men and women from Kansas have been training Ukrainians over the last several years, and even they are amazed that, despite their relationships and training with the Ukrainian soldiers, how successful they are. I think, unfortunately, in this country we thought that this invasion would last a few days and that it would be over and the Ukrainian people decimated or surrendered.

And so our expectations, apparently, were that we were not necessary, that we were not a solution to this problem. The course of events is already predetermined, but the human spirit defies all expectations—the human spirit of the Ukrainian people, the tremendous leadership.

My experience suggests to me the value of a leader. You can have highly trained soldiers, but if you don't have leaders who inspire, their abilities to succeed, their abilities to persevere disappear. And President Zelenskyy has been the role model.

My guess is that citizens around the world look at Zelenskyy and say: Oh, that is the kind of clear leadership, determination that we need—clear spoken, clear acting, not running, fighting the fight.

We must make certain—this is a moral issue, Americans, the world. If you think that the war was going to be over in a few days, you may have a different attitude. But now that we know that it is not, we have to provide the military equipment, the means for the Ukrainian people, their military, their civilians, not just to survive another day but to win the war. How immoral it is to provide just enough to live but not enough to win.

What we saw on the Polish-Ukrainian border is the impact of Putin's war to these people, to the people of Ukraine, to the people of the neighboring countries—the fear that our NATO allies have that Ukraine may not be next. Not only do we need to provide the equipment and support for Ukrainians to win for purposes of the Ukrainian people, but if Putin doesn't pay the price, if he feels that he is all-empowered after his march through Ukraine, I have no level of comfort that he stops at the Ukrainian border.

I am saddened by what I saw: the human suffering, the tragedies. We all have kids and grandkids. And we saw Ukrainian children; we saw parents who love them but had to give them up for their safety and security. We saw families—wives who love their hus-

bands, spouses who love each other but departing because dad, brother needs to stay behind to fight the fight.

And on the other hand, there was the tremendous relief in seeing the response by others. It happens often in crises around the world, when Americans and others—the whole world—resolve to help people in these circumstances.

But this is not a flood; this is not a tsunami; this is not an earthquake. The sadness of this comes from: This is unnecessary. This is one man's evil actions causing the desperation and death, the tragedy, in Ukraine.

And we should know that it doesn't end at the Ukrainian borders. Even if Putin doesn't cross the border, the hunger, the starvation, the lack of food around the world—Ukraine is the breadbasket of Europe, and its ability to feed itself and its ability to feed the rest of the world is disappearing.

We will see the need for assistance and humanitarian aid in countries around the globe only increase at a time in which there is famine in so many places.

It is a circumstance caused by a tyrant, whose actions will not just affect Ukrainian people, but the rest of the world.

We must be unified with our NATO allies. And it was so pleasing to see the NATO countries who now recognize the importance of NATO and are stepping up to fulfill their commitments, in support of the Ukrainians, but in support of this pact that at the end of World War II, across the Atlantic, it was decided that America had a role to play, but we could only play that role with the cooperation of others.

It is still true today. America has a role to play, but we need friends and allies, and we made our commitment to NATO. They, too, need to know that America will be steadfast. We can demonstrate that by being steadfast in Ukraine.

It is immoral, it is death causing, it is damning should the United States of America fail in its obligations.

I will conclude with the story I have told before. It comes from watching the news—something I try to avoid doing—about the reporter who is asking what appears to me to be a 10-, 11-year-old boy in a Ukrainian orphanage that question we often ask young people: What do you want to be when you grow up?

This little boy, through an interpreter, answered that question, What do I want to be when I grow up? His response was: I want to be an American.

What does that tell us about us? Americans? It tells us that we are still something special. We still matter. The rest of the world still pays attention to us, and an 11-year-old boy across the globe knows enough about us to know that is what he wants to be.

That should make us feel proud as Americans, but it also ought to make us accept and fulfill our responsibilities.

No 11-year-old boy in an orphanage in Ukraine ought to be in an orphanage in Ukraine. And we, our allies, must fulfill our responsibilities of what it is to be an American.

Madam President, I offer my willingness to work with you and everyone in this U.S. Senate, the Congress, and the administration to make sure that, knowing that there are people in the world who know what they want when they grow up is to be an American, to do my part to make sure that America is the place and an American is who you would want to be.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, let me start by thanking the junior Senator from Iowa for her leadership.

I thank Senator ERNST for fighting for freedom. Thanks for showing me the way to continue to fight for those who need help.

This weekend, together, we witnessed the worst of mankind, but we also saw the best of humankind, and that would be the Polish people and the job that they have done welcoming—yes, welcoming—almost a million refugees from Ukraine over a period of about 2 weeks.

They didn't just welcome them. They gave them food; they gave them clothing and shelter. And then more than that, they helped process them and get them to a location, to a friend, to a relative, buying them plane tickets, putting them on trains.

I have done missionary healthcare work all across the world, and what we saw the Polish people doing there was absolutely incredible. Half of the Polish people have taken a refugee into their own homes.

But like I said, we also witnessed the worst of humankind, the worst of mankind, and that would be Vladimir Putin's war on the people of Ukraine.

One Ukrainian woman—her name was Olena—whom I spoke with said:

The Russians are attacking Ukraine from the north, from the east, and the south. With their missiles, they can reach every place of our country—there is no safe place in Ukraine any more. Everything can be targeted: hospitals, kindergartens, maternity wards, hospitals, everything.

And another Ukrainian we spoke to, Daria, said:

In the city of Mariupol, almost every single building was hit by a Russian bomb or a Russian missile. People are residing in bomb shelters. They are cut from electricity. They are cut from aid, food, and from water. They are melting snow to drink water. Russians are deliberately throwing bombs into hospitals.

And, again, I am quoting Daria.

There is only one hospital remaining. One of the hospitals was a maternity hospital. Men were trying to evacuate a woman who was in labor, and she died with her unborn baby. Another pregnant woman—her name was Mariana—was going down the stairs. She survived. She gave birth. They don't have food now to feed the mother. I don't know if the baby girl is still alive. There are thousands of people dead, but it's impossible to

bury them. The bodies—it's a horror movie which is happening—people are dead on the streets.

These stories are heart-wrenching, and there is no doubt the world needs to step up and we need Europe to lead. And I am so proud to report the buzz across Europe and the buzz across Germany as we landed, that the Germans are committed once again to this transatlantic partnership and a willingness to commit dollars and funds to this NATO alliance and to the security of the world.

That said, there is so much more that we can still do short of boots on the ground. And like my Ukrainian friends remind me: This war didn't start with Russia on February 24.

And this is Olena again. She said the weakness of the United States started much earlier:

Since the beginning of November, we've been shouting out loud to help arm Ukraine, sanction Nord Stream 2—why did the U.S. lift sanctions on Nord Stream 2 and basically give the green light for Putin to move forward in Ukraine? We clearly warned that that might happen—we were not heard.

Earlier this month, the Ukrainians said that they met with Secretary Blinkin and they begged him to please send air defense systems now. But weeks later, they still don't have them. This is day No. 26 since Russia invaded, and the Ukrainians are telling us they are not seeing any American weapons yet.

I asked them to describe to me what they needed to win this war, and their answer was very simple: maximum military assistance as it relates to weapons, including, MiGs, A-10s, Javelins, Stingers, drones.

Look, the Ukrainians can win this ground war, but the problem is Russia is launching bombs from their own airspace, from their own land, from the seas as well. What they need are missiles that will intercept the Russian bombs.

Another Polish woman we met said:

We were ready as Poland to give these MiGs—

This is a Polish woman speaking now.

We were ready as Poland to give them the MiGs, but the Biden administration didn't want us to provide them. And what happened—instead of consulting us, the Biden administration decided to go public without the Polish Government even knowing that this was the case.

The impression in Ukraine is that the White House is undermining the giving of weapons from our allies to the Ukrainians, that they are thwarting the transfer of these weapons. One of the Ukrainians even went so far as to say she wanted to steal the MiGs because there was just no other option.

This war was completely preventable had the United States projected its strength. The United States can do so much more. President Zelenskyy has begged us, the United States, to lead more, but this administration is following the footsteps of President Obama by leading from behind. They have been slow to react at every step.

This is a portion of a cruise missile that hit in Ukraine. Two Ukrainian diplomats describing to me what happened, where 35 people were killed by the cruise missile. This was launched by Russia on one of the days that President Biden said what NATO will not do to help Ukraine.

Let me say that again. This was launched the day that President Biden said what NATO will not do to help Ukraine.

This is the very telegraphing that has, yet again, proved to be deadly. As Ukrainians pointed out to us, this is what led to the disastrous Afghanistan withdrawal. In their words—the words of the Ukrainians, not mine—they say this administration is operating what they call an “Afghanistan syndrome.”

The Ukrainian people don't need speeches. They don't need words. They don't need resolutions. They don't need Americans forming committees and praying about it. They need more than our prayers. They need action. They need action.

I call for a war tribunal to be formed and Putin and his generals to be held accountable and put on trial for crimes against humanity.

The world needs to seize his personal assets and the assets of his oligarchs, and we need to use those personal assets to rebuild Ukraine. The world needs to stop doing business with Russia today. Don't wait on your governments. Don't wait on the sanctions. I call on every business in the world to stop doing business with Russia today.

And finally, the United States needs to implement our sanctions today, not yesterday. We don't need to delay until June 24 a waiver on energy payments from Russian banks.

We still have so much more we could do short of putting American boots on the ground. We need to send this military aid yesterday—not tomorrow, not next week.

It is not a time to debate. Give them the damn weapons. The brave Ukrainian people will use them. They will fight to the death, but they have to be empowered to do it, and every day we wait, thousands more will die.

I want to finish on a positive note. I am so proud of these young men and women, American fighters in the Big Red One, the 1st Infantry Division of Fort Riley, KS. They have been there for years training Ukrainians, training our partners.

Some of the folks will ask me back home: Are we going to be safe? I have got all the faith and confidence in the world of our soldiers, of our military—all the confidence in the world of these men and women that are willing to put their lives on the line.

And let me reassure you also that the Ukrainian people are not going to give up. They are not going to give up. They are going to fight for every inch, every mile of their home soil.

In Poland, Olena and Daria told me just before we departed:

America is the leader of NATO. Every NATO country is looking at what America is

doing and not doing. What America is saying and what America is not saying. We know that there are NATO countries here on the border who have weapons which we need, but they simply need backup from America. We will win this war. But, at which price will we win this war? Help us win it at the price of less casualty. That's what we are asking the United States.

Like I said earlier, the Ukrainians can win this war. There is a path to victory. I believe in them, but the world has to step up. We have to empower them. We are doing so little of what we could be doing.

I was taught at a young age: Of him who much is given, much is required. And the United States has been given so much. We are still the leader of the free world. It is time we start acting like it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 683, the nomination of Julie Rubin, under the previous order.

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

The bill clerk read the nomination of Julie Rebecca Rubin, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

VOTE ON RUBIN NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 101 Ex.]

YEAS—51

| | | |
|------------|--------------|--------------|
| Baldwin | Coons | Hickenlooper |
| Bennet | Cortez Masto | Hirono |
| Blumenthal | Duckworth | Kaine |
| Booker | Durbin | Kelly |
| Brown | Feinstein | King |
| Cantwell | Gillibrand | Klobuchar |
| Cardin | Graham | Leahy |
| Carper | Hassan | Lujan |
| Collins | Heinrich | Markey |

| | | |
|-----------|----------|------------|
| Menendez | Reed | Tester |
| Merkley | Rosen | Tillis |
| Murkowski | Sanders | Van Hollen |
| Murphy | Schatz | Warner |
| Murray | Schumer | Warnock |
| Ossoff | Sinema | Warren |
| Padilla | Smith | Whitehouse |
| Peters | Stabenow | Wyden |

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—3

Casey Manchin Shaheen

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session. The Senator from Oklahoma.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, there is a lot going on in the world right now: Ukraine; what is happening in China; what is happening with the Iran nuclear conversation right now with Russia and the United States and China; record inflation here in the United States. There is so much going on that I am concerned that we are not also focused on an area at our southwest border.

It is interesting; I have had folks who have caught me and have said: Things must be going better at our southwest border because I don't hear about it as much.

Actually, there is just so much other news that it is drowning it out.

So what is actually happening at our southwest border right now, and where are we? Let me give you a little bit of context and then to be able to talk through some of the issues that are happening.

Today, on our southwest border, about 6,300 people have already illegally crossed. Now, a day that they can manage is about 3,500 people. So we are still hearing record numbers of people illegally crossing the border.

To set this in context, during the 4 years of the Trump Presidency, there were 2.4 million people who were encountered illegally crossing the border during the 4 years of the Trump Presidency. During the first 14 months of the Biden Presidency, we have already exceeded that number. We have had more illegal encounters in the first 14 months than there were in the previous 4 years.

In this process of all these individuals crossing the border, it has been interesting. There was something that was put in place in January of 2020 called title 42 authority. Now, let me explain this briefly. Because of the pandemic that was happening, in March of 2020, the Trump administration put in place that, for single adult individuals who were crossing the border, they would be turned around at the border based on the pandemic that was happening. The Biden administration agreed with that policy, and when they came in, they kept title 42 in place. In fact, last year, 1.1 million people were turned around at the border under title 42 authority.

Title 42 authority was always intended to be temporary. It is not a permanent immigration policy; it is during the pandemic, although it is ironic that the administration is looking to lift title 42 authority on the border at the same time—this month—members of the National Guard are being forced to resign if they don't have their vaccine. So if you don't take your vaccine and you are in the National Guard, you are being forced out, or if you are in the military and you haven't taken it, you are being forced to resign the military, but people illegally crossing our border can come into the United States.

At the same month that there is conversation about dropping the title 42 authority, we are still wearing a mask on our planes, in buses, and in trains based on a requirement of the administration on a threat to COVID. At the same time that is occurring, the administration is looking to lift the title 42 issues at our southern border.

They have had a year to be able to plan for this. I have been in conversation with Ali Mayorkas and with DHS. We have had multiple conversations with the leaders. I have been on the border multiple times to be able to talk to the leadership there, to say we have all known that at some point, title 42 authority is going away, so when that occurs, what is the plan to deal with illegal immigration or what they call irregular migration? What is the plan at that point?

Well, we are finally getting bits and pieces of the plan. The plan is, apparently, from the notes that we are getting and the conversations we have had at the staff level and that I can piece together from multiple conversations with multiple leaders, after a year of considering what to be able to do about illegal immigration and increasing numbers at the border, apparently, within the next couple of weeks, they are going to stop title 42 to be able to more rapidly move people into the interior of the country faster so the border looks less chaotic. The plan is to move people into the country faster so there is not a camera shot on people backed up at the border. That is the plan.

I wish I was kidding on that, but in a briefing with my staff last week, DHS

Office of Intelligence and Analysis told our team that as soon as they release title 42, they anticipate tens of thousands of migrants crossing the border within hours; that they are literally camped up on the south side of the border and that they will flood the border. DHS Office of Intelligence anticipates hundreds of thousands of migrants crossing within 2 weeks and as many as a million crossing within 6 weeks of when they lift title 42 authority.

May I remind us, last summer, when we saw all the chaos on our southern border, that was 900,000 for an entire year. They are anticipating as many as a million in 6 weeks illegally crossing our border, and their plan is not to turn them around; their plan is to bus them to towns and cities all over the United States so they would move away from the border quickly. That does not feel like a plan to me; that feels like a recipe for chaos and frustration from American citizens across the country.

The plan continues to be able to give individuals a piece of paper that they would have a court hearing 6 years in the future—6 years. I wish I was kidding about this. They will come across the border, be given a piece of paper, told they have a hearing 6 years in the future, and if they would like to apply for a work status, they can get that after they are here 6 months.

Last year, we had the highest number of illegal crossings in the history of our country—last year. The administration is now planning for that number to skyrocket this year. Their solution is to give work permits, move people faster to the interior of the country, and repeat. That is not a plan; that is a formula for disaster. That is individuals and families moving into the country who don't have legal status by the millions.

May I remind this body that last year, we had individuals from every single country on the planet who were encountered on our border last year illegally crossing—every single country. Yes, that includes Iran, North Korea, Russia. You name it, every country on the planet illegally crossed our border. The plan this year is not to turn them around; the plan this year is to expedite them into the interior of the country, hand them a form, and say: Show up at court 6 years from now. Oh, by the way, while you are waiting, you can have a work permit.

That is going to just drive even more illegal immigration into our country. That is going to drive people from all over the world to be able to come here and to cross our border illegally. That is an invitation to chaos. And I cannot even believe, even with this administration, that after a year of planning, this is the plan for what they are going to do for illegal immigration on our southern border.

Last summer, we found out through a series of rumors that ICE was planning to put up what they were calling a surge overflow temporary processing

facility in Western Oklahoma, at a private prison there. I contacted DHS, confirmed that they were actually planning this, and told them the obvious issues with that. There was no bus station in that area. There was no airport in that area. They were literally looking to move thousands of people from the border into Western Oklahoma, into a small town, and just release them at that point, and they can figure out what to do and where to go from there.

The administration, after 48 hours of our back and forth, of me pushing, pulled back their plan and said they weren't going to do it. But I have noted their response back to me at the end of that. They said that they had decided not to pursue this facility at this time.

What was threatened in my State a year ago is very likely coming to many States that are represented in this room in the weeks ahead, where individuals are moved all over the country, into small towns and large towns, to be able to move people away from the border—what even DHS estimates may be a million people in 6 weeks to every part of the country so the border doesn't look chaotic. Can I ask you, is your town set up to receive people coming from all over the world to come into your town—a million in a 6-week time period?

Interior processing is a terrible idea. It is a terrible idea. And after a year, DHS can do better than this. So what do we need to do about this? My Democratic colleagues have a unique relationship with this President. You have the opportunity to be able to call the office, to sit down with the leadership team, and to say: This looks like a particularly bad idea. The American people do not like chaos, and they do not like illegal immigration. The American people love legal immigration. We cheer at nationality events. We show up in droves and watch people pledge allegiance to the flag for the first time as an American citizen. But the American people do not like illegal immigration, especially one that is unlimited, chaotic, and from every country in the world.

So I made contact with the administration. I am laying this marker down. We are going to do everything that we possibly can as a team to be able to make it clear that this administration plans to bring chaos to the United States in the next several months, and we are going to do everything we can to be able to stop that. This is not some random threat.

The President of the United States has a unique responsibility to enforce the law. That is what Presidents do. And the people in my State are not asking for something odd or peculiar; they are asking simply for the President of the United States to enforce the law of the United States.

May I remind this body of a statistic you may or may not remember. Last year, ICE deported 57,000 people total in a year. We had 2.3 million people il-

legally encountered at the southern border, and ICE deported 57,000 total in a year. It was a record-low number of deportations and a record-high number of illegal crossings. And now they are planning to lift title 42. All 100 of us should be addressing this administration and telling them this is a bad idea, and I pray they hear us out.

To the President of the United States: Just enforce the law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Washington.

H.R. 4521

Ms. CANTWELL. I come to the floor to talk about the underlying bill that we are trying to get passed. That is the United States Innovation and Competition Act that we passed here in the U.S. Senate about 280 days ago.

One aspect of that bill is a provision that we just had a hearing on in the Commerce Committee today, and that is the funding of what are called semiconductors, the key technology enabling so much of the technology sectors today—from your phones to your smart devices, to automobiles, to the transition we want to make on clean energy, to just about everything that we see that is essential to be smarter, more connected, and to play off some of the advances in technology that allow us to be more efficient.

But we are here to talk about how chips are also a supply chain issue. And the supply chain of this product has definitely been impacted over the last few years, both by the fact that there has been a higher demand for them and because of what has happened during COVID.

In fact, 90 percent of the chips that are most advanced today come from Taiwan. Today's hearing was about how the United States of America needs to do more to produce the next generation of advanced chips for artificial intelligence, automation, and advanced manufacturing, here in the United States, and that an overreliance on the global supply chain—which every American can tell you about the supply chain now because there are products that they are not getting because of the supply chain or the price has gone up because of the supply chain—but we know that this issue of getting this Innovation and Competition Act and getting the funding for more production to be done in the United States on something as critical as semiconductors is a very key issue. So I hope our colleagues will help us get to conference and resolve this issue with our colleagues.

But I would like to talk about a few of those sectors that are really impacting and hurting Americans. First of all, in the automotive sector, thousands of American workers have endured layoffs due to the shortage. The global automobile industry suffered over 200 billion in losses, and Ford was forced to halt or cut production at eight plants as recently as last month.

The cost of a used car has gone up 41 percent, and the price of new cars 12

percent. A lot of this is due to the semiconductor shortage. Let me repeat those numbers: The price of a used car has gone up 41 percent; the price of a new car over here, 12 percent. And this is the price of a 12-percent increase on new equipment.

Well, if you think about it, right now, for most of those people trying to buy the new cars, they might be on a waiting list. But people who can easily afford a new car and need one but can't get it due to the shortage, they are buying used cars instead, and that is what is driving up the price.

So who feels the pain at the pump? It is not the person who has to wait a few extra months for that new car that they wanted. It is the person whose radiator blew out last week who just needs anything to drive to work—anything to get them to and from their job. But now that used car is 41 percent more expensive. That basic used car might have cost \$5,000 last year, but if you add the 41 percent to that, it is now costing \$7,000.

So where is the extra \$2,000 coming from? For that American consumer who has to delay a family trip or do without things for their children or maybe not even be able to pay next month's rent, all of this is due to the impacts that we are seeing from this shortage.

So chips and the semiconductor effort that we are trying to address in the underlying bill are really the ultimate supply chain issue; that is, that some of the networking equipment that I mentioned here—a 12-percent increase—sometimes people are selling chips for a hundred times their regular price just so that people will compete for them to build out the broadband access.

We also are seeing issues of security, now that the source of the chips are so concentrated in Taiwan, that at least 7 different chip manufacturers, people have tried to hack them to steal the designs of these chips. So these are all the reasons why we, today, here need to advance this bill and say to the House: We want to go to conference. We want to move forward on this legislation.

This legislation also supports \$2 billion for, specifically, Defense Department efforts to secure the supply chain, as well, and to help us face this increase in demand.

I just want to say this to my colleagues. I know some people think: Well, this issue will be over. It will be down the road. It is not going to be over until we act. Right now, the world needs 1 trillion chips per year. You need 1 trillion chips per year. In 2021, that went up to 1.2 trillion chips per year. In 2031, it is going to be 2 trillion chips per year.

And this is driven by—you can see the demand. So there is a 200-percent increase in what is going to be needed from the automotive sector, a 60-percent increase from the wireless sector, and an 80-percent increase in the consumer electronics sector.

So the question is, Are we just going to wait and see what happens in Taiwan? Or are we going to make an investment here in the United States to jump from that 1.2 trillion a year to 2 trillion a year and make it be leading-edge U.S. technology?

So I am thankful for this underlying bill today, and I thank the witnesses who testified at today's hearing.

One particular industry that was there was PACCAR, a company based in Washington that is leading the way on transportation, automotive, and driverless trucks, and they explained what this has done to impact their business, why we need advanced chips, and why we need to continue as a nation to promote them.

So I definitely hope our colleagues will see forth to move forward on this kind of investment, get the underlying R&D bill onto the President's desk so we can do what we do best in the United States of America and that is invent, make our manufacturers competitive, and grow jobs.

OCEAN SHIPPING REFORM ACT

Madam President, with that, I would like to turn to another issue. I have been joined here on the floor by my colleague Senator KLOBUCHAR. We very much appreciate her and Senator THUNE's efforts on trying to tackle some of the supply chain issues that are at the ports.

Our ports are seeing record amounts of traffic—a 20-some-percent increase in the amount of traffic coming into the United States—and that congestion has caused lots of problems at our ports.

Senators KLOBUCHAR and THUNE announced legislation that we marked up in committee earlier this week that I hope will see action on the Senate floor as early as next week. That legislation puts new tools into the hands of the Federal Maritime Commission, whose job it is to make sure that there aren't unreasonable rates or practices that impact negatively shippers in the United States.

And right now, what is happening is particularly our agricultural sector is getting very hard-hit; that is, that literally some of these foreign shippers that were at record profits and record millions have basically been leaving without the U.S. exports. They literally are coming to the United States, dropping product off, leaving less than full, and hurrying back to pick up more product and deliver it to the United States.

And our growers haven't been able to get their products onto those ships, and the result of that is they are left on the docks, without the ability to deliver the product to the customers that they would like to see.

So our farmers need help and solutions on this. One solution by the Biden-Harris administration that Secretary Vilsack has implemented is a popup space at our ports to help defray the cost of freight that has been caused.

I just want our colleagues to know that more needs to be done with the Klobuchar-Thune bill because the container cost has gone from \$1,300 per container to \$11,000 per container. This is part of data that has been provided to us.

And what has happened is not only the costs that they are facing, as I said, sometimes they are called, and it is said: If your product isn't here, then we are leaving without it. And that is a big problem if you are talking about Washington apples, seafood, any of the other products that are big from our State.

One individual who testified—or came to a press event that we had in Seattle last week said that the dairy industry and supply chain last year and the problems cost U.S. dairy over \$1.5 billion. And it means that more containers are leaving the port empty.

We believe that the loss of revenue to the ag sector may be as much as 22 percent; that is, that our ag sector isn't being able to get their product out.

So I want to thank the President for his infrastructure package and putting more money into ports and port development, as we did in a bipartisan way with our colleagues in the Commerce Committee, and also for getting this project up and running here at Terminal 46 in Seattle.

This popup storage helped facilitate and pre-position our agricultural products so that they could be ready to get on those ships and not face a penalty because of the congestion we are seeing.

USDA is providing our exporters with \$200 to \$400 per container to help with the storage cost, but it is literally getting them in position so that they can be right around the corner and get picked up quickly. So I want to thank the Biden administration for that.

But I also want to encourage our colleagues to move ahead, as I mentioned, on the Klobuchar-Thune bill, which is saying to the major Federal entity whose day job it is to oversee reasonable rates as it relates to shipping in the United States, please, let's get this legislation on the Senate floor. If we care about supply chain issues, if we care about the prices that are impacting consumers, then let's get this legislation on the floor.

Obviously, the amount of costs that we are seeing per container and the amount of increase in those container costs are impacting everyone.

So if those costs are on every container, whether they are coming in or leaving, then we are seeing increased costs to consumers and consumer products all across the board.

So let's get these supply chain issues, like USICA—the United States Innovation and Competition Act—let's get that supply chain moving. Let's get that supply chain of us making legislation with the House moving so we can fix real supply chain problems with our semiconductors. And let's get this Federal Maritime Commission bill on the

floor next week so we can address the supply chain problems that are costing us more with ag and costing us more with imports.

I yield the floor.

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

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Washington for her incredible leadership of the Commerce Committee and focusing on the issues that matter to businesses, something the Presiding Officer, as the former Governor of Colorado and someone who knows a little bit about business understands as well. We have to fix these supply chain issues, and we have to actually take up the torch.

We have gotten through the worst of this pandemic; we see the lighthouse on the horizon; and it is time to move forward with our economy.

And instead of just diagnosing the problem, we actually have to do some things to fix it. And on that list, for my own State, I would say, No. 1 is workforce and getting people into the jobs that we have available; No. 2, something Senator CANTWELL has made so clear, is the semiconductors and all of the things we should be making in America; No. 3 is infrastructure. We are so proud of the bipartisan infrastructure bill that we worked so hard on and the money going to improve our ports, including the port in Duluth, the busiest port on Lake Superior. And then, finally, something I am going to address today, the Ocean Shipping Reform Act, a bipartisan bill that I lead with Senator THUNE, unanimously passed the Commerce Committee yesterday, and I want to thank Senators CANTWELL and WICKER for their leadership and help on the bill.

Senator THUNE and I are both in the middle of the country. In fact, we are neighbors in Minnesota and South Dakota, and we know that American farmers feed the world and consumers and businesses look to them for in-demand ag goods from soybeans to corn, to dairy, to poultry, to pork, to beef, to name just a few.

We also have tons of small and big manufacturers in the middle of the country—and it is not just Minnesota or Colorado or South Dakota that have been seeing the delays in shipping. It is everywhere in this Nation.

The past 2 years have highlighted significant supply chain disruptions and vulnerabilities for U.S. exporters, including many families across my home State.

U.S. companies have only been able to ship 60 percent of their orders because they can't access shipping containers during certain parts of this pandemic. At the same time, ocean carriers—almost all foreign owned—have reported record profits. It is estimated that the mostly foreign container shipping industry made a record \$190 billion in profits in 2021, a sevenfold increase from the previous year.

Their financial performance certainly isn't the result of improved per-

formance, given how many things we have not been able to ship out. No, they are fleecing consumers and exporters because they know they can get away with it, and this is all while exporters and consumers are paying the price, literally, for the supply chain disruptions caused by their unreliable service.

We need to get exports to those who need them. We need to be a country that makes stuff, invents things, exports to the world. That is why Senator THUNE and I put together the Ocean Shipping Reform Act. We also want to thank our colleagues in the House who have a very similar bill.

Our bill protects American farmers and manufacturers by making it easier for them to ship ready-to-export goods waiting at our ports. It levels the playing field for American exporters by updating Federal regulations for the global shipping industry. It gives the Federal Maritime Commission greater authority to regulate harmful practices by big international ocean carriers.

It directs the Federal Maritime Commission to issue a rule prohibiting international ocean carriers from unreasonably declining shipping opportunities for U.S. exports.

Believe it or not, they bring in stuff from other countries, and then what do they export back? Air. Air. So many empty containers with nothing in them. This would fix that.

In addition to giving the FMC more authority to investigate bad practices, the bill also directs the FMC to set new rules for what the international carrier companies can reasonably charge and require ocean carriers to certify and ultimately prove that the fees they charge are fair. As rates continue to climb, this is more urgent than ever.

The sheer act of passing this bill will send a major message to the foreign-owned ocean shipping industry that it is time to ship our goods out of America and to charge our American manufacturers and our American farmers and, thus, our consumers a fair rate.

I want to again thank Chairman CANTWELL and Ranking Member WICKER for holding a compelling hearing on this bill, all members of the Commerce Committee for passing it through, and Senator THUNE and I have a bipartisan group of 27 cosponsors: BALDWIN, HOEVEN, STABENOW, MARSHALL, PETERS, MORAN, BLUMENTHAL, YOUNG, KELLY, CRAPO, TINA SMITH, MARSHA BLACKBURN, CORY BOOKER, JONI ERNST, CORTEZ MASTO, BRAUN, WARNOCK, RISCH, BENNET, CRAMER, WYDEN, BLUNT, VAN HOLLEN, BOOZMAN, FISCHER, PADILLA, and, yes, the Presiding Officer, Senator HICKENLOOPER.

We are excited about the bill, and I am going to end my remarks a little quickly because I know Senator COONS has some very important remarks himself about a fantastic staff member.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

REMEMBERING MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise to offer some brief remarks about a dear friend, someone upon whom I have relied as a mentor, someone who has served our Nation across many decades, and someone whose passing earlier today is a moment of great significance for our Nation and our place in the world.

I happen to have been a Truman scholar; some of my best friends are Truman scholars; and the person whose passing we mourn today I first met because she was the chair of the Truman Scholarship Foundation Board.

I am speaking of the former Ambassador to the United Nations, the former Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, whom I first got to know decades ago, but whom, in my dozen years here in the Senate, I got to know as a mentor and a friend, someone whose lighthearted humor, whose brilliant insights, whose force of personality, and whose charisma were unmatched.

One of the greatest memories I will have in my life was a dinner I got to enjoy last year with former Secretary and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Colin Powell, and former Secretary of State and Ambassador to the United Nations, Madeleine Albright, and the Ambassador to the United Kingdom.

We sat in her garden and talked for hours about the world, about conflict, about Russia and China, about Putin, about the Balkans, about a whole range of things, and I learned so much.

Madeleine never lost her love for this institution, for the Senate. It was here that she, as a relatively young staffer, cut her teeth on politics and on being engaged in policymaking.

And one of the things that always amused her was that this desk—the desk of Senator Biden and Senator KENNEDY—was also the desk of Senator Ed Muskie, a Senator from Maine for whom she worked for a number of years. She was his chief LA from 1976 until 1978 and then went to work for Zbigniew Brzezinski on the National Security Council.

I will simply say this. Today, we have lost one of our best and one of our brightest, one of the most passionate in her dedication to democracy.

As someone who was born overseas in Prague, Czechoslovakia, and who, along with her family, fled communism to come to the United States, she never stopped offering her insights, her advice, her passionate dedication to democracy. In the books that she read, in the pins that she wore, in the speeches that she gave, in the students that she mentored, Madeleine Albright touched so many lives.

Yet she on occasion was gracious enough to give me just a few minutes of her time. Through her, her daughter Alice and her grandson David became great and dear friends. David's service in my office was an enormous blessing to me and my team.

I just wanted to ask for prayers for them, for their family, and for all

whose lives were touched by Madeleine Albright.

TRIBUTE TO TOM MANCINELLI

Mr. President, I rise today to make some comments about a truly bitter-sweet moment in my career of service.

I have been an elected official for 22 years. I have had the opportunity to work alongside dozens—actually hundreds of dedicated, capable, and hard-working staff. None have earned my trust and my confidence, driven my agenda, set my priorities, and been so central to my service and my life like my national security adviser, Tom Mancinelli.

Like me, a Truman scholar, Tom is someone who decided early on to set his sights towards a life in public service. In the 7 years he has been a member of my team, he has been an incredible mentor, a great leader, and someone upon whose advice I have always been able to rely.

I hired him from service at the Department of State, where he was chief of staff of the Bureau of Political-Military Affairs. He was a Presidential Management Fellow before that, but most importantly, he is a Naval Academy graduate and was an officer in the Marine Corps. I note that brings a smile to his face even now.

As I had a chance just last week to say to the Commandant, I have seen, through Tom's service in my office, a gentleman, an officer who has lived the values of the Corps with honor and courage and commitment; someone who has lived his life with an uncompromising code of integrity, respect for human dignity, respect for others, and an intense commitment to his service and a joyful and whimsical spirit.

As a result of our years together traveling around the world and our time here in the United States, a number of phrases and terms have become a part of my lexicon that I did not know before:

"Once a Marine, always a Marine."

"Every Marine a rifleman."

"No plan survives contact with the enemy."

"Officers eat last."

Tom has been an exemplar of the sort of servant leadership embodied in the phrase "Officers eat last." It means you take care of your team, of your squad, of the men and women entrusted to you. In his two tours in Iraq and in his 7 years with me, Tom has shown that exemplary.

I have celebrated the Marine Corps' birthday with him. I have heard him talk about Tun Tavern. I have seen him brighten the days of countless marines deployed as parts of security detachments at Embassies around the world with a hearty "Semper Fi." He has always made sure that we respected and paid attention to the lives and the service of the men and women of our Armed Forces.

Although it is with great regret that I congratulate him on this, I congratulate him today on his next tour, which will be at the Department of Defense.

Through our time together, we have traveled to 54 countries. That is nearly a third of the countries on Earth. We have pressed dictators and autocrats for democratic progress and human rights. We have visited refugee camps in some of the toughest places on Earth to hear those fleeing persecution and civil war. We trekked to see mountain gorillas in Virunga National Park in Rwanda, and I have watched him with, just over the rise, an elephant in the near distance. We carried out a Presidential mission to go to Ethiopia in the middle of a civil war, and we helped deliver vaccines to our partners, from Guatemala to Taiwan. We visited American troops stationed abroad more times than I can count.

Tom has helped me write and introduce and get marked up and pass bills that would invest in our strategic competition with China, advance electrification across Africa, combat wildlife trafficking, address the root causes of violence and extremism—the Global Fragility Act—and support young Palestinian entrepreneurs. There is a long, long list. But the one of which I am proudest for him and I hope something of which he is proud as well is the huge amount of effort he dedicated to leading the BUILD Act, signed into law in 2018, to establish the new U.S. Development Finance Corporation—\$60 billion in capability deployed to do everything from vaccine manufacturing to sustainable agriculture, from women's empowerment to deploying solar energy in the developing world. The DFC will have a remarkable impact for a very long time to come.

As I have said, it is not just the hard work of policymaking but the inside-the-room work of mentoring and guiding fellows and staff members, becoming the sort of person upon whom I can rely to execute a flawless congressional delegation trip overseas, or codel.

Frankly, I think one of our most recent trips, among the most memorable, was also among his most successful. We crisscrossed the world with a constantly shifting constellation of Members of the House and Senate, leaving from Andrews Air Force Base, flying overnight to Brussels for visits with the EU, NATO, and Belgium, and then continued that same day on to Scotland. We spent time at both the COP26 global conference on climate change and in Edinburgh, looking at new means of generating electricity and power, and capped off that day with a celebration with the Scottish Government at Edinburgh Castle.

We then loaded back on the plane and went all the way to Qatar, had dinner with the Emir, breakfast with the Foreign Minister, and visited Afghan refugees and an Air Force base at which Americans were deployed.

We went on from there to Jerusalem, to Tel Aviv, to Ramallah, to meet with the Prime Minister, Foreign Minister, and Defense Minister of Israel and the Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority.

Not yet done, we got on a plane and went to Berlin to meet with the now-Chancellor central to our response to Russia's aggression in Ukraine and members of the Bundestag before flying home.

All of this was in 1 week—no mess, no fuss, flawless, excellently executed, perfectly planned.

Tom takes the time in the course of a codel like that, rather than being frenetic or self-important, to make sure that the other staffers on the trip are learning about how they will lead future codels, that all the Members are attended to and supported, and that it is a purposeful investment of the time and resources of the American people, all while taking a little bit of time to go celebrate with the marines who helped execute that fantastic codel.

Most impressively to me, Tom has found a way to excel at his career in my office while still being a great father to his children George and Ruth and a husband to his accomplished wife Sarah. On a few occasions, I have had to chase him out and say: Don't miss that. Often, he has already gone to a parent-teacher conference, to a baseball game, understanding that is his first mission and something to which he is tirelessly dedicated.

He will continue his record of public service as the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Legislative Affairs, and I have warned him, dealing with Congress is a really miserable duty. But there is no one—no one—they could have hired who would carry this duty out better or more thoroughly, with more character and competence, than Tom Mancinelli.

Hiring Tom was one of the best choices I have ever made. For as many years as he will return my calls, I will continue to call on him for advice and counsel. I very much look forward to his next chapter in public service.

As I was talking with my own children just this weekend, my youngest said to me that of all the people she has gotten to know in my office, he most exemplified to her what it means to be an American, a patriot, and public servant. I can offer no greater compliment than that—well deserved, well performed, well served.

To my favorite marine, thank you.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

UKRAINE

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today marks 1 month since the illegal and unprovoked Russian invasion of Ukraine began. Since that time, Ukrainian President Zelenskyy has proven himself a courageous and inspiring leader, the Ukrainian military has performed heroically in the face of overwhelming violence, and the Ukrainian people have shown the world what true courage looks like.

There is one person who is responsible for so much suffering and catastrophe: Vladimir Putin. Faced with this senseless attack, Ukraine and the

international community have rallied together to stand up to Putin with a unified front. It is stunning, therefore, that many of my Republican colleagues now seem intent upon suggesting that Russia invaded Ukraine because of something the Biden administration did or failed to do.

There is no polite way to put this: This attempt to score political points by blaming the Biden administration for Putin's invasion is unacceptable and inappropriate.

I think it is important to remind my colleagues of some important facts they are ignoring.

To be clear, the Biden administration has done more than any previous administration when it comes to support for Ukraine. In the roughly 14 months since taking office, the administration has provided more than \$2 billion in security assistance to Ukraine, including weapons like Stingers and Javelins that are proving so effective today. This is far more than any previous administration, and I applaud those 17 Republican Senators who voted for this military and humanitarian aid for Ukraine.

Further, since last fall, the Biden administration has worked tirelessly to build a coalition of nations committed to supporting Ukraine. So when the time came to stand up to Putin's illegal invasion of Ukraine on February 24, the United States stood with more than 30 countries from across the globe to condemn the violence, to execute the largest sanctions and export controls in history, and to support the Ukrainian people by surging humanitarian and security aid into the country. This overwhelming international response would not have happened without President Biden's leadership.

We also should not forget a major reason Vladimir Putin felt so emboldened to invade Ukraine and challenge NATO. For 4 years, President Trump treated our allies like adversaries and pandered to dictators and despots—especially Putin. Mr. Trump's animosity toward NATO created lingering doubt about the United States' reliability and the cohesion of the alliance, jeopardizing our greatest advantage against Russia.

The Trump administration's failure to hold Russia accountable for numerous violations of international norms served only to embolden Putin in challenging U.S. leadership and the rules-based international order.

Most disturbing, of course, was the offense that led to Mr. Trump's first impeachment: his efforts to extort Ukraine's security for political favors at home. That an American President would abuse his office to pressure a foreign government to interfere in our democracy as part of a reelection bid remains deeply troubling.

Mr. Trump's actions damaged NATO, weakened Ukraine, and ceded political leverage to Putin. Now, the Ukrainian people are paying the price. Fortunately, at this critical time, the United

States and our allies are no longer hamstrung by Mr. Trump's erratic leadership—a fact Vladimir Putin must understand very well at this stage.

If Putin thought his actions over the past month would drive a wedge between NATO members and within the international community, he has found himself badly mistaken. Led by President Biden, the international community has united in a way not seen in generations, and Russia is already straining under the immense costs we have levied against it and the courageous actions of the Ukrainian people.

With that in mind, I would like to take a few moments to correct the record on a few debates about our ongoing support for Ukraine.

First, on the issue of arms transfers, the United States has led the international effort to identify capabilities the Ukrainian military can put to immediate use, and I think we have to emphasize "immediate use." Transferring equipment that cannot be used effectively because of the combat conditions in the area or because we need to train or refit the equipment is not going to give the Ukrainian forces immediate assistance, and that is the kind of assistance they need.

In fact, over the past few months, the State Department has worked with incredible speed to facilitate the transfer of U.S.-origin equipment from partner nations to Ukraine. However, all of these transports, whether it be former Soviet-era air defense systems or former Soviet aircraft, occur on a bilateral basis, and ultimately, it is a decision for each partner nation to make within their own internal channels.

With regard to a no-fly zone, the United States has enjoyed air superiority for the past 20 years of conflict in Iraq and Afghanistan, so it is, perhaps, understandable that some of my colleagues think such endeavors are easily achieved and without risk. However, establishing and enforcing a no-fly zone against a near-peer competitor like Russia is far more complex. To do so would almost certainly drag the United States and the entire NATO alliance into a direct armed conflict with Russia. It would also put the women and men tasked with flying such missions at great risk. President Biden has rightly said that the United States will not seek direct conflict with Russia, and establishing a no-fly zone would almost certainly defy that aim.

So, to my colleagues both on this side of the aisle and on the other side of the aisle, enough with trying to blame the Biden administration at every step in this conflict. This crisis demands unity and strength, and I call upon my colleagues, particularly my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, to join me in condemning the one person who bears responsibility for the horrific violence against the people of Ukraine: Vladimir Putin.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I am here today with my great friend, the senior Senator from Missouri, to talk about an issue we both care passionately about and that we have partnered on now for a number of years.

I ask unanimous consent to proceed in a colloquy with Senator BLUNT.

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

EXCELLENCE IN MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, on October 31, 2013, Senator BLUNT and I stood here on the Senate floor to mark a very important anniversary. It was 50 years to the day after President Kennedy signed into law the Community Mental Health Act. It was the last piece of legislation he was ever able to sign.

As we know, his life was tragically cut short, and one important part of his life's work, that of providing full funding for comprehensive mental health services in the community, never came to happen. Instead, behavioral health is funded far too often through grants, and while these grants are important, they are just not enough.

You would never say to somebody who needed heart bypass surgery, "Yep, you need surgery, but so sorry; the grant ran out," which is what happens to someone with a mental health crisis or an addiction all the time. You wouldn't say to somebody with bipolar disorder or substance abuse—well, we actually would say, "So sorry; the grant ran out," and we should not be saying that.

Why should healthcare above the neck be funded differently than healthcare below the neck?

This is something that Senator BLUNT and I started to work on. We know that that should not be true. Healthcare is healthcare. President Kennedy understood this, and so does my friend Senator BLUNT.

Right, Senator BLUNT?

Mr. BLUNT. Exactly.

I am so glad to be here with you, Senator STABENOW. We have been friends for a long time and have worked together on a number of issues both in the House, to which we came at the same time, and in the Senate, when I got to the Senate.

Clearly, this is one of the things of which, I think, we both have a strong sense that we have really made a difference in not only how we look at mental health but in also the way we talk about mental health.

To Senator STABENOW's point of treating mental health like all other health and "what happens when you do that?" we got an award last month when I was home and Senator STABENOW was virtually in Jefferson City, MO, for a few minutes with the Missouri Behavioral Health Council, and we received the Excellence in Mental Health award. Brent McGinty, the head of that council, gave a talk about what they were doing and what they were seeing from what they were doing.

Also, we talked about the partnership with community health centers, another thing we have worked together on.

Joe Pierle and Brent McGinty are actually both here today, coincidentally, as we are talking about this issue that is so important to both of them.

I have often thought about the same type of discussion we had in 2013 as Senator STABENOW just pointed out. We went through the Community Mental Health Act from 1963, and it became apparent that many of the things that probably should have been closed but were serving a need, did get closed, but then the support system didn't come in, in the way that anybody would have envisioned when that came together. I can remember it in Missouri when some of our mental health facilities or hospitals were closed, and that was a fine thing if you had what the bill that President Kennedy signed had in mind and, I think, what we have had in mind.

One of the things we have looked at is—we have looked at 41 States now that have some efforts, some unit, of excellence in mental health—the Certified Community Behavioral Health Centers—in their States. Maybe it is a big county. Maybe it is a city that was able to qualify with the 365-days-a-year, 24/7 standards and with the kind of staff available that you have to have to meet that criteria first. We now have eight States, including Michigan and Missouri, in this process.

One of the things that is happening in all of those units is keeping track of the person's other healthcare challenges when you are dealing with their mental healthcare challenges. The NIH says about one in five adult Americans has a diagnosable and almost always treatable behavioral health issue, and one in five adult Americans probably has other health issues as well. In fact, obviously, they would have.

One of the things we have been trying to keep track of is what happens in the real, confined healthcare world when you deal with people's mental health problems like they were any other health problems. Do they start showing up at appointments more frequently? Do they take the medicine that they are supposed to take for either behavioral health issues or other health issues? Are they eating better or sleeping better or feeling better about themselves? I think it is pretty clear and totally logical that that would be exactly what happens.

Another thing we have seen, after the 50 years of whatever happened in mental health between October 1963 and the day we were on the floor in 2013, is that, in so many ways, the police department, law enforcement, and the emergency room became the de facto mental health system for the country.

We have had people come and be part of the press conferences with us, Senator STABENOW, when we are talking about fewer people being taken to the emergency rooms and the importance

of having a contact that you can make or have, maybe, a place that is not only a place to spend the night but also a place for you and your family so you know that you are going to have an ongoing opportunity to have a relationship to deal with your mental health problem just like you would if you had to be taken to the hospital with other problems.

We have seen some things there, Senator STABENOW, that you may want to talk about a little bit—everything from the iPad that law enforcement officers and the crisis intervention team uses in Springfield, MO, and other places in our State to where they can immediately link the person they are dealing with up on the screen on the iPad with the behavioral health counselor who is there any time of the day—fully manned, 24/7—and see what begins to happen when a professional is dealing with a person in crisis.

I have seen that happen, and I am sure I was there with, probably, the best crisis intervention center person the police department had. You can tell the difference when they start looking at that screen and talking to somebody who is always a behavioral health specialist but also who is just a little bit removed and is totally prepared to enter into that discussion. We have had lots of people talk about the impact on departments and emergency rooms, Senator STABENOW.

Ms. STABENOW. Senator BLUNT, I couldn't agree with you more.

I don't know about you, but when we first started and knew this was going to be a step-by-step process, we weren't able to go nationwide. We had to prove the concept would work with, really, providing comprehensive services, not just what is done in most States, like in Michigan, where there was Medicaid funding for people who were seriously mentally ill, but if you weren't seriously mentally ill, there was no support for anybody else.

So doing a concept like federally qualified health centers, which I have been so proud to be your partner on—where you say, “OK. If you meet high standards, we will fully fund your capacity then to provide services if you meet high standards”—is what the whole point is. After only 2 years of doing that with the eight States' demonstration project, I was really blown away, and I think you were, too, in that, after only 2 years, the kind of results that they were able to get were so meaningful. HHS—by the way, both Democratic and Republican Presidents have embraced this and supported this, which has been wonderful. But, after only 2 years, they found 63 percent fewer emergency room visits.

I remember being in one of the press conferences we did with a police chief from Oklahoma, who was talking about how it was so difficult if they had someone who needed care. They would drive hours and go sit in the emergency room with them, and an officer would be off of their regular duties all day,

sitting with somebody in the emergency room.

So, with a 63-percent reduction in the number of folks sitting in the emergency room because they couldn't get help and then to have a 60-percent reduction in the amount of time in jail, I am not surprised that sheriffs and police chiefs and law enforcement officials across the country are our biggest supporters in terms of having comprehensive community behavioral health clinics. They want people to get help. They don't want them going to jail, just sitting in jail.

The other thing that was so important, I thought, was that there was about a 41-percent decrease in homelessness. Oftentimes, with the iPad that you are talking about, there may be someone on the ground, on the street, and an officer will be asked to respond. The fact that they can put someone—a social worker or a psychologist or someone—on the iPad, on FaceTime, basically, to talk to someone and get an initial diagnosis of what is going on, what kind of help they need, where they should go, and so on has been so effective and I know, for law enforcement, such a relief in that they have tools that they can use, and we are seeing that over and over again.

One of the things we require, of course, is to be able to get this full funding as healthcare so that you have a 24-hour psychiatric crisis operation, which I think has been one of the most important pieces of it.

I don't know about you, but the results, to me, have been amazing, and we now have 10 States in the demonstration projects, and we are ready to offer this opportunity to States across the country.

Mr. BLUNT. Well, we are.

As to what you were talking about with getting people into the healthcare system instead of the criminal justice system, it is, obviously, one of the goals we should have.

Missouri's really got started in January 2017, and in the first 4 years in these certified centers, they served more than 150,000 Missourians and more than 3,500 veterans. That was a 41-percent increase over the 4 years of not being in the program to being in the program. Not only is it able to serve people, but because of the way this is set up, you are able to serve people so much more quickly. You are able to have the staff that you can have because you know you have got the funding you need to have the staff—largely, this is an increase of the Medicaid coverage, but the other Medicaid costs go down more than the behavioral health costs add to the system.

We have always known that this was the right thing to do—right thing to do in the long run, right thing to do for police officers, right thing to do for the emergency room, right thing to do for the prison system, right thing to do for the people being at work.

I think what we are showing here is, not only is it the right thing to do and

saves money over time, but it is the right thing to do and largely pays for itself and maybe more than pays for itself within the immediate context of healthcare; and that is one of the things we are looking at.

What we saw in the last 2 years with COVID was the real crisis that became part of that healthcare crisis with a mental health crisis, of isolation, of people who developed some kind of dependency. If you don't have a mental health problem before you become dependent on opioids or something else, you have one as soon as you become dependent on those. The suicide numbers went up.

Having a structure in place ready to reach out and man the suicide hotline to get people to where they need to get—there is no waiting list for somebody who is thinking about doing harm to themselves or others. We need to have a society where we understand that is an immediate problem; it has to be dealt with immediately; and it is a societal—not only a societal goal, but, actually, it should be one of our primary responsibilities in this society. And I think that is what we are seeing here over and over again, Senator STABENOW.

Ms. STABENOW. I agree.

You know, when I think about COVID and all the increased stress on children and young people and, as you said, the increase in number of suicides—all the pressure is on everyone, from those on the frontlines who are taking care of patients in the hospitals and the stress of families and so on.

We know that it is even more important that we eliminate the stigma of what it means to ask for help—mental health help—or if you have an addiction to be able to ask for help.

It is not enough just to eliminate the stigma; you have to have the service. You have to have the service in the community. It has to be quality services. It has to be funded in a structural way where you are supporting the staff and, again, modeling this after community health centers, which are widely supported—every community in the country, strong bipartisan support.

By our picking up that model and basically saying, We need to do that for mental health and addiction as well as physical health, we are just extending something that has shown such success in the community. And now, because of what has happened and all the pressures of COVID and so on, it is even more important that folks who need help can be able to get that.

You know I think of someone who has struggled with addiction their whole life and they finally get the courage up; they are going to ask for help. The ability to walk into a clinic and say, “I need help” and to have somebody say, “Come on in”—

Mr. BLUNT. I think in almost—in all of the States, once they get this fully running the way they hope it will, that everybody who needs to be seen the first day is seen the first day.

Ms. STABENOW. Right.

Mr. BLUNT. There may be an occasional evaluation where you talk to somebody and realize this is something that you don't have to put at the very front of that day's line; but if you need to be at the front of the line, you get to go to the front of the line. If you need to be seen the first day, you get to be seen the first day. No more 7-day waiting period for a crisis moment.

Ms. STABENOW. Right.

Mr. BLUNT. People still may have to occasionally wait and come back tomorrow or come back Wednesday or whatever the schedule might be—and I think that is critically important.

Now, Senator STABENOW, what you and I are trying to do is to further expand the opportunity. You know, the President said in his State of the Union message:

Let's get all Americans the mental health services they need.

That is a quote: “Let's get all Americans the mental health services they need.” That was a goal in the President's State of the Union message; it should be a significant goal for the country.

What we would like to see happen in this Congress is the expansion of excellence in mental health to every State that wants to do it. Initially, we had 24 States apply to be part of the 8 pilot States. Nineteen of them went all the way through that entire process.

You know, all 50 States may not apply, but we would like to create an environment where all 50 States could apply.

Frankly, every time we get a score on this bill, the score is a little lower than it was before because I think the facts are beginning to persuade even the Congressional Budget Office that this makes economic sense to do. And there may be some startup costs, but the long-term costs may be actually long-term savings. If you do the right thing and save money while you are doing it, Mr. President, that is a pretty good place to be in for a society or a government or a country; and that is what we are trying to get done, Senator STABENOW, in this Congress.

Ms. STABENOW. Absolutely.

And we invite all of our colleagues to join us. We have a great bipartisan effort going on with our Excellence in Mental Health and Addiction Treatment legislation of 2021 that would open the door for all States. We know that many, many States and certainly local communities are very interested. We can do this. We can actually get this done.

When I heard the President speaking about this, I know I had a big smile on my face—and I think you as well, Senator BLUNT. We were like, All right, this is the next step.

Mr. BLUNT. Right. Right.

Ms. STABENOW. I am so excited to see the President agreeing with this and speaking about it in his State of the Union. I am looking forward to his including this in his budget, which will

be coming out very soon, and his supporting and embracing a nationwide program.

I am just so very, very pleased that this is a model that, frankly, has survived both Democratic and Republican Presidents, Republicans, Democrats, House Members, Senate Members, local communities, Governors because it works. Everybody is looking at this. Everybody is looking at this.

Mr. BLUNT. You can have a community behavioral health center working with a primary care center or you could have an independent provider working with their other healthcare provider or vice versa. It is very interchangeable.

The one criteria for the certified community behavioral health centers is the level of staffing—24/7, 365 days a year, always available to be that critically important partner that people with a mental health challenge need. And, frankly, their families and people who care about them need it as well.

Ms. STABENOW. Yes.

Mr. BLUNT. This is a big challenge for the individual that has a behavioral health problem, but it can be an equally big challenge for people who care about them.

Ms. STABENOW. It really is about families.

So, Mr. President, I just want to close by saying I am so grateful for the partnership that Senator BLUNT and I have had. He thinks he is retiring at the end of the year. I am actually going to put him in a closet and not let him leave because he has been such a champion both in his role on appropriations as well as partnering for long-term funding. This is important; this is something real and tangible and meaningful that we can all do together; and I am excited and hopeful we are going to take the next step this year together.

Mr. BLUNT. We are, too.

Mr. President, we look forward to you joining us in this effort.

Ms. STABENOW. Absolutely. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

USICA

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, we have begun the long-awaited process of moving forward on legislation that will bolster our domestic semiconductor manufacturing and confront the growing threats posed by China.

This legislation has had many different names over the last year or so. We started with the Endless Frontier Act in the Senate. Then, miraculously, it became the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, affectionately known as USICA. And then it became the Make It in America Act. But now it has a new name, the Bipartisan Innovation Act.

Well, regardless of what you call it, it is absolutely critical that we get a strong version of this legislation to the President's desk as soon as we can. The Senate passed the original legislation

last summer with significant bipartisan support. We urged our colleagues in the House to treat this legislation with the sense of urgency that it deserved, but they wasted months with no action. To be charitable, I guess they were preoccupied with other matters.

But it wasn't until last month, just ahead of the President's State of the Union, that they finally leapt into action. The President, of course, wanted to talk about this legislation in his speech. So House Democrats had to cobble together a bill in short order. Unfortunately, it was a highly partisan one. Their bill passed almost entirely along party lines, and now, the two Chambers—the House and the Senate—have a critical task ahead of us to reconcile those two versions. We need to begin the formal conference committee process, dive into negotiations, and get that strong bill to the President's desk.

The cornerstone of this effort, as far as I am concerned, is bolstering our domestic semiconductor manufacturing. Even more concerning is that 92 percent of the world's most advanced semiconductors come from one place, and that is Asia. Sixty-three percent come from Taiwan alone. If that supply chain were cut off, it would lead to very serious consequences. And, unfortunately, that potential is not just a doomsday scenario that is farfetched by any means.

A few months ago, I led a congressional delegation to Asia to learn more about the need to confront China in a variety of ways in that region. One of the leaders we met with was the head of the Indo-Pacific Command, the regional command that covers that part of the globe, and he described the current power dynamic rather succinctly. He said it is not a question of if China invades Taiwan but when.

Well, we have one rough idea of when that could potentially happen. President Xi Jinping himself said he wants to be ready to unify the People's Republic of China with Taiwan by 2027, just 5 years from now. But, truth be told, we don't have any idea when President Xi will call that play. We won't have any more notice for that than we did for Putin's invading Ukraine.

It is tough to overestimate the impact this would have on the United States and our allies. And, even absent some military action by the People's Republic of China seeking to swallow up and absorb Taiwan with its manufacturing capacity for the semiconductors, if we had another pandemic, if we had another natural disaster, any one of those three things could disrupt that critical supply chain, much to our detriment and that of the rest of the world.

We learned one thing in COVID-19, and that is that these supply chains are very vulnerable. I still remember the first call I had with my Governor when COVID broke out, and I said: Well, what do you need? What can we do to help?

He said: I need two things. I need testing, and I need PPE, personal protective equipment.

Those are gowns and masks used by healthcare professionals and others to protect themselves when treating people with COVID-19, and the fact of the matter is, almost all of it is made in China.

This notion of globalization of the economy has led us to believe that the only thing to think about when it comes to manufacturing a product is where can it be made the cheapest, but, obviously, there is more at stake than just who can make it the cheapest. We learned that in COVID-19—thus the need to bolster our critical supply chains across a whole range of products, including semiconductors.

Semiconductors are something that most of us don't know a lot about. I have had to learn a lot myself about it, and I still don't consider myself an expert. But I asked my staff: Please tell me; how important is this?

And they said: Well, Senator, everything with an off-and-on switch involves semiconductors.

And if you think about how technological our lives are and how much we depend on everything from the sensors in our car to the backup camera when we back our car out of a parking place, to the laptop computers that our kids were using during COVID-19 to study virtually—and then there is farming equipment, communications equipment, and medical equipment—all of these rely on semiconductors. And 90 percent of them come from one region of the world, and that is Asia.

The shortages we have experienced recently would seem insignificant compared to the complete chaos that would ensue if this supply chain were disrupted. This gets downright dangerous when you think about how a global chip shortage would impact our national security and, more broadly, global security.

Russia's attack and invasion of Ukraine is a wake-up call for the United States and our allies to examine our defense posture across the planet. One of the bright spots of this, if you can call it that, is that countries in Europe, including countries like Germany that were reluctant to contribute 2 percent of their gross domestic product to the joint collective defense effort of NATO, have turned around and stepped up. That is a welcomed development. But the fact of the matter is, our military and our national security depend on access to these semiconductors because, increasingly, our military depends on technology to perform their mission.

One advantage that the United States has typically had against our adversaries around the world is our advanced technology and our capacity to innovate and to solve problems using that technology. But here is the bottom line: That technology cannot function without semiconductors. It is that simple, whether you are talking about

advanced fighters like the fifth-generation fighter, the F-35, or you are talking about missile defense systems like Iron Dome, which was used by Israel to defeat the rockets that were raining in on it in recent months. A single interceptor used by the Iron Dome missile defense system—rocket defense system—contains more than 750 semiconductors, just a single one.

So semiconductors are our key to confront threats by any adversary, not just China, and are essential to our economy here in the United States.

Earlier this week, two national security and foreign policy experts at the University of Texas wrote an op-ed piece in *The Hill* magazine—or newspaper—and they made the national security case for CHIPS funding. They noted this is not the first time that semiconductor supply chains were regarded as a matter of national security. Back in the 1980s, President Reagan pushed to maintain our competitive edge in these chips, thereby helping us lead in the advanced weapons and aircraft that they enabled.

As they said, Reagan didn't just outspend the Soviets; we also out-innovated the Soviets, winning that arms race. And that is what we need to do again today. We can't just rely on our ability to spend more than Russia or China or any other adversary. We need to out-innovate them as well.

Considering the fact that China is the No. 1 master thief of intellectual property, it is all that much more important. Now, there are some critics of the CHIPS Program that has been introduced by the Senator from Virginia Mr. WARNER and myself. Both of us serve on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence. It is one reason why, because of the briefings we get, this became a matter of grave concern to both of us. But the good news is that concern is shared by a broad bipartisan majority in the Senate. There are some, though, who said that this initiative is just a bailout for domestic energy. But that is not the case at all. This is not a handout. It is, frankly, one of the tools we have to reshore—to bring back onshore—this essential manufacturing capacity, as well as incentivize domestic industry to build out our capacity here at home.

Here are the numbers. Over the last three decades, the United States has gone from producing 37 percent of the global chip supply to just 12 percent today—12 percent here in America. The rest of it is in Asia and in other places around the world. Now, that is a big flashing red light when it comes to our national security.

Without some Federal incentives, companies cannot afford to invest the enormous amount of time and capital needed to stand up new chip fabs or expand existing ones, and that is because it costs about 30 percent more to build these fabs here in America than it does overseas.

But, again, going to the low-cost producer is not the only consideration

when it comes to these vulnerable supply chains that are so important to our economy and our national security. That is why it is absolutely critical for us to bring this semiconductor manufacturing back home, and full funding for the CHIPS Program is the best way for us to see results.

We began to establish this program more than a year ago in the National Defense Authorization Act, and the only thing missing now is—well, you guessed it. It is money. We need the appropriations in order to fund this CHIPS Program that we began to embrace over a year ago in the National Defense Authorization Act.

That is why it is absolutely critical that we begin the conference committee process for the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act or whatever it is called today. I will have to refresh my memory—the Bipartisan Innovation Act—since it has had so many different names. But we need to get this done, and we need to get this done now, and we need to get it done right.

Now, I expect the final bipartisan conference committee report to look a whole lot like the Senate version. That is because, as I mentioned a moment ago, the House decided to take the low road and pass purely a partisan bill. The Senate bill was the product of intense bipartisan negotiations and represented a good-faith compromise by all sides.

I think that is the best place for us to begin once the formal conference committee process is underway. I hope we can work quickly to reach a final agreement and one that will serve the interests of the American people, our economy, and, most importantly, our national security.

I urge all of our colleagues to wade into this process so we can begin that conference committee and reach a bipartisan resolution promptly.

This is not a time for us to dawdle or to play politics. It is a time for us to get the strongest possible bill we can to the President's desk, and that begins with passing this appropriations portion of this bill to bring that manufacturing capacity back to America.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NORTH PLATTE CANTEN CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL ACT

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I would like to tell you a story about North Platte, NE.

During World War II, this small, West Central Nebraska town was one of the most famous cities in America, and it was the epitome of homefront patriotism. From Christmas Day 1941 to April 1946, North Platte was the site of

one of the many community-based canteens that offered hospitality to soldiers on their way to join the fight or on their way back home.

There were nearly 120 of these canteens across the United States, mostly along railways, like the Union Pacific line that still runs through Nebraska. Of these 120 canteens, North Platte was by far the biggest. It served more than 6 million servicemembers over the 4½ years it was open. The country's second busiest canteen in Ohio served well under half that many soldiers over its lifetime.

As many as 24 different troop trains, carrying up to 8,000 uniformed personnel overall, rolled through North Platte on any given day.

Here is a quote from a local newspaper about what the residents of just two Nebraska towns, Merna and Anselmo, donated to the North Platte Canteen on a single day in 1944: 53 birthdays cakes, 127 fried chickens, 58 dozen homemade cookies, 32 dozen cupcakes, 73 pounds of coffee, 163 dozen eggs, 68 dozen doughnuts, 41 quarts of pickles, 3 crates of oranges, 9 pounds of ham, 160 loaves of bread, 40 popcorn balls, and 50 pounds of sandwich meat.

It took 22 cars and 3 pickup trucks to drive all those donations 70 miles west to the train station in North Platte.

Members of the community organized regular benefit dances, scrap metal drives, and other events to support the canteen's operations. In all, volunteers raised more than \$137,000—worth more than \$2 million today—to support the canteen, and they did it all on their own.

As you might imagine, the soldiers who were fortunate enough to stop at the North Platte Canteen didn't soon forget the hospitality that they received.

Russ Fay, a Wisconsinite who was barely old enough to be drafted when he was shipped off to basic training in California, was one of those lucky soldiers. More than 60 years after his 10-minute stop in North Platte, he told journalist Bob Greene, who wrote a book about the North Platte Canteen called "Once Upon a Tow":

I can still taste it. I would say that a majority of the men on the battlefield know exactly what North Platte was. . . . They would talk about it like it was a dream. Out of nowhere, [other soldiers would say]: How'd you like to have some of that food from the North Platte Canteen right about now?

The thought of the North Platte Canteen kept our soldiers going during one of the darkest periods in world history. And more than 55,000 people, nearly all of them women from 125 different communities, chipped in to help run it at one point or another. Most were Nebraskans, but many were from our neighboring States of Colorado and Kansas.

One of those Nebraska women was my mother, Florence Strobel. She moved from Lincoln to teach kindergarten in North Platte in the fall of 1944, and she was proud to be among the volunteers at the canteen.

To honor everyone who helped give our soldiers a good memory to hold onto while they were away from home, I recently introduced the North Platte Canteen Congressional Gold Medal Act.

This bill would award a collective Congressional Gold Medal to all of the individuals and communities that volunteered or donated food and other items to the North Platte Canteen. This is the highest honor Congress can give civilians, and the tens of thousands of people who made America's busiest World War II canteen a success are certainly deserving of it.

Under my bill, after the Treasury Department strikes this Congressional Gold Medal, it would be on display at the Lincoln County Historical Museum in North Platte, which has an outstanding exhibit about the canteen.

This wouldn't be the first time that Congress has given the volunteers at the North Platte Canteen the recognition they deserve. Almost 20 years ago, the 108th Congress acknowledged their efforts with a resolution introduced by Nebraska Representative Tom Osborne. I hope the 117th Congress will do so, as well, by passing this bill.

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

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

REMEMBERING MADELEINE ALBRIGHT

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, today we lost a towering figure in American and world history. Madeleine Albright was one of the smartest, strongest diplomats that we have ever had. She came to America as a refugee and helped move the country closer to the promise that it was founded upon. She made the world a better place.

Madeleine Albright was born in the former Czechoslovakia in 1937. When the Nazis took power, her family was forced into exile, ending up in London, where they survived the Blitz. After World War II, they returned to Czechoslovakia but were again forced to seek refuge, this time from communism.

As an 11-year-old, she arrived with her family at Ellis Island. She became a U.S. citizen, graduated college on a full scholarship, and went on to earn a Ph.D. while raising her three daughters, Alice, Katie, and Anne.

She worked here in the U.S. Senate on the Foreign Relations Committee under Edmund Muskie, then at the White House National Security Council, before becoming a renowned professor at Georgetown University. In 1993, President Clinton nominated her as U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. She was the second woman to hold that position.

In 1997, she became the first woman in our Nation's history to serve as a

Secretary of State. As Secretary, she was a strong supporter of NATO, encouraging the alliance to add new members and to protect vulnerable populations. She urged military intervention to save lives in Kosovo. She worked to prevent rogue States from getting nuclear material and supported the Kyoto Protocol. And she strengthened American alliances across the planet.

But Madeleine Albright is not the sum of her accomplishments. Madeleine Albright is something more. She embodied the ideals of our country. She was a constant light in the struggle between freedom and oppression, relentlessly advocating for people to have rights that she knew didn't exist under authoritarian regimes. She broke the highest glass ceiling in her field and then spent the rest of her career fighting for opportunities for other women. We will remember her as a diplomat and a trailblazer.

But I will also remember her as something else: family. My oldest brother Jake is married to her daughter, Katie. When I first became a U.S. Senator, she was thrilled to have a politician in the family and wanted to be helpful without casting a long shadow, so she discreetly called Barbara Mikulski and told her to look out for me.

We were fast friends—not acquaintances, not friends in the political sense, but actual friends.

She was a tireless and sharp political strategist. She was the kind of person who would watch C-SPAN for fun and was endlessly fascinated with politics at all levels, from municipal elections, State elections, Hawaiian politics, the United Nations—she loved this stuff.

She was also a trusted confidante. We had long talks about everything but mostly about our two shared loves: family and politics. And it was always over a meal, which she would occasionally let me pay for.

But most of all, I will remember her as Grandma Maddie, someone who was kind and curious with my kids. She was one of the most decent human beings whom I have ever known. May her memory be a blessing.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

REMEMBERING DON YOUNG

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, Senator SULLIVAN and I are here this afternoon on the Senate floor, and we are here with heavy hearts. We are joined in the Galleries by friends of Alaska because, last Friday, our Congressman, Congressman Don Young—the Congressman for all Alaska and the dean of the House, who served our 49th State ably and faithfully for the last 49 years—passed away as he was flying home to be with the people of Alaska. Seated next to his wife, Anne, he passed peacefully and left this world.

There is no doubt—there is no doubt—that Congressman Young lived a large and full life. He was 88 years young, and we always referred to him

as “young,” not old. He accomplished an incredible amount across the many decades that he served Alaska and served his country, but that doesn't make the loss any less sudden or any less devastating, and it doesn't change the fact that we are now left with a hole the size of Alaska in our congressional delegation.

We were a team. We were small but mighty. The Presiding Officer has heard me, on this floor, talk about the Last Great Race, the Iditarod, and that no dog team—no dog team—can make it without the leader. We all know that. You have got the swing dog, and you have got the wheel dog, and we have all kind of taken different points on that team, but it has always been with Don Young.

I was home over the weekend. I spent the weekend there, reflecting on Don Young's life and on his legacy. I had the chance to speak with his wife, Anne, over the phone. I talked with his daughters—Joni, whom we know well, and Dawn, her sister. I talked to a lot of friends who shared some stories about our Congressman. Many of those stories are probably not fit to print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but there was a lot of reliving of the life and times of Don Young.

For those who didn't have the privilege of knowing Congressman Young, as so many Alaskans did, he was really all of the things that have been written about him and all of the things that have been said about him these past several days. He was all that, and he was more. He was larger than life. We keep saying that: “larger than life.”

He was colorful—as colorful as they come. He could be tough; he could be gruff; he could be very feisty, but he was also warm, engaging. He was charming, but, most of all, he was passionate. He was a passionate man about Alaska and Alaskans—to his very core. And he was loyal. He was loyal and devoted to his family, to his friends, to his staff who served him, and was loyal to the people he loved so dearly.

So we think about Don as forever being Alaska, but Don's life didn't begin in Alaska. He grew up in California, working on his family farm. His father would read Jack London to him at night, and that inspired him, later on, to head north. He served in the Army with the 41st Tank Battalion. Then, after graduating from Chico State college, he answered “The Call of the Wild.”

He eventually made his way north to the village of Fort Yukon, just above the Arctic Circle. He tried his hand at just about everything. He was into construction. He was into mining. He taught at a BIA school in the winter. He was a tugboat captain in the spring and summer. He hunted. He fished. He trapped. He took well to Alaska, and Alaska took well to him.

By then, Don had fallen in love with Alaska, and he was also head over heels for his first wife, Lu, who was a book-

keeper from a respected Gwich'in family. They married in 1963.

He was elected mayor of Fort Yukon the next year, but he didn't spend much time as mayor. He moved on to the Alaska State House of Representatives and then to our State senate, but where he would really make his mark was at the Federal level, as a Member of the House of Representatives, which he joined in 1973.

Initially, it didn't start out so well. He lost the election in 1972 to Nick Begich, only to win it in a special election in March of 1973 after Congressman Begich went missing after an airplane accident. Once in office, Don Young never stopped winning for Alaska.

In his first year in office, Congressman Young helped to authorize the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, which has been the economic backbone of our State ever since. Not long after, his colleagues chose him as their Freshman Congressman of the Year. There are so many, many legislative accomplishments over the course of the Congressman's life—too many to list here—but I will just highlight a few.

In addition to the pipeline authorization, he helped to establish the 200-mile fishing limit and contributed to the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which has allowed Alaska to maintain its world-class fisheries. He wrote the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act, which guides the use of millions of acres of those lands. Congressman Young passed legislation to open a small part of the non-wilderness 1002 Area in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, and he did this a dozen times before we steered it into law in 2017.

Believe me, Congressman Young reminded me every time how many times he had actually gotten it across the finish line in the House, but Don never ever gave up. Given the way of the world now, his commitment to energy security should be more appreciated than ever.

He enacted important measures as chairman of the Natural Resources Committee and a landmark transportation bill, SAFETEA-LU, as chairman of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He was also a strong, strong champion for Alaska Natives and Native Americans.

Don was pretty independent. He was independent in his thinking, and he was not afraid to vote his conscience to help Alaska.

Just before he left Washington, DC, this past week, he was involved in the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act and helped considerably with the Tribal title in that act.

I also credit him—seriously credit him—for garnering enough Republican votes in the House last year to ensure that the bipartisan infrastructure bill could finally move across the finish line. He knew that that measure was good for Alaska, and he said: Not only am I going to give my vote, but I am

going to work to make sure that we have the votes over here to sign this into law.

There are a lot of stories in this body about our former Senator, Senator Stevens, being legendary and pretty tenacious in his pursuit of Federal dollars to help build Alaska, but just know that Congressman Young was right there, every step of the way, making sure that Alaskans received what we considered to be our fair share.

On December 5 of 2017, Alaskans were just filled with pride for Congressman Young when he became the 45th dean of the House—its most senior Member. At the time, I gave him a little gift. It was a star designated in his name. You can actually get a certificate that says, “This star up there is designated to you,” but it was given as a sentiment, reflecting his stature as the North Star of our delegation and our northern State.

When you think about this remarkable journey that Don Young had—from teaching fifth graders in Alaska, to running dog teams, to guiding barges along the Yukon River, to becoming the longest serving Republican Member of Congress of all time—of all time—and being the most senior Member of the House of Representatives—of all that Congressman Young accomplished and of all that he did for Alaska, you have to know that this was no easy task. This was no easy task. For 49 years, he stood alone in the House of Representatives as the sole voice for Alaska. We only have one Congressman for all of Alaska. Only seven States have just one Congressman.

And, of course, Alaska is farther away from Washington, DC, than all of those States, bigger than all of them combined, and our vast amount of Federal acreage means that we have more issues and perhaps more complicated issues that have to be addressed as well, but none of that mattered to Don Young.

He took the long trips back home in stride. He would use his time on the plane to meet people, to talk to them, to just have conversation, try to understand their priorities and concerns, but he was making friends.

He did the same here in Washington. He worked tirelessly here to build relationships, build alliances that would help him help Alaska, help address our State's challenges. It wasn't as if he was seeking out bipartisan relationships necessarily; Don was just the kind of guy who would make friends.

The record shows that Congressman Young was one of the top legislators of our time. He was the primary sponsor of 123 bills that became law. You go over to his office, and you will see pictures on the wall of 10 different Presidents who signed into law different measures that Don had participated in. Again, recall Don Young was one of 435 voting Members of the House and the only one there to represent Alaska, and he was repeatedly named one of his Chamber's most effective Members.

Don Young was old school because his relationships really ran on both sides of the aisle, starting with Speaker PELOSI, Leader MCCARTHY, and spanning the spectrum of all who would work with him. He really did work tirelessly to do what was right for Alaska because, at the end of the day, that is all he cared about, and he was pretty open about that.

Being a Congressman for Alaska requires every last bit of you. It requires tremendous sacrifice from you and your family. If you don't trust that, if you doubt that, just ask Anne Walton Young. Since they married in 2015, she has been by his side literally every day, in the office, traveling with him. She knows. She knows the work ethic of this man, she knows the heart of this man, and she knows how hard he worked for all of Alaska.

From his first day to his last day, 49 years and 13 days, Don Young gave it his all. As a true man of his people, he was just the right Alaskan to serve in the people's Chamber.

Senator SULLIVAN and I are going to have a lot more to say about our dear friend, our partner, our team leader in the coming days and weeks. We will have a number of occasions to honor his life and legacy, including on March 29, when he will lie in state in Statuary Hall for a well-deserved tribute.

For today, however, our reality is that for the first time in 49 years, Alaska does not have a Congressman in the House of Representatives. For the first time in 49 years, Alaska does not have Don Young there to defend, to advocate, and to legislate on our behalf. And I am heartbroken and so are countless Alaskans and individuals across the country whose lives happen to intersect with this legendary legislator.

On Saturday morning, I got a text from a former staffer who left years ago, a young man, and in his text, he says:

Don Young was the only Congressman for all of Alaska for all of my life. I will miss him.

We have lost a giant whom we loved dearly and who held Alaska in his heart always. We thank him for everything he did for us to build our State and fulfill so much of our promise. We owe his family—his wife, Anne; his daughters, Joni, Sister—a debt of gratitude for sharing him with us for so long. Together with them, we mourn for our late Congressman, Alaska's champion, and our dear friend, Don Young.

With that, Mr. President, I yield to my fellow Senator from Alaska.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, like my good friend and colleague Senator MURKOWSKI, I rise today to recognize a giant, a larger than life man, certainly a legend in our State, and certainly a legend in the House of Representatives, Congressman for all Alaska, Donald Edwin Young.

As Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned, we lost this great Alaskan, this great American, while flying home with his beloved wife, Anne, by his side just this weekend. He was flying back home to Alaska, the State he loved so much and served so well. It is a State that loved him back and showed him that love by electing him to office every 2 years since 1973. Think about that. Unbelievable. He was the longest serving politician in Alaska's history, the longest serving Republican Member of the House in U.S. history, our North Star, Don Young. As Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned, he was 88 years young.

I just want to say, like all Alaskans, my wife Julie and I, when we heard the news, we were saddened, shocked, devastated by the sudden passing of Congressman Don Young. And we heard this from so many people over the weekend: his spirit, authentic, tenacious, indomitable, a man of the people—a true man of the people—epitomized our State to such a degree that there was this sense that he would always be there, that he would live forever. There was this sense, and the shock back home is so palpable because of that. Think about, almost three-quarters of our State's history, Don Young was our Congressman.

So I, too, want to spend a little bit of time talking about this incredible man, this life in full, as Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned.

A lot of stories about being raised on a small ranch in Central California, where he began the hard work of ranching as a young, young boy. Don Young once said: My dad was a good man, but he believed when you turned 7, you became a hired man. So he was working at the age of 7, Sun up to Sun down. It was hot, riddled with snakes and poison ivy. Evidently, Don Young did not like snakes or hot weather because he mentioned often about his father reading him Jack London's “The Call of the Wild,” a book about a dog, a man, the harsh conditions of the Yukon, and loyalty.

Senator MURKOWSKI already mentioned that one of the things—and I love this man so much—but one of the things about him that you always knew was loyal, loyal, loyal. What a great quality. What a great quality.

Then, of course, Alaska captured his imagination—no snakes, no poison ivy, snow. Those of us, all of us who saw Don Young over the years carry around that battery-powered portable fan, we knew that, well, Don Young ran hot with that fan.

So, as Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned, he got his associate's degree from Yuba Junior College in 1952. He served in the Army—I always loved to give him a little grief about his Army service as a marine—Chico State, and then at an Elks Club in Chico, he heard then-Alaska Territorial Governor Mike Stepovich give a speech about Alaska, talking about the wonders of Alaska, and Don Young was hooked. In 1959, the year we became a State, he heeded the

call of the wild, headed up the Alcan—much of it still unpaved—in a brandnew Plymouth Fury, and the great State of Alaska would never be the same.

According to Don Young, in Alaska, you could “do anything you wanted to,” so he did. As Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned, he fought forest fires. He owned a skating rink for a short time. I would have loved to have seen that, by the way. He owned a movie theater, tried his hand at commercial fishing, trapping, prospecting for gold. Of course, he was a tugboat captain, teacher at a BIA school, importantly, in Fort Yukon, and that is where he always called home. In fact, he still has a home there. He used to joke he is the only Congressman who, when he goes home, uses an outhouse when he goes home.

He eventually met Lu, his wife—incredible Lu, who stayed by his side for 46 years until she passed in 2009. Since that time, Don found another wonderful partner in Anne. So, Anne, thank you and the family for sharing him with us.

Don, with Lu's prompting, caught the political bug. He served in the State house in Alaska and the State senate. Now, he discovered that he didn't like the senate much. “All they did was stand around with hands behind their back and talk”—that is what he said about the Alaska State Senate.

Well, guess what. His attitude about the U.S. Senate wasn't that much different. “You Senators are always late,” he would often growl at me and LISA—and we were when we had our frequent Alaska delegation meetings. But even as Senators, we always knew our place with Congressman Don Young, dean of the House. All those Alaska congressional meetings were over in his office—were over in his office.

One of my favorite things I did with Don Young, as dean of the House, wherever I saw him—particularly in public in Alaska—the first time I would see him at an event or something, I would say, “It's the dean of the House.” I would grab his hand, take a knee, and kiss his ring. Now, he always said, “Stop that. I hate it when you do that.” But do you know what? I think he actually kind of liked it. I actually think he kind of liked it.

So he didn't like the Senate; he liked the House, the place where bills move fast, where elections are right around the corner no matter what—think about that, 25 elections. Jeez Louise. I could never think about that—and where the action was. Mostly, he was a man of the people, and he belonged in the people's House.

Along the way, he had two wonderful daughters, Joni and Sister, whom he loved fiercely. He always said the most important thing in his life were those two daughters.

Lu was nothing if not persuasive. She was no doubt the boss in the family, and so when she told him he needed to

run for Congress, he did. And with the help of many people—and I would like to say my wife's grandmother, her Sitsoo, was an avid Don Young supporter, flew all over interior Alaska during those early campaigns to help him introduce himself to a wider audience.

So when Don was appointed to his seat in 1973, the original knock against him, he said back then, was that he didn't know anything about DC. People said: You don't know anything about DC; it is going to take you 2 years until you can find the bathroom in your office building.

I am sure some of you heard the story that the first day in office, he combed the Rayburn Building looking for the bathroom, when someone finally said, “Congressman, why don't you use the one in your office?” which I don't think he had noticed. So he was learning.

But on a more serious note—and I love this story. The day after he was sworn in, there was a hearing on the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Authorization Act.

After being held up for years by litigation and studies—imagine that; sound familiar, America?—Don successfully pushed through an amendment—to me, one of the most brilliant amendments ever conceived in the Halls of Congress—that said: No more studies and no more litigation. We are done. We are building the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System now.

He said:

It was a hard fight. Half of my side was [initially] fighting against me.

But when the vote was called, he prevailed. His amendment prevailed by four votes, and Alaska's history was changed forever. America's history was changed forever.

And, by the way, what a great idea: Stop endless litigation. Stop studying things. Build infrastructure. The country and the State of Alaska need energy. Practical, commonsense, get it done—this is why Alaskans loved Don Young so much.

The day of that vote, when it was successful, 1973—remember—Ralph Nader stood outside the hall and declared Don Young the most powerful Member of Congress—brandnew, baby freshman from Alaska, Don Young. Now, you can say a lot of things about Ralph Nader, but he knew power when he saw it, and Don Young had it, kept it. He went on to win every election after that.

And, as Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned, more than 90 bills that he sponsored became law, thousands more that he cosponsored—mostly to help Alaska but to help our whole country. And he became a fierce advocate for helping people—thousands and thousands of Alaskans and Americans.

Every 2 years since 1973, Alaskans could count on Don Young, during 1 of his 24 elections, standing on a corner with his supporters—many here today—waving signs in the cold in No-

vember back home, wearing his old winter coat. And if you didn't know it then—and few Alaskans didn't know—you wouldn't guess that the man in those clothes had so much power and had done so much to help his fellow Alaskans and fellow Americans. Nearly everything—and I mean everything—that has advanced to benefit our State in the Congress has Don Young's fingerprints on it. The Alaska we know today is only possible because of Don Young.

As I mentioned, there is, of course, the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System, which transformed our State and our Nation, as well as many of the victories that Senator MURKOWSKI just mentioned.

I always like to talk about the Magnuson-Stevens Act, which, of course, transformed America's fishing industry. Among others things, it created a 200-mile limit to keep foreign fishermen from plundering our fish and sustained our fisheries. It used to be just 3 miles. Now, we all know it is the Magnuson-Stevens Act, but, of course, Don Young moved it in the House with Congressman Gerry Studds of Massachusetts. So I used to like to say, in events with Don Young: Magnuson-Stevens, or maybe a better name would have been the “Young-Studds Act,” which, of course, he loved that idea. So I kind of liked calling it the “Young-Studds Act.”

But here is the thing, the story that is such a great story that a lot of people don't know: The executive branch wasn't thrilled about this bill, wasn't thrilled about it at all, to such a degree that President Ford was considering vetoing it. Why? Because he had a really smart, clever Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, who thought it would raise tensions with our allies—the Koreans and the Japanese in particular—who loved fishing off the coast of Alaska, taking our fish. Two hundred miles off, they were going to lose out. They were mad. So he was encouraging a veto.

Whether it was on the racquetball court, in the Halls of the Capitol, or a potlatch in rural Alaska, Don Young knew where to be to get things done for Alaska. And he knew that the President and Kissinger were heading to Asia, stopping over in Alaska. So Don and his two daughters and Lu got a ride on Air Force One. A few martinis later, Don Young, the new Congressman from Alaska, was debating one of the most brilliant men in America—the Secretary of State, former Harvard professor Dr. Henry Kissinger—on Air Force One in front of President Ford: Veto the Magnuson-Stevens Act or not.

Well, guess who won that debate: the Harvard professor or the tugboat captain? It was the tugboat captain. Now, Don jokingly credits the martinis, but we all know that he was the one who got that done. And, again, our State and our country's history wouldn't be the same. And, by the way, Henry Kissinger and Don Young were great friends ever since.

Mr. President, that is just one example of many, as Senator MURKOWSKI mentioned. Don Young served with 10 Presidents, and he knew them all. President George H.W. Bush called him "Moose." They played racquetball often. He had Dungeness crab flown in to eat with President George W. Bush.

He and President Clinton were at the White House together one night when the vote was called. They were having so much fun that President Clinton said: I don't want you to leave, Don.

Don said: Well, Mr. President, I will need a hall pass.

So he got a handwritten note from President Clinton, writing to the Speaker of the House: Dear Mr. Speaker. Please excuse Don Young from voting tonight. We are having cigars at the White House.

And when Don Young went to the White House to sign the ANWR legislation that we had been working on and that he had been working on for over 40 years and were able to pass—again, our small and mighty team working together, 2017, with President Trump—he turned to President Trump and said: So you are the other Don in this town.

So Don Young has been great friends with Presidents, world leaders, but what really motivated and moved him was helping people, especially Alaskans. It didn't matter their title, their political affiliation. He just wanted to help people.

He said: As long as you respect the other person and their beliefs, you can be successful. Whether in the majority or the minority, I try to work with people to solve problems. My job is to listen to what they want and how I can then help them get it done.

Like I said, commonsense, practical—no wonder so many Alaskans loved Don Young. And we all know he could tell a story, holding court.

As we know, in the House there isn't assigned seating, but there was one seat in the House that nobody sat in: Don Young's. And, by the way, if you did, you may be taking your life into your own hands.

He sat, and Members gathered around him, listening to his stories. The story of the oosik might come up, how he used that in debates, how he sat during a committee hearing with his fingers caught in a bear trap to make a point, and his legendary office Christmas parties. Young staffers and Members from all over the Congress stood in a long line that snaked into the hallway just to have a few minutes to hear him holding court.

But his true love was always Alaska. He could have done anything, been anything, but he chose to stay and work for the people up until the last moment of his life.

You can make all the money in the world. But if you aren't happy, it doesn't count for anything.

And Don Young was a happy man.

When we lost Don Young, we lost a piece of Alaska, a piece of ourselves, a piece of his indomitable, irascible spir-

it. But it will live on forever, and I know that he has an army of loyalists he has amassed through the years in the Gallery, in addition to family, his wonderful family.

Dozens of staffers are here to pay tribute. Some of them now work for my office. In fact, early on in my Senate career, I learned something very smart. I frequently stole Don Young's staff to come work for me: well-trained, smart. I still do it. And he never minded. As a matter of fact, he always said: I just want what is best for my people.

Larry Burton, Erik Elam, Chad Padgett, Liz Banicki, Scott Leathard—so many are still here with me. So many cut their teeth at Don Young's office. And like so many who know Don Young, they are intensely loyal to this great Alaskan.

His spirit will live on in the House of Representatives and the people's House, and his spirit will live on in everything he has done for our State and every Alaskan from the Trans-Alaska Pipeline, to the Ketchikan shipping yard, to the many, many land exchanges, the health clinics dotting our State, the state-of-the-art Alaska Native Medical Center in Anchorage.

And his spirit will live in his wonderful family: Joni and Sister, his 13 grandchildren, Anne, and so many others. Don was a dear friend and mentor to me, to Senator MURKOWSKI, to my wife Julie, and so many others. He was truly a man of the people, a great man of the people.

We miss you, Don. Rest in peace.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). The Senator from Wisconsin.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 737, the nomination of Hector Gonzalez, under the previous order.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Hector Gonzalez, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. 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.

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 102 Ex.]

YEAS—52

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Baldwin | Hickenlooper | Reed |
| Bennet | Hirono | Rosen |
| Blumenthal | Kaine | Sanders |
| Booker | Kelly | Schatz |
| Brown | King | Schumer |
| Cantwell | Klobuchar | Sinema |
| Cardin | Leahy | Smith |
| Carper | Lujan | Stabenow |
| Collins | Markey | Tester |
| Coons | McConnell | Tillis |
| Cortez Masto | Menendez | Van Hollen |
| Duckworth | Merkley | Warner |
| Durbin | Murkowski | Warnock |
| Feinstein | Murphy | Warren |
| Gillibrand | Murray | Whitehouse |
| Graham | Ossoff | Wyden |
| Hassan | Padilla | |
| Heinrich | Peters | |

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—3

| | | |
|-------|---------|---------|
| Casey | Manchin | Shaheen |
|-------|---------|---------|

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. OK. Folks, once again, it is Wednesday night. We are going to try to repeat the same success we had the last few Wednesdays and not drag this out for too long. So I urge Members to either sit in their chairs or be around the Chamber. We have a whole bunch of votes.

I ask unanimous consent that any remaining votes tonight be 10-minute votes.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. So please stay nearby so we can get this done.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate

proceed to executive session and vote for the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 679, the nomination of John Chun, under the previous order.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John H. Chun, of Washington, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Washington.

VOTE ON CHUN NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 103 Ex.]

YEAS—49

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Baldwin | Heinrich | Peters |
| Bennet | Hickenlooper | Reed |
| Blumenthal | Hirono | Rosen |
| Booker | Kaine | Schatz |
| Brown | Kelly | Schumer |
| Cantwell | King | Sinema |
| Cardin | Klobuchar | Smith |
| Carper | Leahy | Stabenow |
| Collins | Lujan | Tester |
| Coons | Markey | Van Hollen |
| Cortez Masto | Menendez | Warner |
| Duckworth | Merkley | Warnock |
| Durbin | Murkowski | Warren |
| Feinstein | Murphy | Whitehouse |
| Gillibrand | Murray | Wyden |
| Graham | Ossoff | |
| Hassan | Padilla | |

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—4

| | |
|---------|---------|
| Casey | Sanders |
| Manchin | Shaheen |

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). 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 Nevada.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 684, the nomination of Cristina Silva, under the previous order.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Cristina D. Silva, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

VOTE ON SILVA NOMINATION

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

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 104 Ex.]

YEAS—50

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|------------|
| Baldwin | Heinrich | Peters |
| Bennet | Hickenlooper | Portman |
| Blumenthal | Hirono | Reed |
| Booker | Kaine | Rosen |
| Brown | Kelly | Schatz |
| Cantwell | King | Schumer |
| Cardin | Klobuchar | Sinema |
| Carper | Leahy | Smith |
| Collins | Lujan | Stabenow |
| Coons | Markey | Tester |
| Cortez Masto | Menendez | Van Hollen |
| Duckworth | Merkley | Warner |
| Durbin | Murkowski | Warnock |
| Feinstein | Murphy | Warren |
| Gillibrand | Murray | Whitehouse |
| Graham | Ossoff | Wyden |
| Hassan | Padilla | |

NAYS—46

| | | |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Barrasso | Ernst | McConnell |
| Blackburn | Fischer | Moran |
| Blunt | Grassley | Paul |
| Boozman | Hagerty | Risch |
| Braun | Hawley | Romney |
| Burr | Hoeven | Rounds |
| Capito | Hyde-Smith | Rubio |
| Cassidy | Inhofe | Sasse |
| Cornyn | Johnson | Scott (FL) |
| Cotton | Kennedy | Scott (SC) |
| Cramer | Lankford | Shelby |
| Crapo | Lee | Sullivan |
| Cruz | Lummis | |
| Daines | Marshall | |

| | | |
|--------|------------|--------|
| Thune | Toomey | Wicker |
| Tillis | Tuberville | Young |

NOT VOTING—4

| |
|---------|
| Casey |
| Manchin |

| |
|---------|
| Sanders |
| Shaheen |

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session. The Senator from Illinois.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 685, the nomination of Anne Traum, under the previous order.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Anne Rachel Traum, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

VOTE ON TRAUM NOMINATION

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

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

Is there a sufficient second?

There is 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), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 105 Ex.]

YEAS—49

| | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------|
| Baldwin | Graham | Murphy |
| Bennet | Hassan | Murray |
| Blumenthal | Heinrich | Ossoff |
| Booker | Hickenlooper | Padilla |
| Brown | Hirono | Peters |
| Cantwell | Kaine | Reed |
| Cardin | Kelly | Rosen |
| Carper | King | Schatz |
| Collins | Klobuchar | Schumer |
| Coons | Leahy | Sinema |
| Cortez Masto | Lujan | Smith |
| Duckworth | Markey | Stabenow |
| Durbin | Menendez | Tester |
| Feinstein | Merkley | |
| Gillibrand | Murkowski | |

Van Hollen
Warner

Warnock
Warren

Whitehouse
Wyden

[Rollcall Vote No. 106 Ex.]

YEAS—49

NAYS—47
Barrasso
Blackburn
Blunt
Boozman
Braun
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Cornyn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Ernst
Fischer

NOT VOTING—4

Casey
Manchin

Sanders
Shaheen

The nomination was confirmed.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this is the last vote of the evening.

I ask that the Senate proceed to executive session to vote on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 677, the nomination of Alison Nathan, under the previous order.

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

VOTE ON NATHAN NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 47, as follows:

Risch
Romney
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Tuberville
Wicker
Young

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

Heinrich
Hickenlooper
Hirono
Kaine
Kelly
Kennedy
King
Klobuchar
Leahy
Lujan
Markley
Menendez
Merkley
Murphy
Murray
Ossoff
Padilla

Peters
Reed
Rosen
Schatz
Schumer
Sinema
Smith
Stabenow
Tester
Van Hollen
Warner
Warnock
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NAYS—47

Barrasso
Blackburn
Blunt
Boozman
Braun
Burr
Capito
Cassidy
Cornyn
Cotton
Cramer
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Ernst
Fischer

Grassley
Hagerty
Hawley
Hoeven
Hyde-Smith
Inhofe
Johnson
Lankford
Lee
Lummis
Marshall
McConnell
Moran
Murkowski
Paul
Portman

Risch
Romney
Rounds
Rubio
Sasse
Scott (FL)
Scott (SC)
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Tuberville
Wicker
Young

NOT VOTING—4

Casey
Manchin

Sanders
Shaheen

The nomination was confirmed.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the substitute amendment 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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on amendment No. 5002 to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, a bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology, as amended.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tammy Duckworth, Mark R. Warner, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Mazie K. Hirono, Mark Kelly, Tammy Baldwin, Jacky Rosen, Ron Wyden, Margaret Wood Hassan, Maria Cantwell.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the bill 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 senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, a bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology, as amended.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tammy Duckworth, Mark R. Warner, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Mazie K. Hirono, Mark Kelly, Tammy Baldwin, Jacky Rosen, Ron Wyden, Margaret Wood Hassan, Maria Cantwell.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, Wednesday, March 23, be waived.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 686, 689, 691; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; 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 Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Alvin Harlyn Warren, of New Mexico, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2023; Fiona Whelan Prine, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2024; and Beverly Gage, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2024 en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with

Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

TRIBUTE TO OFFICER JUNIOR PAULEUS

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, when a police officer is shot in the line of duty and survives, every fellow officer breathes a sigh of relief and offers a silent prayer of thanks because they know that such a risk exists each time they put on their uniform and begin another day on the job.

Today, I want to recognize a member of the Lexington Police Department, Officer Junior Pauleus, who was shot in the back at close range on February 5, 2022, as he was conducting a routine investigation with other members of the Lexington police force.

Officer Pauleus, only 28 years old, has an interesting and compelling life story. He is a proud American, but not by birth. Originally from Haiti, Officer Pauleus met his future wife, Audrey, while she was on a mission trip. He eventually immigrated to the U.S. and became a citizen. Now, settled and thriving with his young family in Kentucky, he very recently joined the Lexington Police Department and was still on field training officer status on that fateful Saturday in February when he said his normal goodbyes to his wife and three children—including his 5-day-old son—and started another shift.

Thankfully, this is a story with a happy ending, and we are grateful for many things: for the fact that he and the officers with whom he was working with are all safe following the shooting; for the discipline and training on which they all rely; for the body armor that protected him; and for all the men and women of his department who willingly serve the Lexington community, even with the knowledge that, in an instant, their own lives can be taken.

I am privileged to meet young men and women like Officer Pauleus each time I travel to events throughout Kentucky. I am personally indebted to them for their service, and I am honored to recognize one example from among their ranks today.

TRIBUTE TO TROOPER MICHAEL SANGUINI

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, too often, we hear an account of another police officer in our Nation coming under attack while carrying out their daily duties, protecting the citizens of their community. It is important that we remember these sacrifices and the many dangers these brave men and women face each day. The daily walk of an American law enforcement officer is truly a walk of faith each day: faith in their abilities obtained from countless hours of training, faith to face the many dangers presented to them during their daily activities, faith in the many friends and family members be-

hind the scenes offering supporting prayer and strength, and faith in knowing their job is a calling to assist the many in their community seeking help in time of need.

Today, I want to recognize a member of the Kentucky State Police, Trooper Michael Sanguini, who was shot multiple times on January 28, 2022, while conducting a traffic stop in Harrison County. According to the preliminary investigation, he was struck six times, of which three shots were stopped by his ballistic vest. One shot struck his portable radio, and another struck his issued taser, with one shot striking his body. Thankfully, Trooper Sanguini suffered non-life-threatening injuries. God clearly protected this young trooper.

Trooper Sanguini is a native of Bourbon County, KY, and a graduate of Bourbon County High School. He then went on to Eastern Kentucky University, graduating in 2019. Following his graduation from the Kentucky State Police Academy in 2019, Trooper Sanguini was assigned to the Dry Ridge Post. I am pleased to say that Trooper Sanguini remains a viable part of the Kentucky State Police following this incident. I wish Trooper Sanguini a full and speedy recovery from his injuries and personally thank him for the dedication to his profession and his willingness to risk everything for the protection of others.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LATIN AMERICAN ASSOCIATION

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, today let the Senate recognize the 50th anniversary of the Latin American Association based in Atlanta, GA.

Founded and led by Angel Ortiz and Stratton Frank, what started as a small organization to serve Atlanta's then-emerging Latino population has become one of the largest service providers and advocates for Georgia's Latino and immigrant communities.

With a focus on civic engagement, economic empowerment, youth services, family stabilization, and immigration services, the association has made a big difference in the lives of hundreds of thousands of Georgians.

The Latin American Association has been instrumental helping immigrants who have newly arrived to the United States to assimilate, feel at home, and positively contribute to our great Nation. Because of their work, Georgia and the country are better off.

On behalf of the State of Georgia and the U.S. Senate, I express our heartfelt thanks to the Latin American Association.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:16 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

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.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Rebecca Eliza Gonzales, of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Director of the Office of Foreign Missions, with rank of Ambassador.

Nominee: Rebecca Eliza Gonzales.

Post: Director of the Office of Foreign Missions.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Rebecca Eliza Gonzales: None.

James Mahlangu (spouse): None.

Douglas T. Hickey, of Idaho, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Finland.

Nominee: Douglas Hickey.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Finland.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Douglas Hickey: \$5,000.00, 2018, Spirit of America PAC; \$800.00, 2018, Democratic Party of Virginia; \$1,000.00, 2018, Rufus Gifford for Congress; \$5,000.00, 2018, American Possibilities PAC; \$2,700.00, 2018, Kaine Victory Fund; \$1,900.00, 2018, Kaine for Virginia; \$2,700.00, 2019, Friends of Mark Warner; \$2,700.00, 2019, Friends of Mark Warner; \$2,800.00, 2019, Biden for President; \$2,800.00, 2019, Amy McGrath for Senate, Inc.; \$5,000.00, 2019, Common Ground PAC; \$5,000.00, 2020, Friends of Kamala Harris; \$10,000.00, 2020, Georgia Federal Elections Committee; \$1,666.66, 2020, Democratic Party of Virginia; \$666.66, 2020, Democratic Party of Virginia; \$1,666.66, 2020, Ohio Democratic Party; \$666.66, 2020, Ohio Democratic Party; \$10,000.00, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$100,000.00, 2020, Unite the Country; \$2,800.00, 2020, Claire Russo for Congress; \$1,666.67, 2020, North Carolina Democratic Party—Federal; \$1,000.00, 2020, One Vote at a Time; \$666.67, 2020, North Carolina Democratic Party—Federal; \$2,700.00, 2019, Kamala Harris for the People; \$5,000.00, 2020, Common Ground PAC; \$2,800.00, 2020, Chris Bubser for Congress; \$2,800.00, 2020, Claire Russo for Congress; \$1,666.67, 2020, Colorado Democratic Party; \$666.67, 2020, Colorado Democratic Party; \$666.67, 2020, Georgia Federal Elections Committee; \$2,800.00, 2020, Biden for President; \$1,666.67, 2020, Democratic Executive Committee of Florida; \$1,666.67, 2020, Nebraska

Democratic Party; \$666.67, 2020, Nebraska Democratic Party; \$666.66, 2020, Democratic Party of Wisconsin; \$1,666.67, 2020, New Hampshire Democratic Party; \$666.67, 2020, New Hampshire Democratic Party; \$2,800.00, 2020, Kamala Harris for Senate; \$2,100.00, 2020, Kamala Harris for Senate; \$1,666.67, 2020, Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party; \$666.67, 2020, Minnesota Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party; \$100.00, 2020, Kamala Harris for the People; \$41,100.00, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$1,666.66, 2020, Democratic Party of Wisconsin; \$1,666.66, 2020, Texas Democratic Party; \$1,666.66, 2020, Texas Democratic Party; \$1,666.66, 2020, Texas Democratic Party; \$666.66, 2020, Texas Democratic Party; \$25,000.00, 2020, Biden Victory Fund; \$1,666.67, 2020, Georgia Federal Elections Committee; \$15,600.00, 2020, Georgia Senate Victory Fund; \$2,800.00, 2020, Amy Kennedy for Congress; \$1,666.67, 2020, Michigan Democratic State Central Committee; \$666.67, 2020, Democratic Executive Committee of Florida; \$666.67, 2020, Michigan Democratic State Central Committee; \$2,800.00, 2020, Warnock for Georgia; \$1,666.67, 2020, Arizona Democratic Party; \$2,800.00, 2020, Jon Ossoff for Senate; \$1,666.67, 2020, Nevada State Democratic Party; \$666.67, 2020, Nevada State Democratic Party; \$666.67, 2020, Arizona Democratic Party; \$1,666.66, 2020, Pennsylvania Democratic Party; \$666.66, 2020, Pennsylvania Democratic Party; \$2,900.00, 2021, Alex Padilla for Senate; \$2,900.00, 2021, Alex Padilla for Senate.

Dawn Ross: \$35,500.00, 2020, DNC Services Corp/Democratic National Committee; \$2,800.00, 2020, Biden for President; \$2,800.00, 2020, Biden for President; \$41,100.00, 2020, Biden Victory Fund.

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.

Nominee: Alina L. Romanowski.

Post: Baghdad, Iraq.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date, and donee:

Self: None.

Spouse: Matzelevich, William: \$5.00, 11/02/2020, ACTBLUE; Matzelevich, William: \$10.00, 10/29/2020, ACTBLUE; Matzelevich, William: \$25.00, 10/13/2020, ACTBLUE; Matzelevich, William: \$25.00, 10/06/2020, ACTBLUE; Matzelevich, William: \$2.50, 10/06/2020, ACTBLUE; Matzelevich, William: \$75.00, 09/28/2020, ACTBLUE; Matzelevich, William: \$7.50, 09/28/2020, ACTBLUE.

Steven H. Fagin, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Yemen.

Nominee: Steven Harris Fagin.

Post: Ambassador's to Yemen.

(The following is a list of members of my immediate family. I have asked each of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.)

Contributions, amount, date and donee:

Steven Harris Fagin: None.

Monde Muyangwa, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations 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.

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.

By Ms. STABENOW for the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

*Christy Goldsmith Romero, of Virginia, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for the remainder of the term expiring April 13, 2024.

*Kristin N. Johnson, of Michigan, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring April 13, 2025.

*Summer Kristine Mersinger, of South Dakota, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for the remainder of the term expiring April 13, 2023.

*Caroline D. Pham, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission for a term expiring April 13, 2027.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(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 Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 3904. A bill to enhance the cybersecurity of the Healthcare and Public Health Sector; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 3905. A bill to prevent organizational conflicts of interest in Federal acquisition, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARKEY (for Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. ERNST, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. MARKEY)):

S. 3906. A bill to improve certain programs of the Small Business Administration to better assist small business customers in accessing broadband technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 3907. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require the

Secretary of Health and Human Services to identify obstacles to identifying and responding to children missing from foster care and other vulnerable foster youth, to provide technical assistance relating to the removal of such obstacles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. DAINES, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3908. A bill to provide that certain policy statements of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall have no force or effect unless certain conditions are met, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 3909. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make employers of spouses of military personnel eligible for the work opportunity credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. SMITH):

S. 3910. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a funding program for supporting EMS organizations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 3911. A bill to establish the Shenandoah Mountain National Scenic Area in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. ERNST, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

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"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 775

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 775, a bill to require institutions of higher education to disclose hazing-related misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 828, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1116

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1116, a bill to amend chapter 81 of title

5, United States Code, to create a presumption that a disability or death of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by any of certain diseases is the result of the performance of such employees duty, and for other purposes.

S. 1218

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1218, a bill to provide economic empowerment opportunities in the United States through the modernization of public housing, and for other purposes.

S. 1806

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1806, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend tax incentives for biodiesel and renewable diesel.

S. 1831

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1831, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide electronic benefits transfer program for children during school closures, and for other purposes.

S. 2050

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor 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. 2061

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2061, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure coverage of mental health services furnished through telehealth.

S. 2597

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2597, a bill to amend the Animal Health Protection Act with respect to the importation of live dogs, and for other purposes.

S. 2808

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2808, a bill to provide compensation for United States victims of Libyan state-sponsored terrorism, and for other purposes.

S. 2854

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2854, a bill to allow for the transfer and redemption of abandoned savings bonds.

S. 2889

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey

(Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2889, a bill to amend the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 to address the timing for the use of funds with respect to grants made to shuttered venue operators.

S. 3169

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3169, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to prohibit the introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of food packaging containing intentionally added PFAS, and for other purposes.

S. 3262

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3262, a bill to improve the efficient movement of freight at ports in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 3448

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3448, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the Freedom Riders, collectively, in recognition of their unique contribution to Civil Rights, which inspired a revolutionary movement for equality in interstate travel.

S. 3491

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3491, a bill to establish a commission to reform and modernize the Department of State.

S. 3522

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) 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. 3544

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3544, a bill to authorize funding for section 619 and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

S. 3700

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3700, a bill to provide for ap-

propriate cost-sharing for insulin products covered under Medicare part D and private health plans.

S. 3787

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3787, a bill to prohibit the importation of petroleum products from the Russian Federation, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish an income tax credit for the sale or blending of certain fuels containing ethanol and to extend tax incentives for biodiesel and renewable diesel, to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3802

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3802, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a windfall profits excise tax on crude oil and to rebate the tax collected back to individual taxpayers, and for other purposes.

S. 3864

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3864, a bill to improve the pediatric mental health care access grant program.

S. 3899

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3899, a bill to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 to reauthorize and update the Act, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 38

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 38, a joint resolution relating to a national emergency declared by the President on March 13, 2020.

S. RES. 334

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 334, a resolution memorializing those impacted by and lost to the COVID-19 virus.

S. RES. 473

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 473, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the necessity of maintaining the United Nations arms embargo on South Sudan until conditions for peace, stability, democracy, and development exist.

S. RES. 547

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) 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, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 3909. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make employers of spouses of military personnel eligible for the work opportunity credit; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Military Spouse Hiring Act with my colleagues Senators BOOZMAN, HASSAN, and ROUNDS. Enacting this bill would improve financial stability for Blue Star families across the country.

The families of America's servicemembers make sacrifices that often go unrecognized. Among them is packing up and moving frequently, with military spouses regularly having to leave stable employment to move to a new area and start over. This is compounded by the complex system of State licensing and certification requirements, which can prevent these spouses from taking jobs that utilize their expertise and experience. Because of this, military spouses have unemployment rates substantially higher than the national average, and they are often underemployed when they do have jobs. Adding to the financial struggles caused by frequent periods of unemployment and underemployment, the rising cost of child care puts a substantial burden on many military families.

The Military Spouse Hiring Act would help these families by making military spouses an eligible population for the work opportunity tax credit. This tax credit has proven effective in improving employment prospects for other groups. Extending it to military spouses would help them find employment more easily after moving to new areas.

I hope my colleagues will support this bill to help families who have made the greatest sacrifice for our nation.

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

S. 3911. A bill to establish the Shenandoah Mountain National Scenic Area in the State of Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation that is the product of 18 years of collaborative work from a diverse group of stakeholders in Virginia, including local recreation groups, conservationists, timber industry representatives, and sportsmen.

The Shenandoah Mountain Act of 2022 would designate more than 92,000 acres of the George Washington National Forest in Virginia as the Shenandoah Mountain National Scenic Area, SMNSA.

Congress designates national scenic areas to protect the natural and scenic value of lands that are also compatible with recreational uses such as hiking, fishing, hunting, camping, mountain biking, among others.

The SMNSA encompasses four wilderness areas: Skidmore Fork, Little River, Ramsey's Draft, and Lynn Hollow, which in total include 10 peaks above 4,000 feet and 150 miles of trails to attract campers, hikers, mountain bikers, fishermen, birders, and equestrians. The legislation also establishes a 5,764 acre wilderness area at Beech Lick Knob, located 10 miles to the north.

The SMNSA will protect important water resources, as it contains headwaters for the Potomac and James Rivers and watersheds that provide drinking water sources for Harrisonburg, Staunton, and communities farther downstream, such as Washington, DC, and Richmond. It is also a hotspot for biodiversity. Cold mountain streams in the area are also a stronghold for native brook trout. Today's legislation would permanently protect those rivers and streams from industrial development, and it would also help safeguard plant and wildlife habitat for black bears, wild turkeys, more than 250 species of birds, and at-risk species like the Cow Knob and Shenandoah Mountain salamanders.

The Shenandoah Mountain National Scenic Area will provide a boost to the region's growing tourism industry. In 2019, the tourism economy directly employed 5,365 people and generated \$601 million in Augusta, Rockingham, and Highland Counties, as well as Harrisonburg and Staunton. Designation of the SMNSA would further grow this value.

These challenging past 2 years have underscored that getting out into nature is critical to our health and well-being. I am proud that the Shenandoah Mountain Act will expand these opportunities within the George Washington National Forest for visitors near and far, while also boosting our local economies, protecting drinking water sources, and preserving the wildlife that makes this area so special.

The local governments of Staunton, Augusta, Rockingham, and Harrisonburg, along with over 400 businesses and organizations, have endorsed the new designation for the vast benefits it will have on the surrounding communities. I thank my colleague Senator MARK WARNER for joining me in introducing this legislation. I also commend our local stakeholders for working on this proposal for so many years.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5003. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment 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.

SA 5004. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5003 proposed

by Mr. SCHUMER to the amendment SA 5002 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4521, supra.

SA 5005. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4521, supra.

SA 5006. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5005 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4521, supra.

SA 5007. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4521, supra.

SA 5008. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5007 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4521, supra.

SA 5009. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5008 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the amendment SA 5007 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill H.R. 4521, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5003. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment 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; as follows:

At the end, add the following: "This Act shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of the enactment of this Act."

SA 5004. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5003 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the 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; as follows:

On page 1, line 2, strike "1 day" and insert "2 days".

SA 5005. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4521, to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology; as follows:

At the end, add the following: "This Act shall take effect on the date that is 3 days after the date of the enactment of this Act."

SA 5006. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5005 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; as follows:

On page 1, line 2, strike "3 days" and insert "4 days".

SA 5007. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 4521, to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology; as follows:

At the end, add the following: "This Act shall take effect on the date that is 5 days after the date of the enactment of this Act."

SA 5008. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5007 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; as follows:

On page 1, line 2, strike “5 days” and insert “6 days”.

SA 5009. Mr. SCHUMER proposed an amendment to amendment SA 5008 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the amendment SA 5007 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; as follows:

On page 1, line 1, strike “6 days” and insert “7 days”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I have ten requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 9 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on the Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during

the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have one request for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. It has the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committee is authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, March 23, 2022, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 4373

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first 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. I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ADVANCED AIR MOBILITY COORDINATION AND LEADERSHIP ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 225, S. 516.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 516) to plan for and coordinate efforts to integrate advanced air mobility aircraft into the national airspace system, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Advanced Air Mobility Coordination and Leadership Act”.

SEC. 2. ADVANCED AIR MOBILITY WORKING GROUP.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall establish an advanced air mobility interagency working group (in this section referred to as the “working group”).

(b) *SENSE OF CONGRESS.*—It is the sense of Congress that Advanced Air Mobility (AAM) represents a key area of sustainable transportation and economic growth for the United States and globally, and that it is imperative that the United States take a leadership role in the adoption and furtherance of this technology. Therefore, given the path to initial operations is taking place utilizing today's regulatory framework, it is critical that government agencies collaborate and focus on taking this vital industry to the next level through policy and investment in energy, infrastructure, security and transportation. The focus of the working group is interagency coordination to enable the maturation and growth of AAM.

(c) *PURPOSE.*—The purpose of the working group established under this section is to plan for and coordinate efforts related to safety, infrastructure, physical security and cybersecurity, and Federal investment necessary for maturation of the AAM ecosystem, particularly passenger-carrying aircraft, in the United States in order to—

- (1) further United States leadership;
- (2) grow new transportation options;
- (3) amplify economic activity and jobs;
- (4) advance environmental sustainability and new technologies; and
- (5) support emergency preparedness and competitiveness.

(d) *MEMBERSHIP.*—The working group shall be comprised of at least 1 representative of each of the following Federal departments and agencies:

- (1) Department of Transportation.
- (2) Federal Aviation Administration.
- (3) National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
- (4) Department of Commerce
- (5) Department of Defense.
- (6) Department of Energy.
- (7) Department of Homeland Security.
- (8) Department of Agriculture.
- (9) Department of Labor.
- (10) Federal Communications Commission.
- (11) Such other departments or agencies as the Secretary of Transportation determines appropriate.

(e) *COORDINATION.*—The working group shall engage with State, local, and Tribal governments, industry and labor stakeholders, stakeholder associations, and others determined appropriate by the Secretary of Transportation, including—

- (1) manufacturers of avionics, AAM use aircraft, propulsion systems, structures, and air traffic management systems;
- (2) air carriers, commercial operators, general aviation operators and future AAM operators;
- (3) airports;
- (4) fixed-based operators, as defined in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5190-7;
- (5) certified labor representatives for pilots associations, air traffic control specialists employed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and aviation safety inspectors;
- (6) State, local, and Tribal officials or public agencies, with representation from both urban and rural areas;
- (7) first responders;
- (8) groups representing environmental interests;
- (9) electric utilities, energy providers and market operators of electricity;
- (10) academia with experience working with industry on new technology and commercialization;

(11) groups representing the telecommunications industry; and

(12) aviation training and maintenance providers.

(f) **REVIEW AND EXAMINATION.**—Not later than 1 year after the working group is established under subsection (a), the working group shall complete a review and examination of, at a minimum—

(1) the steps that will mature AAM past initial operations;

(2) the evaluation of air traffic control and management concepts that might be considered as part of evolving AAM to higher levels of traffic density;

(3) current Federal programs and policies that could be leveraged to advance the maturation of the AAM industry;

(4) infrastructure, including aviation, surface, energy, and telecommunications infrastructure, physical security and cybersecurity, and utilities necessary to accommodate and support expanded operations of AAM after initial implementation;

(5) steps needed to ensure a robust domestic supply chain;

(6) anticipated benefits associated with AAM aircraft operations, including economic, environmental, emergency response, and transportation benefits;

(7) the interests, roles, and responsibilities of Federal, State, local, and Tribal governments affected by AAM aircraft operations; and

(8) other factors that may limit the full potential of the AAM industry, including community acceptance or restrictions of such operations.

(g) **AAM NATIONAL STRATEGY.**—Based on the review and examination performed under subsection (f), the working group shall develop an AAM National Strategy that includes—

(1) recommendations regarding the safety, security, infrastructure, air traffic concepts, and other Federal investment or actions necessary to support the evolution of early AAM to higher levels of activity and societal benefit; and

(2) a comprehensive plan detailing the roles and responsibilities of each Federal department and agency, and of State, local, and Tribal governments, necessary to facilitate implementing the recommendations developed under paragraph (1).

(h) **REPORT.**—Not later than 180 days after the completion of the review and examination performed under subsection (f), the working group shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report—

(1) detailing the review and examination performed under subsection (f); and

(2) providing the AAM National Strategy, including the plan and associated recommendations, developed under subsection (g).

(i) **EVALUATION OF TERMINATION OF WORKING GROUP.**—Not later than 30 days after the date on which the working group submits the report required under subsection (h), the Secretary of Transportation shall evaluate and decide whether to terminate the working group and shall notify the appropriate committees of Congress of such decision.

(j) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADVANCED AIR MOBILITY; AAM.**—The terms “advanced air mobility” and “AAM” mean an air transportation system that moves people and cargo between places using innovative aircraft designs (such as vertical take-off and landing (VTOL)) and new technologies (such as electric or hybrid (fuel and electric) driven propulsion), which are integrated into existing airspace operations as well as operated in local, regional, intraregional, rural, and urban environments, and which may include remotely piloted or autonomous aircraft.

(2) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.**—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives;

(E) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(F) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

(3) **VERTICAL TAKE-OFF AND LANDING; VTOL.**—The terms “vertical take-off and landing” and “VTOL” mean an aircraft with lift/thrust units used to generate powered lift and control and with more than two lift/thrust units used to provide lift during vertical take-off or landing.

SEC. 3. GAO STUDY AND REPORT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the interests, roles, and responsibilities of Federal, State, local, and Tribal governments affected by AAM aircraft and operations; and

(2) submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the study, including the Comptroller General’s findings and conclusions.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In conducting the study required under subsection (a), the Comptroller General shall review the following:

(1) The state of the law as of the enactment of this Act with respect to Federal authority over operations of AAM aircraft systems in the national airspace system.

(2) The state of the law as of the enactment of this Act with respect to State, local, and Tribal authority over operations of AAM aircraft in the national airspace system.

(3) Potential gaps between authorities under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(4) Proposals to facilitate the safe and financially viable growth and development of the AAM industry and integration of AAM aircraft into the national airspace system.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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. 516), as amended, was passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the motion 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.

SAFE CRIBS ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 226, S. 1259.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1259) to provide that crib bumpers shall be considered banned hazardous prod-

ucts under section 8 of the Consumer Product Safety Act, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 1259) was passed, as follows:

S. 1259

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Safe Cribs Act”.

SEC. 2. BANNING OF CRIB BUMPERS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, crib bumpers, regardless of the date of manufacture, shall be considered a banned hazardous product under section 8 of the Consumer Product Safety Act (15 U.S.C. 2057).

(b) **CRIB BUMPER DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “crib bumper”—

(1) means any material that is intended to cover the sides of a crib to prevent injury to any crib occupant from impacts against the side of a crib or to prevent partial or complete access to any openings in the sides of a crib to prevent a crib occupant from getting any part of the body entrapped in any opening;

(2) includes a padded crib bumper, a supported and unsupported vinyl bumper guard, and vertical crib slat covers; and

(3) does not include a non-padded mesh crib liner.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the motion 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.

SUPPORTING FAMILIES OF THE FALLEN ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 290, S. 2794.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2794) to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase automatic maximum coverage under the Servicemembers’ Group Life Insurance program and the Veterans’ Group Life Insurance program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2794) was passed, as follows:

S. 2794

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Supporting Families of the Fallen Act".

SEC. 2. INCREASE IN AUTOMATIC MAXIMUM COVERAGE UNDER SERVICEMEMBERS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE AND VETERANS' GROUP LIFE INSURANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1967(a)(3)(A)(i) of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking "\$400,000" and inserting "\$500,000".

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the later of—

(1) the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act; or

(2) the date on which the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines that—

(A) the amount for which a member will be insured pursuant to the amendment made by subsection (a) and the premiums for such amount are administratively and actuarially sound for the Servicemembers' Group Life Insurance program under subchapter III of chapter 19 of title 38, United States Code, and the Veterans' Group Life Insurance program under section 1977 of such title; and

(B) the increase in such amount carried out pursuant to the amendment will not result in such programs operating at a loss.

Mr. SCHUMER. I further ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

MAKING ADVANCES IN MAMMOGRAPHY AND MEDICAL OPTIONS FOR VETERANS ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 303, S. 2533.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2533) to improve mammography services furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Making Advances in Mammography and Medical Options for Veterans Act".

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

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—SCREENING AND EARLY DETECTION

Sec. 101. Strategic plan for breast imaging services for veterans.

Sec. 102. Telescreening mammography pilot program of Department of Veterans Affairs.

Sec. 103. Upgrade of breast imaging at facilities of Department of Veterans Affairs to three-dimensional digital mammography.

Sec. 104. Study on availability of testing for breast cancer gene among veterans and expansion of availability of such testing.

Sec. 105. Mammography accessibility for paralyzed and disabled veterans.

Sec. 106. Report on access to and quality of mammography screenings furnished by Department of Veterans Affairs.

TITLE II—PARTNERSHIPS FOR RESEARCH AND ACCESS TO CARE

Sec. 201. Partnerships with National Cancer Institute to expand access of veterans to cancer care.

Sec. 202. Report by Department of Veterans Affairs and Department of Defense on interagency collaboration on treating and researching breast cancer.

TITLE I—SCREENING AND EARLY DETECTION

SEC. 101. STRATEGIC PLAN FOR BREAST IMAGING SERVICES FOR VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year 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 strategic plan for improving breast imaging services for veterans.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategic plan required by subsection (a) shall—

(1) cover the evolving needs of women veterans;

(2) address geographic disparities of breast imaging furnished at a facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs and the use of breast imaging through non-Department providers in the community;

(3) address the use of digital breast tomosynthesis (DBT-3D breast imaging);

(4) address the needs of male veterans who require breast cancer screening services; and

(5) provide recommendations on—

(A) potential expansion of breast imaging services furnished at facilities of the Department, including infrastructure and staffing needs;

(B) the use of digital breast tomosynthesis;

(C) the use of mobile mammography; and

(D) other access and equity improvements for breast imaging.

SEC. 102. TELESCREENING MAMMOGRAPHY PILOT PROGRAM OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Commencing not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall carry out a pilot program to provide telescreening mammography services for veterans who live in—

(1) States where the Department of Veterans Affairs does not offer breast imaging services at a facility of the Department; or

(2) locations where access to breast imaging services at a facility of the Department is difficult or not feasible, as determined by the Secretary.

(b) DURATION.—The Secretary shall carry out the pilot program under subsection (a) for a three-year period beginning on the commencement of the pilot program.

(c) LOCATIONS.—In carrying out the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary may use community-based outpatient clinics, mobile mammography, Federally qualified health centers (as defined in section 1861(aa)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395r(aa)(4))), rural health clinics, critical access hospitals, clinics of the Indian Health Service, and such other sites as the Secretary determines feasible to provide mammograms under the pilot program.

(d) SHARING OF IMAGES AND RESULTS.—Under the pilot program under subsection (a)—

(1) mammography images generated shall be sent to a telescreening mammography center of the Department for interpretation by qualified radiologists; and

(2) results shall be shared with the veteran and their primary care provider in accordance with policies established by the Secretary.

(e) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the conclusion of the pilot program under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report evaluating the pilot program.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the quality of the mammography provided under the pilot program under subsection (a).

(B) Feedback from veterans and providers participating in the pilot program.

(C) A recommendation of the Secretary on the continuation or discontinuation of the pilot program.

SEC. 103. UPGRADE OF BREAST IMAGING AT FACILITIES OF DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO THREE-DIMENSIONAL DIGITAL MAMMOGRAPHY.

Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall—

(1) upgrade all mammography services at facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs that provide such services to use digital breast tomosynthesis technology, also known as three-dimensional breast imaging; and

(2) submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report—

(A) indicating that the upgrade under paragraph (1) has been completed; and

(B) listing the facilities or other locations of the Department at which digital breast tomosynthesis technology is used.

SEC. 104. STUDY ON AVAILABILITY OF TESTING FOR BREAST CANCER GENE AMONG VETERANS AND EXPANSION OF AVAILABILITY OF SUCH TESTING.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a study on the availability of access to testing for the breast cancer gene for veterans diagnosed with breast cancer, as recommended by the guidelines set forth by the National Comprehensive Cancer Network.

(2) ELEMENTS.—In conducting the study under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall examine—

(A) the feasibility of expanding the Joint Medicine Service of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide genetic testing and counseling for veterans with breast cancer across the country; and

(B) access to such testing and counseling for veterans living in rural or highly rural areas, and any gaps that may exist with respect to such access.

(b) EXPANSION OF AVAILABILITY OF TESTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall update guidelines or institute new guidelines to increase the use of molecular testing and genetic counseling for veterans diagnosed with breast cancer, including veterans living in rural or highly rural areas.

(2) **DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS.**—In updating or instituting guidelines under paragraph (1), the Secretary may develop clinical decision support tools, such as clinical pathways, to facilitate delivery of breast cancer care that is in line with national cancer guidelines.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) the results of the study under subsection (a);

(2) any updates to guidelines or new guidelines instituted under subsection (b);

(3) breast cancer clinical pathways implemented by the Department of Veterans Affairs and the utilization of those pathways across the Department; and

(4) any progress of the Department in improving access to and usage of molecular and genetic testing among veterans diagnosed with breast cancer, including for veterans living in rural or highly rural areas.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms "rural" and "highly rural" have the meanings given those terms in the Rural-Urban Commuting Areas coding system of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 105. MAMMOGRAPHY ACCESSIBILITY FOR PARALYZED AND DISABLED VETERANS.

(a) **STUDY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall conduct a study on the accessibility of breast imaging services at facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs for veterans with paralysis, spinal cord injury or disorder (SCI/D), or another disability.

(2) **ACCESSIBILITY.**—The study required by paragraph (1) shall include an assessment of the accessibility of the physical infrastructure at breast imaging facilities of the Department, including the imaging equipment, transfer assistance, and the room in which services will be provided as well as adherence to best practices for screening and treating veterans with a spinal cord injury or disorder.

(3) **SCREENING RATES.**—

(A) **MEASUREMENT.**—The study required by paragraph (1) shall include a measurement of breast cancer screening rates for veterans with a spinal cord injury or disorder during the two-year period preceding the commencement of the study, including a breakout of the screening rates for such veterans living in rural or highly rural areas.

(B) **DEVELOPMENT OF METHOD.**—If the Secretary is unable to provide the measurement required under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall develop a method to track breast cancer screening rates for veterans with a spinal cord injury or disorder.

(4) **REPORT.**—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the study required by paragraph (1), including—

(A) the rates of screening among veterans with a spinal cord injury or disorder, including veterans living in rural or highly rural areas, as required under paragraph (3)(A); or

(B) if such rates are not available, a description of the method developed to measure such rates as required under paragraph (3)(B).

(b) **CARE FROM NON-DEPARTMENT PROVIDERS.**—The Secretary shall update the policies and directives of the Department to ensure that, in referring a veteran with a spinal cord injury or disorder for care from a non-Department provider, the Secretary shall—

(1) confirm with the provider the accessibility of the breast imaging site, including the imaging equipment, transfer assistance, and the room in which services will be provided; and

(2) provide additional information to the provider on best practices for screening and treating veterans with a spinal cord injury or disorder.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms "rural" and "highly rural" have the meanings given those terms in the Rural-Urban Commuting Areas coding system of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 106. REPORT ON ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF MAMMOGRAPHY SCREENINGS FURNISHED BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General of the Department of Veterans Affairs shall submit to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate, and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on mammography services furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include an assessment of—

(1) the access of veterans to mammography screenings, whether at a facility of the Department or through a non-Department provider, including any staffing concerns of the Department in providing such screenings;

(2) the quality of such screenings and reading of the images from such screenings, including whether such screenings use three-dimensional mammography;

(3) the communication of the results of such screenings, including whether results are shared in a timely manner, whether results are shared via the Joint Health Information Exchange or another electronic mechanism, and whether results are incorporated into the electronic health record of the veteran;

(4) the performance of the Women's Breast Oncology System of Excellence of the Department; and

(5) the access of veterans diagnosed with breast cancer to a comprehensive breast cancer care team of the Department.

(c) **FOLLOW-UP.**—Not later than 180 days after the submittal of the report under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a plan to address the deficiencies identified in the report under subsection (a), if any.

TITLE II—PARTNERSHIPS FOR RESEARCH AND ACCESS TO CARE

SEC. 201. PARTNERSHIPS WITH NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE TO EXPAND ACCESS OF VETERANS TO CANCER CARE.

(a) **ACCESS TO CARE IN EACH VISN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall enter into a partnership with not fewer than one cancer center of the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health in each Veterans Integrated Service Network of the Department of Veterans Affairs to expand access to high-quality cancer care for women veterans.

(2) **TREATMENT OF RURAL VETERANS.**—The Secretary, in carrying out partnerships entered into under paragraph (1), shall ensure that veterans with breast cancer who reside in rural areas or States without a cancer center that has entered into such a partnership with the Secretary are able to receive care through such a partnership via telehealth.

(b) **REPORT ON PARTNERSHIP TO INCREASE ACCESS TO CLINICAL TRIALS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) how the Secretary will ensure that the advancements made through the existing partnership between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the National Cancer Institute to pro-

vide veterans with access to clinical cancer research trials (commonly referred to as "NAVIGATE") are permanently implemented; and

(2) the determination of the Secretary of whether expansion of such partnership to more than the original 12 facilities of the Department that were selected under such partnership is feasible.

(c) **PERIODIC REPORTS.**—Not later than three years after the date of the enactment of this Act, and every three years thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives a report—

(1) assessing how the partnerships entered into under subsection (a)(1) have impacted access by veterans to cancer centers of the National Cancer Institute, including an assessment of the telehealth options made available and used pursuant to such partnerships; and

(2) describing the advancements made with respect to access by veterans to clinical cancer research trials through the partnership described in subsection (b)(1), including how many of those veterans were women veterans, minority veterans (including racial and ethnic minorities), and rural veterans, and identifying opportunities for further innovation.

SEC. 202. REPORT BY DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ON INTERAGENCY COLLABORATION ON TREATING AND RESEARCHING BREAST CANCER.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in collaboration with the Secretary of Defense, shall submit to Congress a report on all current research and health care collaborations between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense on treating veterans and members of the Armed Forces with breast cancer.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a)—

(1) shall include a description of potential opportunities for future interagency collaboration between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense with respect to treating and researching breast cancer; and

(2) may include a focus on—

(A) with respect to women members of the Armed Forces with a diagnosis of or who are undergoing screening for breast cancer, transition of such members from receiving care from the Department of Defense to receiving care from the Department of Veterans Affairs;

(B) collaborative breast cancer research opportunities between the Department of Veterans Affairs and the Department of Defense;

(C) access to clinical trials; and

(D) such other matters as the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense consider appropriate.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to and that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the bill, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the bill, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (S. 2533), as amended, was passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. I further ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MARCH 24, 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I would like to say school is good for young pages.

Second, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow on Thursday, March 24; and that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the

time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 280, H.R. 4521, America COMPETES Act; further, that at 11:30 a.m., the Senate vote on confirmation of the Luger nomination, as provided under the previous order; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed during Thursday's session of the Senate, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 9:51 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, March 24, 2022, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 23, 2022:

THE JUDICIARY

ALISON J. NATHAN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT.

JOHN H. CHUN, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON.

JULIE REBECCA RUBIN, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND.

CRISTINA D. SILVA, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA.

ANNE RACHEL TRAUM, OF NEVADA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA.

CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE

ALVIN HARLYN WARREN, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2023.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

FIONA WHELAN PRINE, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2024.

BEVERLY GAGE, OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2024.

THE JUDICIARY

HECTOR GONZALEZ, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.