



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 2023

No. 40

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, March 3, 2023, at 9 a.m.

Senate

THURSDAY, MARCH 2, 2023

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Loving King of the universe, thank You that nothing can separate us from Your love. Remind us that we are surrounded by Your unconditional, positive regard, regardless of our faults and failures. Lord, help us to see that our anxieties and fears, our doubts and disappointments cannot diminish Your affection for us.

Today, bless the Members of this legislative body. Give them wisdom to see what needs to be done and the courage to do it. Lord, help them to persevere in doing Your will, knowing that a productive harvest is certain.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Colleen R. Lawless, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of Illinois.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

HONORING JASON ARNO

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before I get into my remarks this morning, I want to offer my thoughts and prayers to everyone affected by the four-alarm fire on Main Street in Buffalo, NY, yes-

terday, and I want to especially offer my condolences to the Buffalo Fire Department, which lost one of its firefighters, Jason Arno, in the line of duty during this horrible tragedy. Our thoughts and prayers go out to his family as well.

I want to thank all of the first responders who were on the scene. We are profoundly grateful for all you do to keep us safe every day.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS LUNCH

Mr. President, now on the President's visit to our caucus lunch this afternoon, later today, Senate Democrats will welcome President Biden to the Capitol for a special caucus lunch to talk about our agenda for the 118th Congress.

I predict that today's conversation will reemphasize a couple of important points. Unlike the other party, Democrats are united. We have a great story to tell about our work over the last 2 years, and we are ready to keep working in a bipartisan way to make life better for the American people.

If the last 2 years focused on getting our agenda passed into law, one of the focuses of our lunch will be on how the next 2 years will be about implementing that agenda. Legislation must and will continue, but implementation will also be a top priority.

Democrats are making sure that Americans see our agenda—see our agenda in their own backyards, on their way to work, and when they balance their checkbooks. Americans will see our agenda as the roads and bridges and highways they use every day finally get the fixes that are so needed, and Americans will see our agenda in

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S615

action as manufacturing—good-paying manufacturing jobs, high-end jobs—returns to our shore, as new innovations get developed here at home.

We will also talk with President Biden about one of the most important priorities that defines our party: building ladders to help people get into the middle class and helping people who are already in the middle class stay there.

We will continue protecting Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid from the hard right. We will keep investing in infrastructure jobs and good-paying union jobs, and we will hold abusive corporations accountable for putting profits over people's safety.

We are also going to make sure that, once people make it into the middle class, they have the tools to stay in the middle class. That was precisely the reasoning behind our work on IRA, on CHIPS and Science, on pushing for student debt relief and increasing Pell grants, and so much more.

I expect we will also discuss how we will keep Americans safe and keep democracy alive in the 21st century. One year into Putin's violent assault on Ukraine, the support for Ukraine will hold firm, and that, praise God, has been very bipartisan. Leader McCONNELL and I are united in that regard.

So we will focus on taking an all-of-above approach to outcompete President Xi and the Chinese Communist Party. CHIPS was an important step in that direction, but we cannot relent. The administration has already taken a few Executive actions that will increase our ability to bring jobs back here and prevent the Chinese from purloining our intellectual property. But we certainly cannot rest on our laurels.

Finally, and very importantly, we are going to talk about how Democrats will preserve our unity in the months ahead. The story here in Congress over the first few months of 2023 has been one of contrasts. Democrats are united on helping average Americans, while Republicans are divided, paralyzed by chaos, and so many of them doing the bidding of the ultrarich and the very well connected and powerful.

Republicans like to talk about standing up for average folks and fighting "wokeism"—whatever that means—but look at what they have actually done this year. They have given cover to wealthy tax cheats, escalated their war on women, even tried to push a national sales tax that would raise taxes significantly—up to 30 percent—for average families.

How the heck is an average family going to pay 30 percent more for everything they buy? What planet are these folks on?

Nowhere else is the contrast between Democrats and Republicans more glaring than when it comes to raising the debt ceiling. President Biden and Senate and House Democrats have been clear from the very beginning that we are united on what our plan is: Both sides must come together and raise the

debt ceiling without engaging in hostage-taking, brinksmanship, or political blackmail.

Speaker MCCARTHY, however, is unable to unite his conference or explain what exactly the Republican plan is. The hard right is demanding that we agree to spending cuts in exchange for their votes. But to this day, there is no consensus and no clarity about what cuts Republicans want.

Speaker MCCARTHY, it is March 2. Where is your plan? It is March 2, Speaker MCCARTHY. You have been talking about a plan for a while. Where is it? Where is your plan?

You say Social Security and Medicare is off the table. But until the American people see a plan, they cannot just take the Speaker at his word that Social Security and Medicare will be safe, because so many on his right flank—so many mainstream Republican Members even—have long pushed to have these programs changed.

And there is more that Americans have to worry about. What is the Republican plan on Medicaid or funding the police, on Pell grants, on defense, on food for kids? Will all of these things get cut from their plan?

Again, this goes back to the central problem with the Republican House majority. It will be exceedingly difficult and, in all likelihood, impossible for them to unite around a plan that they can pass with their 220-some-odd votes and that the American people will accept and like.

This contrast is going to keep growing and growing in the months ahead. During today's lunch, we will talk with the President about how we can make sure Americans see and understand the contrast. I thank President Biden for his time, and I very much look forward to having him here at our Capitol.

INSULIN

Mr. President, now on insulin, yesterday's news that Eli Lilly is capping insulin for patients at \$35 a month is a very big deal. That will make an enormous difference for the millions of Americans that rely on this drug to manage their diabetes.

I commend Eli Lilly for taking this much needed step, but, frankly, this should have happened a long time ago. There is no excuse for monthly insulin costing \$600, \$700, \$800 a month and people quaking in their boots about whether they can take half the dose, a quarter of the dose, no dose at all and getting even sicker. So we are happy to see that this company ends its terrible practice of keeping insulin prices high, and they deserve commendation.

It does bring up a few other points.

First, Eli Lilly's announcement is good progress, but still not close to enough. There is no substitute for legislation, such as the legislation you have been offering, Mr. President, Senator WARNOCK. There is no substitute for legislation that locks down a mandatory and permanent cap on insulin for all Americans, not just those who get insulin from certain companies.

Second, lowering insulin costs is a good policy that everyone on both sides should get behind. This should not be a Democratic issue or a Republican issue. It is something that affects people in every city in every State.

And, third, now is the time to finish the job and pass a bill to put a \$35 cap on insulin for all Americans.

Last year, we Democrats made good progress in the Inflation Reduction Act to lower insulin to \$35 for seniors on Medicare. It is my hope—it is my hope—to soon bring a bipartisan bill to lower prescription drug costs and cap insulin costs at \$35 for everyone—for everyone—to the floor and pass it with support from both sides of the aisle.

Let's get this done. It is so important for the American people. We Democrats are going to do all we can to get it done, hopefully, in a bipartisan way.

FOX NEWS

Mr. President, finally, on FOX News—there is a lot to talk about this morning. Earlier this week, we learned that Rupert Murdoch admitted during a deposition that he and FOX News executives knowingly—knowingly—broadcasted the Big Lie on their network despite many of them knowing it was completely bogus. When asked if he could have stepped in to stop it, Mr. Murdoch claimed that he could have but chose not to, and he expressed regret for not doing so.

With all due respect, expressing regret is not enough. I repeat, expressing regret on an issue so vital to the future of our democracy is just not enough. What Rupert Murdoch and FOX News executives and hosts have done is dangerous. When people doubt that elections are on the level, that is the beginning of the end of this wonderful democracy. Elections are our wellspring. When people don't believe they are legit, democracy starts flying out the window and some other form of autocracy comes in. We are not there yet, but FOX News and its commentators who have lied have helped sow some evil seeds in our body politic.

The wellspring of democracy is elections, and it is why this wonderful, great experiment has endured for so long. When conspiracy theories like the Big Lie are allowed to grow, when they are given a prime time spot on cable news—well, we all saw what could happen on January 6.

That is why I wrote a letter with Leader JEFFRIES to Mr. Murdoch this week, demanding that he should do what he should have done a long time ago: First, stop spreading lies about the election; second, stop sowing division; third, stop weakening faith in our democracy; and fourth, stop the commentators who continue to repeat the Big Lie even after so many at FOX, including Mr. Murdoch, admitted it was a lie, admitted they regretted it happened. Stop them from doing it.

Again, expressing regret is simply not enough.

In the light of mounting evidence that FOX News knowingly misled their

viewers, it is alarming, it is disturbing, and it is highly inappropriate for Speaker MCCARTHY to share highly sensitive security camera footage of the January 6 attack with Tucker Carlson, one of the biggest peddlers of the Big Lie, one of the people who have done more to destroy faith in this democracy than just about anyone else.

Releasing this footage publicly reveals the location of security cameras across the Capitol grounds, making it harder and more dangerous for our brave Capitol Police officers who defended the Capitol that day to do their job. Giving someone as disingenuous, fundamentally dishonest as Tucker Carlson when it comes to what happened in the election—giving him exclusive access to this type of sensitive information is a grave mistake—a grave mistake—by Speaker MCCARTHY and feeds into the propaganda he has already put on FOX News's air.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader is recognized.

CRIME

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the American people are deeply concerned about the collapse of law and order in our country. Thirty-nine percent of New York residents say they feel less safe than they did 1 year ago. Last month, 63 percent of likely voters in Chicago said they felt personally unsafe from gun violence and crime. By the way, on Tuesday, those Chicago voters tossed out the incumbent mayor. Americans see this problem going from bad to worse. More than 70 percent of the country expects we will see crime rates rise even higher this coming year.

Unfortunately, my fellow Kentuckians know this as well as anyone else. In my hometown of Louisville, youth homicides tripled between 2018 and 2021. In fact, since the onset of the pandemic, Louisville has seen the second worst increase in youth homicides among more than a dozen similar U.S. cities. Total homicides have slightly subsided from their record high in 2021, but they are still sitting in the triple digits.

One Louisville couple whose 19-year-old son was murdered by a convicted felon in 2019 summed up the way everybody is feeling. Here is what they said:

[Homicides] may be down, but it's not down enough.

Of course, crime is not limited to the most callous acts of murder; there is also a literal rash of brazen theft. Just 2 days ago, the town of Somerset in my State was stunned when their local car dealership was robbed point-blank. A group of masked thieves stormed the showroom and drove no fewer than six high-end cars right off the lot.

The nationwide decline in law and order hasn't been happenstance. Today's Democratic Party has made a deliberate decision to make public safety and innocent citizens a lower priority

than repeat criminal offenders. This has happened at the Federal level, where prominent Democrats have spent years amplifying anti-police rhetoric that tangibly and provably hurts law enforcement and certainly leads to more crime.

It has happened at the local level, where liberal mayors and city councils around the country have waged rhetorical wars against their own police departments and sometimes actually followed through on cutting funding.

The left's "soft on crime" campaign has even infiltrated the legal system itself. Far-left political donors have worked to get radical district attorneys elected in and around major cities. Many of them have promptly instituted what amount to blanket amnesties to whole classes of crimes.

For example, in Los Angeles, the district attorney's refusal to go after major misdemeanor offenses has brought his office prosecution rate down to half of what it was under his predecessor. The Commonwealth's attorney over in Fairfax County has repeatedly declined to pursue justice against perpetrators of child sexual assault. The former district attorney in Boston who made headlines for declaring that charges involving 15 different serious crimes would be "outright dismissed" was actually rewarded by President Biden with a promotion to be the U.S. attorney for her whole State.

To make matters worse, in the midst of the violent crime surge that Democrats' actions have helped cause, their administration's Department of Justice has focused on many of the wrong things. A year and a half ago, Attorney General Garland instructed the Department, including the FBI, to go sniffing around stories of concerned parents voicing opinions at local school board meetings. In the middle of a violent crime wave, the administration's priority was extra security for moms and dads exercising their First Amendment rights.

Just last fall, armed FBI agents were sent to rural Pennsylvania to arrest a father at home in front of his young children because the man had defended his son during an earlier minor altercation outside an abortion clinic. Apparently, under this administration, the crime of protesting while conservative can bring FBI agents to your house with guns drawn.

Then just a few weeks ago, a memo leaked from the Bureau's Richmond, VA, office that talked about needing to put informants in church pews so the FBI could spy on Catholic Americans whose religious views they deemed overly traditional.

Our major cities are beset with murders and carjackings, but these Democrats are focused on subjecting God-fearing Americans to this junior-varsity J. Edgar Hoover act. It is nonsensical. And don't think for a minute they have simply turned up the security evenly, across the board. In fact, it has been quite the opposite.

While the Biden-Garland DOJ seems fanatically overzealous about harassing conservative citizens, they are currently asleep at the switch when far-left activists are flouting actual Federal laws.

When fringe activists advocated for violence against sitting Justices of the Supreme Court, when crowds spent months picketing outside Justices' private family homes in direct contravention of Federal law, the Attorney General didn't lift a finger. The Biden administration simply refused to enforce black-letter Federal law that prohibits picketing and protesting at judges' private residences. That is the law. This willful failure to enforce the law effectively made the President and the Attorney General willing partners in the improper pressure campaign that the leak of the draft opinion was surely designed to spark in the first place.

Get this—as the senior Senator from Utah has pointed out, there have been more than 80 recorded attacks on pro-life pregnancy centers since the start of last year and 130 attacks on Catholic churches.

Do you know how many of the offenders Attorney General Garland's DOJ has managed to charge? A grand total of two, just two. Suffice it to say the Attorney General had a lot to answer for at his oversight hearing before the Judiciary yesterday, but, unfortunately, Senators saw no evidence that a course correction is coming.

For example, the Attorney General wouldn't give Ranking Member GRAHAM a straight answer on designating Mexican drug cartels as foreign terrorist organizations. He wouldn't give a straight answer about whether we should expand mandatory minimum sentencing laws to address the fentanyl crisis. He seemed to imply the status quo is OK, and the DOJ already has the tools it needs to address the problem, which I would add, if true, would make the administration's failures all the more galling.

He also couldn't satisfy questioning from Senator CORNYN about whether the Department is deliberately not charging drug traffickers with offenses that would already entail mandatory minimums under current law; in other words, basically cherry-picking their way around existing penalties to make current law even softer on lethal drugs.

Look, the American people want and deserve law and order. Getting murderers off our streets and foreign poison out of our neighborhoods are among the most basic governing responsibilities you could possibly think of. Evidently, the Biden administration either does not agree or just cannot deliver.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF JONATHAN JAMES CANADA GREY

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I have two important things I would like to speak about today. And let me first start with a confirmation vote we will be having this afternoon on Judge Jonathan J.C. Grey to serve as the U.S.

district judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Both Senator PETERS and I are strong, strong supporters and thank President Biden for nominating him, and we look forward to colleagues joining us in a bipartisan vote, just as we had on the cloture vote, to make sure that he is confirmed today.

Senator PETERS and I were both honored to introduce him and his family during his hearing in the Judiciary Committee in November, and I know his family is so very proud of him—as we are. Judge Grey is an outstanding choice to support the people of Michigan because he has been doing just that. Judge Grey is currently serving as a U.S. magistrate judge for the Eastern District of Michigan. As a magistrate judge, Judge Grey has presided over both civil and criminal cases.

Before that, he served as an assistant U.S. attorney in the Eastern District of Michigan and the Southern District of Ohio, where he prosecuted criminal offenses.

During the past 10 years, 95 percent of Judge Grey's practice has been in the Federal courts, whether as a magistrate judge or an assistant U.S. attorney.

He also worked as an associate at a law firm in Chicago, where he practiced labor and employment law and served as a law clerk for two Federal judges.

Given his incredible breadth of experience, it is no surprise that the American Bar Association's Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary unanimously found him to be "well qualified" for this position.

Judge Grey was born in Mississippi and is a proud graduate of Morehouse College and the Georgetown University Law Center. And in the spirit of those two institutions, Judge Grey is a deep believer in giving back, both in Michigan and through his alma maters.

I can think of no better place for Judge Grey to continue to serve the people of Michigan and our country than on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, and both Senator PETERS and I urge our colleagues to vote yes to confirm Jonathan Grey this afternoon.

REMEMBERING THE VICTIMS OF THE MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY MASS SHOOTING

Mr. President, as everyone knows, I am an incredibly proud MSU Spartan. I earned both my undergraduate and my graduate degrees from Michigan State University. And I have been so proud to represent the university in the Michigan Legislature, in the U.S. House, and the U.S. Senate.

I am a Spartan, as is Senator PETERS, and I am horrified and heartbroken and I am angry because we are mourning three lives that were lost on February 13 when a gunman came to campus and randomly started shooting students.

Arielle Anderson, Brian Fraser, and Alexandria Verner were each full of hopes and dreams and so much prom-

ise. Arielle, age 19, graduated from Grosse Pointe North High School in 2021. She was known for her confidence, her kindness, and her incredible drive. She was studying to become a surgeon.

Brian, age 20, graduated from Grosse Pointe South High School, where he competed on the swimming and diving teams. He was studying business and was president of the Phi Delta Theta fraternity.

And Alexandria—her friends called her Alex—was a 20-year-old graduate of Clawson High School, where she excelled in volleyball, softball, and basketball. She was studying integrated biology and anthropology and had hoped to graduate next year.

Arielle, Brian, and Alex had their whole lives ahead of them, and my heart aches for everyone who loved them and is missing them today.

We also know that gun violence isn't just about the lives that are ended; it is also about the lives that are forever—forever—changed. At Sparrow Hospital in Lansing, Spartans are still fighting just to survive. Thousands more students and employees and community members have been left with scars you can't see, but they are there. They hurt as much and take as much time to heal as anything else.

It is crucial that we ensure that everyone receive the mental healthcare that they need at this time. Last year, my initiative to bring high-quality mental health and addiction services to communities across the country was signed into law in the gun bill that we passed and right now is helping to make a difference in meeting the needs in the East Lansing, Lansing, Mid Michigan community, and I want to thank the Community Mental Health Authority of Clinton, Eaton, and Ingham Counties for working so closely with Michigan State University right now to provide support for everyone who needs it.

So many different things are happening on campus and across the community. Just one example: Counselors from Community Mental Health have set up a place in the East Lansing Public Library where they are providing resources and immediate, free support from therapists, and people are coming forward to volunteer their time to help make this happen as well.

They brought in support animals to comfort those in pain. Clinics like Community Mental Health don't just provide help after a crisis though. This is about helping people every day, helping people in the first place so that there is a place to call, and there is. And people in the community, family members concerned, people in neighborhoods that are seeing something that they are concerned about need to call and ask for help.

But better mental health isn't enough. We also need to make it harder for people who harm others to get their hands on guns because it is one thing if you are somebody who is unstable and have a knife; it is another thing if you

have a gun. The consequences are very different depending on what you are holding in your hand.

Firearms are now the leading cause of death for American children and teens. Think about that: not car accidents, not cancer—guns. We can change that. We must change that.

The Michigan Legislature is taking action to strengthen our State's licensing process and background checks, require safe storage, and pass a red flag law. What we did last summer was provide dollars to States to develop red flag laws, and I am so proud of our Governor and our new majorities in the statehouse and senate for taking action now. I strongly support their efforts. I am grateful as a citizen, as a mom, as a grandmother whose children are in the schools that they are taking these actions.

On a Federal level last year, I was proud to support the Safer Communities Act, which was an important step, but we need to do so much more.

We need to pass a military assault weapons ban—legislation that I am cosponsoring. And while we are at it, let's close the gun show loophole and ensure that all gun sales in America require background checks. It is just common sense.

We owe it to Arielle, Brian, and Alex, and the whole MSU community, to those who have been impacted across the country. These stories are way too common and should be absolutely unacceptable to everybody.

Thoughts and prayers are not enough. It is pretty hollow, as the Presiding Officer knows, as we all have spoken about. It is pretty hollow when we are not willing to take the actions that can save lives, and that is the way that we remember those who have been lost.

One of the most important things, the most beautiful things about Michigan State and our entire Michigan community is how we came together to support one another. It is amazing. I have been incredibly touched by the stories of how people have helped one another, both on that tragic night and the days since. From the dispatchers and the first responders who immediately and calmly responded to a chaotic and dangerous scene to the selfless staff at Sparrow Hospital giving comfort and lifesaving care every day, to East Lansing residents, and Lansing residents and everyone from across Michigan who came together and put up yard signs to greet students as they returned to campus, and, yes, to the incredible support shown by our rivals. An enormous crowd of University of Michigan students gathered in Ann Arbor on February 15 to show solidarity and support at the same time Spartans were gathered at The Rock in East Lansing.

A number of Wolverine sports teams have worn special warmups honoring Michigan State. And even Ohio State, even Ohio State, a great rival as well, hired an airplane to fly above Michigan

State's campus pulling a banner that read: "We are with you. Spartan Strong. Love, Ohio State."

The MSU community and the community of East Lansing are so grateful, we are all so grateful for the outpouring of support. We will get through this, but we shouldn't have to. But we will get through it. We just need to take action to stop this from happening again. We are all Spartan Strong.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, 15 months ago, I spoke here on the Senate floor to commemorate the victims of a shooting at Oxford High School in Oxford, MI. And just over 2 weeks ago, as a gunman opened fire at Michigan State University, our State lived through yet another nightmare. Another routine evening turned tragic. Another community was left scarred by unimaginable gun violence. And another three families will never see their children come home.

Just after 8 p.m., on a crisp Monday evening, gunfire erupted at MSU's Berkey Hall. As the alerts poured in, students all across campus huddled in fear. Some blockaded their dorm rooms and turned off the lights. Others grabbed whatever objects were nearby in case they needed to fight back. Parents called their children to check in if they were safe and worried if it could be the last time that they spoke. Those near the gunman hid under tables and ran for their lives. One student said it sounded like a stampede as they tried to escape.

In the end, three of their classmates did not make it. Three students who had their entire lives ahead of them were stripped of their futures in an instant.

Arielle Anderson, a 19-year-old from Harper Woods, was a sophomore. She enjoyed roller skating, photography, and live concerts. A committed student, she was working to graduate early and embark on a career as a pediatrician. She had a fierce intellect and a deep love for her family, touching everyone in her life with a kind and gentle spirit.

Alex Verner was 20 years old. She was a junior from Clawson and was studying to become a forensic scientist. She was a gifted student athlete in high school, excelling in softball and basketball and volleyball, and a dedicated member of her community. Friends and teachers describe her as a leader and a giver, someone who was always smiling. One of her peers remembered that she was "the very best of us."

Brian Fraser, the 20-year-old sophomore from Grosse Pointe had an infectious smile and a sense of humor that could brighten an entire room. As president of the Phi Delta Theta fraternity, he demonstrated a commitment to service and to leadership. He had been studying business and economics, but his life was cut short.

As a father and a fellow Spartan, my heart breaks for these gifted students, for their families and friends, and the time that was stolen from them. My heart breaks for those who survived who will carry the weight of this horrific memory for years to come.

And while this scene unfolded, first responders and law enforcement officials bravely leaped into action. Dedicated doctors and nurses have worked around the clock to help the five students who were critically injured. But I am grateful to these men and women for their tireless work.

At the same time, I know that the students and staff at MSU and in the broader East Lansing community will need time. They will need time to heal in the wake of this tragedy, but they shouldn't have to do that work alone. We can honor them by taking meaningful action, and we must do that now.

Last year, Congress showed that commonsense reform is still possible with the passage of the bipartisan Safer Communities Act, the most significant legislation to address gun violence in nearly three decades. It invests in mental health resources, expands school safety measures, enhances background checks, and includes new guidelines to make sure we keep guns from getting into the wrong hands.

While it is clear that this law did not go far enough, it has begun to make critical changes. We are already starting to see its benefits reach my State. Last week, Senator STABENOW and I welcomed \$8 million in Federal funding to the Michigan State Police. This investment will help combat drug violence and enhance crisis intervention programs all across the State of Michigan.

But there is so much more that we can and we must do. We must pass legislation to expand Federal background checks to all gun sales, a measure that I helped reintroduce in the Senate and one that is supported by the overwhelming majority of the American people. We could enact reasonable limits on high-capacity magazines and close dangerous loopholes. We can pass red flag laws while still respecting the rights of law-abiding, responsible gun owners. And we could invest in first responders, like those who so bravely answered the call at Michigan State.

The choice is ours to make. We could honor these young adults by making change or we can play politics and let this cycle continue. But for Arielle, Alex, and Brian, and for the students and staff at Michigan State and for every family that has been torn apart by gun violence, we must choose to act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). The Republican whip.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, if you ask any Republican what kind of energy policy he or she supports, you will likely hear the phrase "an 'all of the above' energy policy." Today, I want to take a minute to talk about, first,

what we mean by an all-of-the-above energy policy and second, why we support this kind of policy.

So what is an "all of the above" energy policy?

Well, as the name suggests, an "all of the above" energy policy is an energy policy that embraces the full spectrum of available energy resources, both renewable and conventional. It is important not to ignore the conventional part, as many of my colleagues across the aisle would like to do. It is not enough to embrace renewable energy, even multiple types of renewables. And, for reasons I am going to discuss, any energy policy that doesn't embrace conventional as well as renewable sources of energy is insufficient. It places both our energy security and energy affordability in jeopardy.

Back to my explanation, as I said, an "all of the above" energy policy is an energy policy that embraces the full spectrum of available energy sources. It embraces wind, solar, hydropower, biofuels, biomass, geothermal, nuclear, oil, natural gas, and more. That is the definition.

Now, why is an "all of the above" energy policy important? Why not, for example, eliminate fossil fuels from the mix? Or why not choose one or two renewable fuels and put all of our energies into advancing those one or two technologies to hasten the arrival of a clean energy future?

Well, there are a number of reasons why these options or those options and any option that doesn't embrace the full range of available energy technologies are a bad idea.

First of all, the fact of the matter is that we are simply not yet at the point where we can rely solely on clean energy technologies. We will still need conventional energy, and we are going to continue to need conventional energy resources and, in particular, natural gas for the foreseeable future.

My State of South Dakota actually derives a huge portion of our electricity generation from renewables, notably wind and hydroelectric, totaling about 82 percent of utility-scale production in South Dakota. But conventional fuels, nevertheless, play an essential role in electricity generation in South Dakota.

Wind, like solar and other renewables, by its nature is intermittent, even in places like South Dakota, where wind is a regular feature. And because technology has not yet advanced to the point where we can store up sufficient renewable energy to power an electric grid, even places like my State that rely heavily on renewables for electricity generation depend on conventional energy sources like coal and natural gas to keep the power on consistently.

California is another State with significant production from renewables, like hydropower and solar, but the availability of those sources are affected by variables like cloud cover and drought. And while California generally gets a lot of sunshine, again, the

technology to effectively store energy from those renewables at the scale necessary to power California's grid is simply not here yet. It is probably fair to say that one reason California's electricity grid is known for being unreliable is because the State is overly reliant on renewables without sufficient backup from conventional energy sources to meet demand.

Now, I think we are unquestionably going to get to the point where we can store renewable energy more efficiently and on a large scale, but we are not there yet. It is important to recognize that fact and to recognize that the availability of consistent, reliable energy in this country is still dependent on a consistent, reliable supply of conventional energy sources.

An "all of the above" energy policy isn't just a reliability imperative. It is also a national security imperative. Having a secure and stable energy supply is critical to our Nation's security. Our military bases and hospitals, for example, can't afford energy blackouts.

Again, having a secure and stable supply requires embracing the full spectrum of available energy sources, including the conventional energy sources that ensure the reliability of our Nation's electricity supply.

Furthermore, embracing the full spectrum of available resources includes developing domestic resources so that we are not overly reliant on supplies from other countries. The energy challenges and soaring costs countries like Germany have faced over the past year, owing to their heavy reliance on Russian energy, are a timely reminder of the importance of developing domestic—domestic—energy supplies.

Aside from energy security and reliability, an "all of the above" energy policy is essential because we don't yet know exactly what a clean energy future will look like. There are still a lot of challenges to work out with renewables and clean energy technologies. As I said, we have not yet developed the technology to store renewable energy on a large scale without significant efficiency loss.

There are a number of other challenges with clean energy technologies. Electric car batteries, for example, are heavily reliant on critical minerals. We currently rely heavily on other countries—not all of them politically or environmentally friendly—for our critical mineral supply. Environmentalists are, of course, loathe to tap our own natural resources. The same constraints affect batteries necessary to expand commercial and residential energy storage.

And while wind and solar energy are producing record amounts of electricity, each have their own end-of-life challenges for recycling and disposal as they are replaced.

Nuclear power provides a valuable source of clean energy, but construction costs are staggering, and we still haven't fully arrived at a solution for storing nuclear waste.

And the list goes on.

This isn't to say that American ingenuity won't solve some of these challenges or that conventional energy has none of its own, but that is exactly why we need to keep exploring all of these technologies and the opportunities and challenges that they present.

The fact of the matter is that our country's energy future will continue to be multifaceted, not reliant exclusively or predominantly on one or two energy technologies. For one thing, different areas of the country will have different availability when it comes to renewables, like the abundance of wind on the Great Plains. Even if we significantly improve the storage and transmission situation, it is likely that it will always be most efficient for different areas of the country to rely most heavily on the energy resources that they have closest to home.

So, as I said, it is important that we move forward with developing the full range of energy resources and not attempt to put all of our eggs in the same basket or to have the government pick winners and losers. Excessive government direction runs the risk of diminishing or cutting off innovation in the technologies that could be the future of clean energy.

We should be encouraging the exploration of all clean energy avenues and then seeing what the market ultimately gravitates toward, which is likely to be the technologies that are simultaneously practical, affordable, and effective.

The clean energy evolution away from coal toward cleaner burning natural gas, which has been a major driver of emissions reduction, was driven not by top-down direction from government—certainly not by government ideologues here in Washington—but by private industry, which saw the next wave of energy production and harnessed it.

Finally, we need an "all of the above" energy policy to keep energy prices affordable for American families.

Discouraging conventional energy exploration and production—or forcing a move to renewable sources before we have the technology available to ensure that renewables can deliver a reliable and affordable supply—is a good way to make Americans' energy bills continue to soar.

An "all of the above" energy policy is the way to guarantee an affordable and reliable energy supply, and Members of both parties—both parties—should be embracing an "all of the above" approach to American energy. Unfortunately, however, that is not the case. Instead, Democrats are pursuing increasingly extreme, Green New Deal policies designed to discourage investment in the exploration of and the production of conventional energy, without regard to whether or not we are anywhere near to having the resources and technology to move beyond conventional energy.

The so-called Inflation Reduction Act that the Democrats passed last August contained a series of tax hikes on conventional energy production that are driving up Americans' energy bills. It also contained a lot of funding for Green New Deal fantasies that are likely to achieve nothing more than wasting taxpayer dollars.

I am a big and a long-time supporter of clean energy. I have a record that goes back to my days in the House of Representatives, and I am confident that we will get to a day when we will be able to rely almost exclusively on clean energy technologies, especially when you factor in carbon capture paired with clean natural gas. But we are not there yet. Until that day comes, we need to embrace an "all of the above" energy policy for energy security, for energy reliability, and to keep Americans' energy bills affordable.

I hope that more of my colleagues across the aisle will come to realize this reality before they seriously impair the stability and security of our Nation's energy supply.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, first of all, I want to thank my good friend, the assistant minority leader from South Dakota, for a very, very good review of exactly where we are. I agree wholeheartedly except for a little bit of the IRA. We might have a little difference of opinion there because I really think it is an energy security bill, and we are all going to work with and together to make sure an "all of the above" energy approach is what we are going to take.

With that, I want to thank him. I think it was very good. As one Democrat, I agree wholeheartedly, and I would like to work with him on that.

I ask unanimous consent that I, Senator CORNYN, and Senator BENNET be permitted to complete our remarks prior to the scheduled votes.

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

GOVERNMENT SPENDING

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to thank my friend from Oklahoma, Senator JAMES LANKFORD, for continuing the Senate's long tradition of delivering President George Washington's Farewell Address earlier this week. It is an annual reminder of what is great about America, but it is eerie how his warnings ring true today, even though it was delivered some 227 years ago.

President Washington warned of the dangers of putting the will of the political party ahead of the will of the Nation. He also warned against the accumulation of debt and encouraged us to cherish public credit as a very important source of strength and security.

My personal relationship with this and understanding is from my grandfather, affectionately known as "Papa," "Papa Joe," who would always

say: Joe, if you have unmanaged debt, you will make cowardly decisions of how you live your life.

Yet here we are today, watching party politics and out-of-control spending threaten the very foundation of our great Nation. This is exactly what George Washington was talking about, and he was so right 227 years ago as to what is so wrong with Washington today and what the American people are really sick and tired of having go on.

The American people have had enough of the accounting gimmicks and budgetary games that we play in Congress, and it has got to stop. I would venture to say that there are very few accountants—professionals in this field and accounting professionals, who have expertise—who could make any sense out of our scoring and how we expense—the scoring and expensing—what we think it will cost and what it actually does, and how they transfer those back and forth. It is almost unbelievable.

The American people deserve the truth, and every Republican and every Democrat has the responsibility to tell them the truth. So let's start with the facts.

Fact No. 1, in 2013, Federal spending was less than \$3.5 trillion. Today, it is more than \$6.2 trillion. In 10 short years—less than 10—that is an 80-percent increase. We have increased our expenses voluntarily by \$2.8 trillion in a very short time. It is hard to believe. It truly is.

Fact No. 2, last year's total revenues were \$4.9 trillion—4.9—which left us with a deficit of \$1.4 trillion. No matter what anyone says, this is from the CBO. These are our scoring people.

Fact No. 3, we have been spending more than we bring in. Think about this. All of us, think about it. We have been spending more than we bring in in our government every year for the past 21 years—every year—and the debt that has resulted is absolutely crippling.

Think about 21 years. How many people could do that? How many citizens? How many of your constituents or my constituents? In West Virginia, New Mexico, Texas, or wherever they may live, how many could basically run a deficit that long and still have a home, have a family, or be functioning in any way, shape, or form? Most of us couldn't even make it 21 days, OK? You have got to balance things out and make adjustments. I have never seen anything like it. Basically, I guess, if you have a printing press, you don't have to worry.

Fact No. 4, the years of fiscal irresponsibility have brought us to the crisis that we face today. Our debt, as we stand here and speak to you today, is \$31.46 trillion—that is our public debt—which equals over \$94,000 per every man, woman, and child in West Virginia and in the United States and in New Mexico and in Texas and everywhere else—\$94,000 per person in our great country. This year, we are going

to spend more than \$600 billion—\$600 billion—just on debt, just on basically servicing the debt of the Nation. That is like getting a credit card and your owing \$5,000 on your credit card, but you have to pay \$340 just in interest that month. All you can do is pay the interest. You can't even touch the principal because you can barely pay the interest.

Think about this. Just the interest on our debt is more than \$5,000 per household in America—\$5,000 if everyone fulfilled his obligation, I guess. How can anyone, really, with a straight face deny that we have a problem—how can any of us no matter what part of the political spectrum we come from?

It doesn't have to be this way, and the American people deserve better than this. Our problem really isn't a Republican problem or a Democratic problem. It is an American problem. It truly is for every American. We have a problem, and only as we start putting our country first and acting as Americans can we fix it. There can't be this total political division: It is not my fault; it is your fault or it is their fault and vice versa—depending on where you are standing, I guess, in the body here and what political identity you have to you.

President Trump had it, and the people want to say: Whose fault is it?

It is all of our fault. Under President Trump, we added an estimated \$7.5 trillion to projected debt levels from legislation and Executive orders, including \$4 trillion that was not directly because of COVID—\$7.5 trillion in those 4 years. Under President Biden, we have added more than \$5 trillion to the projected debt levels from legislation and Executive orders, including more than \$2.5 trillion not related to COVID. So everyone is to blame. We are all at fault.

My Democratic friends don't want to say a word about our out-of-control spending and our outright refusing to even talk to Republicans about reasonable and responsible reforms. All we hear about is that we have to have a clean debt ceiling.

We are going to pay our debts. We have to pay our sins of the past, but can't we at least sit down and discuss—just discuss: How did we get here so fast, faster than at any time in history? In a 10-year period, how did we accumulate this much debt? Can't we even talk about that and see if there is a pathway forward?

My Republican friends refuse to offer any specifics, and some have recklessly threatened default, which is absolutely not on the table and cannot be on the table. It will not happen, I can assure you.

We will never solve the problem by having each party running in the opposite direction. We will only be able to change course by coming together, embracing common sense, and finding common ground.

Just think of our own lives when we go home and leave these bodies, Con-

gress—when 535 of us go back to our home places and sit down at our kitchen tables, look at our families, and look at where we are financially. Just think about it. It doesn't really have to be this way. They really expect better, and they should be getting better—every person in America.

So, really, what should we do?

First and foremost, the President and Congress need to do our jobs right now—no exceptions, no excuses.

Now, let me tell you that what I am going to be telling you now is something we have not practiced since I have been here for 12 years. We need to pass a budget on time. Pass a budget on time. That is by September 30. The President will already be over a month behind schedule when he submits his budget next week. It was due on February 6. Now, the dates I am going to give you come out of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. We have a piece of legislation that tells us the guidelines and the timetables that we should use to run this great country of ours.

By April 1, the Senate Budget Committee needs to report its budget resolution. By April 15, the House and Senate need to reconcile the differences they may have in their budgets. Then, by September 30, we must approve all spending bills.

I am just simply saying we shouldn't go home until we get it done. We really shouldn't. If we don't pass a budget, we, the leaders—from the President all the way down—shouldn't get paid, period. Think about this. The American workers don't get paid if they don't get their jobs done. They don't get paid if they don't work, and neither should any of us. I don't know how ever to make us follow the guidelines. We have a piece of legislation we haven't followed since 1985.

The only thing I know is that maybe the money would stop us from not doing our jobs and make us start doing our jobs. That is why, earlier this year, I was proud to reintroduce the No Budget, No Pay Act, with my friend from Indiana, MIKE BRAUN, to hold Members of Congress accountable. We should do our jobs or not get paid. I introduced this commonsense bill with Tom Coburn, my dear friend—God rest his soul—from Oklahoma. We started this in 2011, when I got here.

Tom said: I think it is something you will like, JOE.

So I jumped on it with Tom and have been on it ever since.

The continuing weaponization of the debt and deficit and the political games that we all play need to stop. They need to stop. While this may seem like common sense to most Americans, it would be a huge accomplishment for Congress if we would just operate in a timely fashion. The savings would be great, and no one would have to bear any cuts just to get it done on time. Talk to the military or talk to anybody about how devastating CRs are—continuing resolutions—and

omnibus bills at the end and all of the things that happen.

It has been 20 years since we passed a budget on time. We haven't had a real budget at all, even a late one, since 2016—not even a late one since 2016. We haven't had a real budget in 20 years. I don't know how everybody else does it, but I can tell you, if you are out of sync that bad, you had better sit down and work something out. Last year, neither the House nor the Senate Budget Committee even bothered to pass a budget out of committee. Neither even bothered to do one. It is unbelievable.

If you are listening at home and this sounds absolutely pathetic and crazy, that is because it is. No one is holding our feet to the fire. We aren't holding our own feet to the fire. It is unacceptable that we run the single largest economic entity in the universe without having a budget in place.

Let me tell you: Any household and any business that does not recognize what their income and outgo is will not be in business long. You are not going to be profitable. You will probably be bankrupt as an individual. With 21 years of running deficits as an individual, you can't do it, and as a business, you can't do it.

Nobody in this type of an economy and this type of structure of a government can operate and survive. As a Governor, I used to hold weekly—and Governors are responsible because, I think, there are 46 or 48 States that have a balanced budget amendment. That means we, as the chief executive officers in our States, are responsible for balancing the budgets. We would sit down every week like clockwork. My financial people would come to my office every Tuesday afternoon. It was baked in every Tuesday. We would sit down and go over any adjustments that might need to be made, and we would make them. When the financial crisis hit in 2008 and 2009, we were doing it sometimes twice a day to stay ahead of the curve—by not falling into the trap of having a deficit. We had to make tough cuts. We lived with it, and West Virginians came through it, and we were better off financially than we ever were before because we stayed ahead of the curve. Now as a U.S. Senator, I am embarrassed to say that not only are we not living within our means, we don't even want to discuss it and talk about it, what the problems may be. We need to stop digging our heels in and work out our differences.

When it comes to dealing with and controlling our spending and lifting the debt ceiling, at least we can talk about it. At least we can agree that we have a problem. At least we can basically maybe come together and find out how did we get to where we got to so quickly. We need to put all of our ideas on the table, just like we did last year with a number of important, bipartisan bills, so that we can pass and we can agree on bipartisan legislation and create long-lasting fiscal accountability.

Senator CHUCK SCHUMER, Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, Congressperson

KEVIN MCCARTHY, and Congressperson HAKEEM JEFFRIES—they need to propose a budget, allow for debate and discussion, and put it up for a vote. This needs to happen.

The debt ceiling clock is ticking. We can't afford to wait any longer. We need to serve as true fiduciaries for our country. That is what we are here to do.

The projections are that in a few short years, the national debt, as a share of the economy, will be the highest it has ever been in the history of this country. The debt will exceed—will exceed—the prior record of 106 percent of GDP, which we set after World War II.

Think about when we had the highest debt ever until now—the highest debt—and what happened to cause that debt. The United States of America entered war on all fronts. We saved the world from fascism. We basically helped rebuild Europe. We have something to show for that. What do we have to show for it now? What do we truly have to show for the debt we have incurred right now?

Most everyone uses 2050 as a benchmark. I hear 2050 in so many scenarios for accomplishments in different arenas. Pick whatever you have heard about 2050 that you may fit in, but 2050 has been the high-water mark. But I want to tell you what happens. If we continue down the path that we are on, we will have accumulated by 2050 nearly \$130 trillion of public debt. We are at \$1.46 right now—\$130 trillion. Just to service the interest on the debt—just to service the interest on the debt—will be \$5 trillion a year. This is by CBO; this is not me or anybody else coming up and trying to scare the bejesus out of you. This is what these young Americans are going to be facing with their children and grandchildren by 2050.

Not only that someone can tell me that this could even be plausible, but think about everyone here. Think about everyone in this great body. Think about your family. Think about your constituents. Our national debt weakens our economy, it weakens our national security, it weakens the trust Americans have in their government, and it weakens our role in the world. It weakens our role in the world.

I tell you, my grandfather, again, Papa said: Unmanaged debt—which we have a runaway train right now—unmanaged debt will make cowardly decisions. You will make cowardly decisions.

Fortunately, we still have time this year to prevent the catastrophic financial forecast.

I am asking all of you to join me in calling for, first, an honest budget without accounting gimmicks and tricks; second, a short-term deal to bring down our out-of-control spending right now, this year; and a plan to deal with our longer term fiscal challenges. The commonsense approach offers the accountability Americans want, the re-

sponsibility approach that we need, and the results we deserve.

My constituents have begun to ask me: How serious a crisis could we face if we continue to ignore our Nation's debt?

I think I have laid out the seriousness of our financial situation if we continue down the path we are on.

From President Washington, our Founding Father, 227 years ago to a more modern-day warning from our then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in 2011, ADM Mike Mullen, at my first Armed Services meeting—he was testifying before the Senate Armed Services. He was asked the question: What is the greatest threat our Nation faces? We thought it was going to be China, Russia, whatever it may be. Without skipping a beat, without missing a word, he said that the debt of our Nation is the greatest, greatest threat we face—the debt of our Nation. Just like the warning of our Founding Father in his Farewell Address, those words are even truer today than they were then.

If you love your children, if you love this country, you will stop the madness and start acting reasonably and responsibly to get our government's financial house in order. It is long past due. The partisan politics can wait. There is always time to have arguments and disagreements, but the looming debt crisis cannot—it cannot—basically have the disruption that we have and the discourse and the political toxic atmosphere that we have here. We have got to come together for the sake of our great country.

As I close, I want to say may God bless—which He has blessed—this great country and by all means help the United States of America to be even better than what we are today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, during my time in the Senate and even prior, when I had the honor of serving as Texas attorney general, I spent a lot of time in our border communities working with the mayors, county judges, private land owners, nongovernmental organizations, and law enforcement at every level. The majority of these men and women have lived along the Texas-Mexico border for their entire lives. They have witnessed the impact of policies from Washington from different administrations. They have seen spikes and dips in migration. They have reaped the benefits of legitimate trade and commerce, and they have dealt with the consequences of security failures. In short, they have seen a lot. But virtually everyone agrees that they have never seen anything like President Biden's present border crisis.

Over the first 2 years of the Biden administration, we have broken one record after another when it comes to migration. Here are some shocking statistics. U.S. Customs and Border Protection logged nearly 2.4 million border

crossings during a single year. During 1 month alone, the Agency encountered more than a quarter of a million migrants.

The scope and scale of this crisis is absolutely unprecedented, and it is having a major impact on our border security missions. When highly trained and professional Border Patrol agents are spending their time passing out meals and doing administrative tasks, they aren't able to do what they train for, what they want to do, which is to stop drugs like fentanyl, which killed more than 70,000 Americans last year alone.

I was able to meet with some parents who lost their teenage children to fentanyl poisoning last week in Hays County school district right outside of Austin, TX. It was among the most emotional events I have ever attended, because these parents had happy, healthy teenage children going to high school, who took something they thought was a relatively innocuous pill, only to find out it was contaminated with a minute amount of fentanyl, and it took their lives. These parents want us to stop the flow of these drugs across the southwestern border.

When the Border Patrol is not on the frontlines, they are not able to stop the transnational criminals, the cartel members, or other people on the terrorist watch list from sneaking into the United States.

A few weeks ago, I traveled with a bipartisan delegation of Senators to El Paso and then to Yuma—Yuma, AZ, a southwestern part of Arizona—a sleepy, little agricultural community. The Border Patrol Sector Chief told us that they encountered people speaking as many as 200 languages from 176 different countries at that little, sleepy border community in southwestern Arizona.

As it turns out, there is a major airport in Mexicali, in northern Mexico, just across from Yuma, and people were literally flying there from around the world and turning up at the Border Patrol sector and claiming asylum, people from 176 different countries. These are people who are exploiting the vulnerabilities in our asylum system—something we can and we should fix, but so far, there has been no cooperation in order to fix our broken asylum system.

Over the years, I have had the pleasure of taking a number of colleagues to the Texas southern border to see these dynamics up close and learn from the experts on the ground.

The distinguished Presiding Officer comes from a border State. I must say, my impression is that for many people who don't live in a border State or have the experience we have as border State Senators, most of what they think they know about the border they have learned in the movies or by reading novels; in other words, it is not reality. That is why it is so important to go to the border.

As I mentioned, in January, a bipartisan group of seven of our colleagues joined me in El Paso and then Yuma. But in El Paso, a place where President Biden finally visited the day before we got there, the circumstances were so severe that migrants were sleeping on city sidewalks in freezing temperatures because shelters were at capacity. They have been overwhelmed like everything else on the border. My colleagues were able to see for themselves the impact of this crisis on law enforcement and on the nonprofit organizations like Catholic Charities and others, which were trying to help these migrants in very difficult circumstances.

It was a busy and productive trip. But I am eager to return this evening to the Texas southern border with another group of colleagues. Senator THUNE from South Dakota, Senator WICKER from Mississippi, Senators FISHER and RICKETTS from Nebraska, and Senator BRITT from Alabama will join me for a series of tours and meetings in the Rio Grande Valley starting this evening. We will receive a tour of the border from some of the dedicated law enforcement officials who protect it. We will get an up-close look at one of the Border Patrol's processing centers and learn more about the challenges they are facing due to the sheer volume of migrants crossing the border every day.

One reason for this increased volume is not because of increased poverty or violence in communities in Mexico or Central America; it is because of what the Border Patrol calls the pool factors—that is, the impression that you can come to America's doorstep, and you can make your way into the United States and live the rest of your life because there are no consequences to coming to the United States outside of a legal, orderly, humane process. That is why we are seeing this unprecedented border crisis as a result of those policies and that perception, which is reality.

We will talk to local law enforcement officials as well—the sheriffs—and the private land owners on how this flood of humanity is impacting their communities. We will receive briefings from Federal, State, and local law enforcement about efforts to secure the border.

We had Attorney General Garland testify in front of the Judiciary Committee yesterday, and we asked him about the 108,000 Americans who died as a result of overdoses from drugs that come across the southwestern border. He said: Well, we are doing everything we can. Then eventually he said: Well, we need more money. Then he said: Well, this isn't really my job. He said that is the job of the Department of Homeland Security. In other words, he was passing the buck. Meanwhile, the flood of humanity continues, and the flood of deadly drugs continues as well.

It is important that as many Senators as possible see and understand

the dynamics of what has happened. If we are going to have a shot at fixing this mess, which can only happen on a bipartisan basis, then everyone needs to know what we are up against.

I appreciate my colleagues—these colleagues, as well as other colleagues—who have taken the time to visit the border and learn from the people who know it best. They are the true experts. I am grateful for everything they do to promote the security and prosperity of our border communities.

I am especially thankful that they take the time to share their perspective with our other Senate colleagues so we can work together to, hopefully, finally address this crisis.

TEXAS INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. President, on another matter, today is Texas Independence Day, a day for Texans to celebrate our unique history and honor the brave men and women who shaped it.

It was 187 years ago, on March 2, 1836, that Texas adopted its Declaration of Independence from Mexico. If you read that Declaration of Independence of 1836, it bears a lot of similarities to what our Founding Fathers declared when they declared their independence from England.

But independence from Mexico happened in the context of the struggle that is perhaps best remembered by the Battle of the Alamo, which laid some of the groundwork for eventual victory. One courageous defender of the Alamo was a man named William Barret Travis, a lieutenant colonel in the Texas army. During the battle, his fellow soldiers were outnumbered 10 to 1—10 to 1—by the forces of Mexican dictator Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna.

On February 24 of that year, with his position under siege, Lieutenant Colonel Travis wrote a letter pleading for reinforcements, and I would like to read it. It was addressed “To the People of Texas & All Americans in the World.”

Fellow Citizens & compatriots—

I am besieged, by a thousand or more of the Mexicans under Santa Anna—I have sustained a continual Bombardment & cannonade for 24 hours & have not lost a man—The enemy has demanded a surrender at discretion, otherwise, the garrison are to be put to the sword, if the fort is taken—I have answered the demand with a cannon shot, & our flag still waves proudly from the walls—I shall never surrender or retreat. Then, I call on you in the name of Liberty, of patriotism & everything dear to the American character, to come to our aid, with all dispatch—The enemy is receiving reinforcements daily & will no doubt increase to three or four thousand in four or five days. If this call is neglected, I am determined to sustain myself as long as possible & die like a soldier who never forgets what is due to his own honor & that of his country—Victory or Death.

Signed by William Barret Travis.

Well, the Travis letter is one of the most treasured documents in Texas history, and it lays bare the ideals and character of the people who founded our State, people characterized by their courage, by their sacrifice, by

their devotion, by their fortitude, and a deep and strong and enduring sense of independence.

Here in the Senate, both Democrats and Republicans from Texas have had the honor of reading the fabled Travis letter over the years. This tradition actually goes back to Senator John Tower, who began his career in the Senate in 1961. I am glad that tradition continues today to ensure that the words of William Barret Travis live on and that generations of Texans and Americans can appreciate the courage and sacrifice they demonstrated at that time.

So, today, I would like to express my gratitude for these Texas patriots, many of whom would later serve in the U.S. Congress, including Sam Houston, whose Senate seat I am honored to now occupy. Their courage and sacrifice will never be forgotten.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

NOMINATION OF GORDON P. GALLAGHER

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor and share a few words about an upcoming vote we are going to have this afternoon. I guess it will be now, on Gordon Gallagher, President Biden's nominee for the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado.

Judge Gallagher comes to this floor with a stellar reputation in Colorado and nearly 25 years in service to others, as a defense attorney for both indigent and paying defendants, a prosecutor in Mesa County, and as U.S. magistrate judge for the District of Colorado.

The judge credits his devotion to public service to his grandfather, who served as an air navigator during the Second World War and was shot down over Eastern Europe on his 49th mission. After the war, Gordon's grandfather came home to continue the fight for America's highest ideals, working to integrate housing in his local community.

And his example stuck with Gordon. So when he did a family trip to Colorado when Gordon was just 8 or 9, like everybody who comes to our State, he fell in love with it and fell in love with the Rocky Mountains. And years later, as a student at Macalester, he fell in love with a Coloradoan, his wife Christine. Gordon would eventually follow Christine back to Colorado, where he earned a law degree from the University of Denver.

After graduating, Gordon practiced at a law firm representing small businesses and served for nearly 4 years as a deputy district attorney for Mesa County, CO. Later, Gordon launched his own firm as a defense practitioner and began working with the Office of the Alternate Defense Counsel, representing clients who couldn't afford their representation. He spent over a decade in this role, fighting for the American ideal that everyone, no matter what their means, deserves equal

representation before the law. In 2012, Gordon was appointed as a part-time magistrate judge for the U.S. District Court for the District of Colorado, a position he holds to this day.

Senator HICKENLOOPER and I recommended Judge Gallagher to this position because, unlike anyone currently on the district court, he has spent the majority of his career on the Western Slope of Colorado, a rural, mountainous part of our State with a specific perspective on issues that range from public lands to natural resources, to Federal regulation.

We need that perspective on the Federal bench. It has been too long. We haven't had an appointee from the Western Slope of Colorado in over 30 years, and Judge Gallagher is the perfect nominee to bring that perspective to the bench.

Over his career on the Western Slope, Gordon's work ranged from representing a young man charged with the manslaughter of his best friend to securing rehabilitative services for members of the Southern Ute and Ute Mountain Ute Tribes, to hearing traffic complaints in smalltown courts because sheepherders had blocked the local highway.

I know I am not saying anything that the Presiding Officer hasn't seen in New Mexico.

And, as a presiding judge, Gordon has presided over most stages of a felony docket, from substantive motions through pleas, postconviction proceedings, and sentencing—a level of participation in Federal criminal cases far beyond a typical magistrate judge.

He has also worked on a vast array of issues including criminal, civil, patent, pro se, and environmental litigation, including many cases with difficult tradeoffs between natural resource extraction, conservation, and recreation.

These issues are common for the U.S. District Court for Colorado, and they require someone with Judge Gallagher's deep and direct experience. More than that, everyone we have spoken with tells us how much Judge Gallagher enjoys being on the court and how he cherishes the opportunity to serve our country, just like his grandfather.

Judge Gallagher's entire career has prepared him for this position. He has proven his character, his integrity, and his legal acumen over a distinguished 25-year career. He has my full and enthusiastic support.

I want to thank my fellow colleagues on the Judiciary Committee for advancing his nomination with overwhelming bipartisan support. They saw what an exceptional judge he would make, and I wholeheartedly agree. I hope we will have a large bipartisan vote to support Judge Gallagher in his confirmation.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON LAWLESS NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 37 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—41

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

NOT VOTING—8

Crapo	Fetterman	Tuberville
Durbin	Kennedy	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Merkley	

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 40, Gordon P. Gallagher, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Jeff Merkley, Jeanne Shaheen, Elizabeth Warren, Mazie Hirono, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Jack Reed, Gary C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Brian Schatz, Cory A. Booker.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Gordon P. Gallagher, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 38 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—41

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

NOT VOTING—9

Crapo	Fetterman	Tillis
Durbin	Merkley	Tuberville
Feinstein	Paul	Whitehouse

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 41.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Gordon P. Gallagher, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 1:45 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:21 p.m., recessed until 1:45 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PETERS).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jonathan James Canada Grey, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

VOTE ON GREY NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Grey nomination?

Mrs. BLACKBURN. 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. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 39 Ex.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—42

Barrasso	Boozman	Britt
Blackburn	Braun	Budd

Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cassidy	Johnson	Rubio
Cornyn	Kennedy	Schmitt
Cotton	Lee	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Marshall	Sullivan
Daines	McConnell	Thune
Ernst	Mullin	Tillis
Fischer	Paul	Tuberville
Hagerty	Ricketts	Vance
Hawley	Risch	Wicker
Hoeben	Romney	Young

NOT VOTING—9

Crapo	Fetterman	Moran
Durbin	Lankford	Sanders
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The senior Senator from Mississippi.

U.S. ARMED FORCES

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, our Nation is once again in an age of great power conflict. It is a dangerous time for this country, for our military, and for our citizens.

The mission of the U.S. military is to deter and, if necessary, win real wars, not engage in culture wars. And so I rise this afternoon to say that this administration's current diversity, equity, and inclusion program is not only unnecessary but harmful to our military and to our national security.

But, first, let me do a quick history lesson. Eighty years ago, our country was pitted against fascist foes from three continents. Our "greatest generation," my father among them, answered the call to arms and defended the world against an evil autocrat. Back then, the military was not what it should be. Our ranks were segregated. But a group of fearless African-American airmen challenged the conscience of the military and the Nation and paved the road to change.

In early 1943, the Tuskegee Airmen were making the final preparations to deploy to North Africa and later to Italy to take on the Axis war machine. They made history as the first African-American combat pilots, and they served with honor and distinction.

Their actions are now the stuff of popular film and literature, and they are a cornerstone of American culture. But the valor of the Tuskegee Airmen did not just appear overnight. John C. Robinson, a native son of my home State of Mississippi, spent a decade laying the groundwork for the airmen's future heroism. Born to a Pullman porter, Robinson completed 10th grade but was barred from further education. He could afford only a wagon ride on his first trip to the Tuskegee Institute, where he would learn the engineering trades hundreds of miles away from home.

He persevered, after facing several rejections from America's leading aviation school, and eventually he worked as a janitor by day and studied aviation by night, graduating at the top of his class with flying colors.

When Mussolini's brigades of Italian fascists invaded Ethiopia, Robinson jumped into the breach. He led the air campaign in one of the first salvos of World War II. His story would become well known to Americans in the newspapers and on the radio waves, and he inspired a generation as one of the first Black combat pilots.

As one historian put it, it was solely because of Robinson's contributions that the Tuskegee program became popular with the Army. Only in America, could the son of a Mississippi porter who was denied a college education because of the color of his skin become one of the finest aviators his country ever saw in a moment when we needed him most.

This is who we are. This is what our service men and women sign up to defend every day. Today, as then, we live in an age of great power conflict. Today, as then, we face hate-filled autocrats who seek to dominate. These foes present the American people with a test, and the Tuskegee Airmen's story reminds us that we can pass that test. The Tuskegee Airmen knew the principles of the United States—liberty and justice for all—though not fully achieved, were worth fighting for at home and abroad.

Because of their courage, along with the leadership of our government, their focus on the core mission of the U.S. military to defend us in war led to the defeat of fascism in Europe, but it also changed our troops. The Tuskegee Airmen's heroism challenged the conscience of the Armed Forces and the country. They paved the way for a transformation.

The U.S. military today is the largest, most diverse engine of social mobility in this country. The U.S. military is the most successful civil rights program in the history of the world.

The fact is, American soldiers from all backgrounds are now promoted on the basis of their character, commitment, ability, and courage. The treatment dreamed of by the Tuskegee Airmen has become a reality.

That is why it is so mystifying, even disturbing, to see the current diversity, equity, and inclusion initiatives. If you look at the policies of the Department of Defense, you would be forgiven for thinking our forces are today under a cloud of segregation and extremism.

The truth is, the military now represents the best of our society and has consistently advanced the cause of equal rights. Even before the rest of the country was ready to take that pivotal step, the military took that step.

Now, as Commander in Chief, President Biden still has the most important job that the Commander in Chief has ever had, and that is leading our military in defense of the United States. But his administration is making that job harder every day by focusing on leftwing social issues.

In the wake of a disastrous retreat from Afghanistan and increasingly hostile behavior from China and Russia,

the President should be prioritizing military readiness. Instead, he has decided, inexplicably, to spend his first 2 years in office focusing on something else—on shaping the Department of Defense into an institution that is spearheading toxic social policies instead of focusing on military strength. This agenda has harmed military readiness and alienated a large portion of potential military recruits.

The ideas propagandized by the bureaucrats and so-called diversity officers within our military are painting a false picture of reality. In addition, they clearly run afoul of America's founding principles and our country's dedication to the proposition that all men are created equal.

The mission of the U.S. military is to deter real wars and win them if necessary, not to wage culture wars within the ranks. But there are numerous examples of how this administration has made it a top priority to push progressive social policies on the military, and it is undermining the effectiveness of our national defense.

Within the first 6 months of the Biden administration, Pentagon civilian leadership demanded the creation of a powerful new diversity, equity, and inclusion bureaucracy focused on everything but readiness.

Right before the 2022 midterms, the Secretary of Defense released a memo warning, with no evidence whatsoever, that the recent Supreme Court decision on abortion would negatively impact readiness and recruiting, with no evidence whatsoever that this was true. Every dollar we spend on defense should have a clear connection to advancing military effectiveness and lethality.

My colleague Senator JONI ERNST, herself a veteran, has been especially clear-eyed on this topic, proposing legislation blocking the use of taxpayer dollars to fund specious efforts related to abortion at the Department of Defense. I agree, and I am glad to join her in this effort.

The Senate Armed Services Committee has a duty to conduct careful oversight and analysis of the Department of Defense.

Today's woke social issue agenda does not improve military effectiveness or lethality. That is why my colleague Senator TOM COTTON and House Member DAN BISHOP are introducing new legislation to stop the use of critical race theory in the Department of Defense, including in our service academies.

It will take strong support for efforts like these to root out toxic ideas, but we must begin to do it now. Misguided efforts from bureaucrats and political appointees alike to inject domestic social issues into defense policy will harm our military's ability to perform its mission.

It pains me to say this, but public confidence in our services is low and shrinking. The Reagan Institute reports that fewer than half of Ameri-

cans have trust in the military, down from over 70 percent a few years ago.

Largely because of the President's decision to advance his liberal ideology on our armed services, the military now faces the biggest challenge to recruiting in the history of the modern All-Volunteer Force. By the end of this year, the Army will likely be more than 30,000 soldiers smaller today than it was the day President Biden took the oath of office. The Navy is actively recruiting thousands of people who are normally barred from military service because the Navy recruiters cannot find enough qualified recruits to man our growing fleet.

Recruiting is an essential element of military readiness. Hardware is important, to be sure, but if our best and brightest are discouraged from putting on a uniform, we cannot hope to field a ready force.

Addressing this problem starts with addressing how we shape our future leaders. Our four military service academies share a commitment to excellence and boast an impressive track record of molding the officers who will lead the branches of our Armed Forces. I am delighted to help so many young Mississippians gain admission to our academies. But, sadly, over recent years, even our academies have not been immune to the same spread of toxic race- and gender-infused agenda that has inflamed so many college campuses across the Nation.

Across the service academies, students can now find indoctrination courses on, and I quote, "the social and physical constructs of race, gender, and ethnicity in the context of social inequality in America." At every service academy, one can now find diversity, equity, and inclusion programming listed for students. The examples of what this does to the military would be laughable if they weren't so dangerous. This past September, the Air Force Academy actually instructed cadets that the words "mom" and "dad" might not be inclusive enough. In a less amusing part of the same briefing, cadets were told to avoid the word "colorblind." This is happening at our Nation's elite service academies, not at the faculty lounge at Berkeley, and it is ridiculous.

Many raise concerns about extremism at the military. Yet, after a military-wide shutdown to focus on extremism in the ranks, we found out that fewer than 100—fewer than 100—persons out of a military of 1.2 million Active-Duty servicemembers had engaged in extremist activity.

General Milley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, later revealed that between the shutdown and new "diversity, equity, and inclusion" training requirements levied by the Biden administration, the Department of Defense has spent nearly 5.9 million man-hours on the issue of extremism. That represents over 64,000 hours for each confirmed case of extremism last year.

To the extent there is extremism in the military—and it is rare—it is a problem we can work together on a bipartisan basis to solve, as Senator DAN SULLIVAN has repeatedly discussed, and I appreciate his leadership. But again I say it is extremely rare in the U.S. military.

In fact, many of the attempts to root out extremism have unintended consequences, including convincing potential recruits that they are not welcome in the military. These efforts have also punished Americans with earnest and deeply held beliefs—people who share the same beliefs as I do, people who want to serve in the military.

For example, as part of the “extremism stand down day,” the Navy issued training materials to sailors stating explicitly that conservative views of “marriage, abortion, and LGBTQ rights” are “not considered mainstream”—“not considered mainstream.” The U.S. Navy should not sideline traditional religious and moral views by declaring them out of step with the times.

Let me be clear. I hold sincere convictions about the sanctity of life. I may be in the majority in some States, and I may be in the minority in others, but I am entitled to my views, and our Department of Defense has no business characterizing them as outside the mainstream.

One thing that is not mainstream is the Pentagon’s unrelenting focus on diversity, equity, and inclusion over the past 2 years. The U.S. military is the largest and most diverse public institution in the country. For decades, it has been an engine of economic and social mobility and a place for Americans of all stripes to come together in support of a common mission. From the youngest private to the most senior general, our military is composed of Americans from every possible background you can imagine. We should celebrate that fact.

Sadly, this is not the operating mentality of the leadership at today’s Pentagon. The Department of Defense’s new Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility Strategic Plan aims to, and I quote, “ensure equitable career progression” for military personnel by eliminating promotion and retention barriers.

By adding “equity” rather than “equal opportunity” to the military promotion process, the Biden administration is judging the selection of military leaders not on the content of their character but on whether an individual happens to be a member of one demographic group for another. Simply put, this amounts to quotas over merit.

This equity approach to promotions and assignments takes a sledgehammer to the foundation of the military, and, worse, it creates divisions that put our men and women in uniform at risk. It pits them against each other based on factors they cannot control.

More than any other public institution, our military represents the broad-

est picture of American society. That is as it should be. It is not “systemic racism,” as one senior member of the Defense Department said. This rhetoric draws the ridicule of our enemies. The Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the agents of the Kremlin have shown no hesitation in ridiculing the language of woke bureaucrats.

Rather than fighting culture wars at the Pentagon, our focus should turn to doing everything in our power to expand the population eligible and qualified for military service. I will partner with any other Member of Congress who wants to achieve this goal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Florida.

CHINA

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, no issue dominates our attention more these days than our growing rivalry with China, and rightly so. It is a historic challenge. It is one that I think we waited way too long to recognize, and now we are scrambling to make up for that.

But I think, in all the attention that is being paid to this, it is important that we remember or at least recognize that the core, the essential issue here is not China, *per se*, by itself; the core issue here is a decades-old, bipartisan consensus that is entrenched in our economics and our politics—a consensus that said that economic globalization would deliver, well, freedom and peace. It was almost a religious faith in the power of the free flow of people and money and goods across borders as the answer to virtually every problem that faced the world. That is how we built our politics. That is how we built our foreign policy.

You know what, for about 50 years after World War II, it generally worked. The reason why it generally worked is because we didn’t actually have a global market. If you look at the economy we were engaged in, if you look at the free trade and the like during that period of time, it was primarily a market made up of democratic allies, of countries that shared common values and common priorities for the future.

Even when the outcomes during that time were not always in our benefit, even when maybe some industry left for a country in Europe or maybe during the time that Japan challenged us in some sectors from Asia, at least the beneficiary—even though it may have harmed us in the short term, the beneficiary of that outcome was not the Soviet bloc, the Soviet Union, or some geopolitical competitor; the beneficiary was another democracy and an ally in our confrontation with communism during that period of time.

The point is, it generally worked during that time because, by and large, the interests of the global market and the interests of our country never got out of balance too far.

Then the Cold War ended, and our leaders—and I say “our leaders” because this was really a bipartisan

thing—our leaders became intoxicated with hubris. I remember the lexicon was, it is the end of history, and the world will now be flatter, and every country is now going to naturally become a free-enterprise democracy, and economic liberalization will always result in political freedom. You flood a country with capitalism, and that country will not just get rich, but they are going to turn into us or some version of one of our democratic allies.

So, in pursuit of that historic gamble, which had no historic precedent, we entered into all kinds of trade deals and treaties and rules and regulations on an international scale, and we invited into that all kinds of countries that, by the way, were not democracies, did not share our values, and did not have the same long-term goals for the world as we do. Their long-term goals, in fact, were incompatible. Of all of the deals that were made, none has had greater impact than the decision that was made in the first year of this century: to admit China into the World Trade Organization.

They opened up our economy to the most populous nation on Earth, controlled by a communist regime. They did it not because anybody argued that it would be good for American workers. Remember, they made the argument that eventually it would be, but they weren’t arguing that this was going to help us in the short term and that this would be good for our industries. The central argument behind doing this with China is that we think capitalism will change them. They are going to eat Big Macs and drink Coca Cola. They are going to literally ingest democracy, and it will transform them. They argued that capitalism was going to change China. Now we stand here 23 years later and realize that capitalism didn’t change China. China changed capitalism.

They opened up their doors and said: Come on in. They attracted industries with cheap labor. They said: We have cheap labor and cheap workers, and it flooded. Millions of American jobs, important industries, and factories flooded into China, and they did it with the promise of luring American investors and American money, which poured into China—all of it with the promise that you could make a lot of money in this huge market very quickly, with huge rates of return, and, obviously, for the companies, lower labor costs and therefore more profits for them.

We lost jobs and factories closed and towns were gutted, but the leaders at that time said: Don’t worry. They are only taking the bad jobs. The jobs that have left are not the good jobs. These bad jobs are going to be replaced by good jobs—better jobs. Americans are going to be able to have those jobs. Those Chinese workers who took your jobs are going to get richer now, and with that money they start to make, they are going to do two things: They are going to start buying American products and they are going to demand

democracy and freedom and they are going to change China.

Well, I don't think I am going to spend a lot of time today explaining that that did not work out. That is not how it played out. China allowed our companies in, but do you know what they did? They forced every one of these companies to partner with a Chinese company—a small one at the time. They forced you to partner with them, and they stole your trade secrets. So they invited them in and learned how to do whatever it was you did. When they no longer needed you, they kicked you out; their company took over. In many cases, they put the company that taught them how to do it or that they stole the secrets from out of business. That is what they did. They used it to build up their own economy, their own companies.

The Chinese middle class also grew at a historic rate, but ours collapsed—an almost inverse effect. The numbers are stunning. If you look at the destruction of these American working-class jobs and the rise of the middle class in China, they happened at the same time and on almost the same scale.

China did get rich—they most certainly got rich—but they didn't use that money to buy our products. They used that money to buy the products that are made in China. They didn't become a democracy either. What was once a poor Chinese Communist Party is now a rich Chinese Communist Party that has tightened its grip on the country and has actually started going around the world to try to export their authoritarian model.

They literally go around telling countries: Democracy cannot solve problems. Our system is so much better at solving problems. We can move quicker. We don't have to have a town-hall meeting before we do everything. We can have strategic 20-year plans. We can solve your problems.

For developing countries around the world, it potentially has some appeal.

The fact is that we are now confronted with the consequences of this historic and catastrophic mistake, and it is important to understand what some of these are. They will be familiar to you because we see them every day. They play out not just on the floor of the Senate, but they play out in our society and in our politics and on television.

First, we are a nation that is bitterly divided. It is easy and lazy to say: Oh, we are divided as Republicans and Democrats or as liberals and conservatives. Frankly, the biggest divisions between Americans are not even ideological per se. They seem to be attitudinal, and, largely, they seem to be along the lines of an affluent class of people who work in jobs and careers and in industries and live in places that have benefited from this rearrangement of a global economy. They do jobs that pay well and that work in a system like this. It is divided against the millions of working people who are

left behind by all of these changes and who live in places that are literally hollowed out—once vibrant communities that have been gutted.

By the way, remember when they would say, “Don't worry. Those people will move somewhere else in the country for those new jobs”? They didn't move because people don't like to leave their communities; they don't like to leave their extended families; they don't like to leave all of the things that they have ever known that have supported them. It didn't work that way. It has left us a country that is addicted. We are addicted to cheap exports from China, and we are dependent on Chinese supply chains for everything—from food to medicine, to advanced technology. We just had a pandemic that reminded us of this.

And what does that mean, these long supply chains being dependent on a geopolitical competitor. It means we are vulnerable—vulnerable to blackmail, vulnerable to coercion.

Do you know what else it left us with? An economy that is highly concentrated and fragile. Our economy is primarily based today on two sectors. What is all the news about? Turn on the financial networks, and you will see what all of the discussion is about. They are primarily two sectors: finance, meaning people who take your money and invest it somewhere else. They don't make anything, but they invest your money. That is fine. It is a legitimate business. But it is finance and Big Tech. Those two industries that are now the pillar of our economy are controlled by just a small number of giant multinational corporations—the same ones that, by the way, outsource their jobs. These multinational corporations have more power than the government. In many cases, they have more power than the government, and they have no loyalty to our people or to our country. Their interest is not the national interest. They are multinationals. In fact, they are owned by shareholders and investment funds from all over the world.

This idea that globalizing our economy would prevent a great power competition between nations was always a delusion. I think the people of Hong Kong and Taiwan and Ukraine can tell you that this idea that free trade always and automatically leads to peace isn't true either.

None of us have ever lived in a world where America was not the most powerful Nation on Earth. I was born into and grew up in a world where two superpowers were faced off in this long, cold, and dangerous Cold War between communism and freedom, between the free world and people who lived enslaved behind an Iron Curtain.

Then I came of age—literally came of age in 1989–1991, 18 to 20 years of age—my first years in college. I came of age, and, suddenly, I watched the Berlin Wall fall, and I saw the Soviet Union collapse. Let me tell you, if you had told me 10 years earlier—or told any-

body—that the Soviet Union was going to vanish off the face of the Earth, that it would be no more, I wouldn't have believed it. It was a time that was truly historic and unprecedented.

Now, three decades later, we find ourselves once again in a rivalry with another great power, and this rivalry is far more dangerous and our rival is far more sophisticated than the Soviet Union ever was. The Soviet Union was never an industrial competitor. The Soviet Union was never a technological competitor. The Soviet Union was a geopolitical and a military competitor. As for the near-peer rival in China that we have now, they have leverage over our economy. They have influence over our society. They have an army of unpaid lobbyists here in Washington—unpaid lobbyists because these are the companies and the individuals who are benefiting from doing business in China. They don't care if, 5 years from now, they won't even be able to work here anymore as they are making so much money off of their investments, their factories, and their engagements there now that they lobby here for free on their behalf.

By the way, this is a rival that has perfected the tactic of using our own media, our own universities, our own investment funds, and our own corporations against us. They have used it against us every day.

With all of this focus on China—look, I have talked as much about China as anybody here, going back 5, 6 years now, but this is not the story of what China has done to us. What China has done is—they saw a system that we created. They took advantage of its benefits, and they didn't live up to its obligations. Do you know why? Because China was trying to build their country. They were making decisions that were in China's national interests, not in the interest of the global economy or some fantasy about how two nations are in business, and if there are McDonald's in both countries, they will never go to war.

This is not the story of what China has done to us. This is the story of what we have done to ourselves because we have allowed this system of globalization to drive our economic policies and our politics, and it remains entrenched. Even now, people who agree that we have to do something about this will tell you: But we can't do that. We can't do that because it will hurt exports. They will put a tariff on some industry or China will kick us out.

None of this is going to matter in 5 or 6 years. They won't need the tariff on farm goods from the United States. They will own the farm. They are already buying up farmland. You won't have to worry about the investment funds not being able to make a return on an investment in 5 years. They won't need their money anymore.

So this system was a disaster, and the result of the system was not global peace and global prosperity. The result

was not a world without walls in which we were all part of one big, happy human family. The reality is that people live in nations, and nations have interests, and, by and large, for almost all of human history, nations have acted in the interests of their nations. Now we see what happens when one side does that and the other does not. The result has been the rise of China and Big Business—the two big winners. All of this is the consolidation of corporate power in the hands of a handful of companies and key industries and the rapid and historic rise of China at our expense.

China is a populous country. They were always going to be a superpower—they were always going to be one—but they did it faster because they did it at our expense. They didn't create these jobs; they moved them. They didn't create these industries; they took them.

We buy solar panels from China. Who invented solar panels? We did.

They lead the world now in battery production for these electric vehicles. We invented it. They make them; they have perfected them; and they now lead in the technology. I can go on and on.

They are building more coal-fired plants than any country on Earth. Today, China has more surplus refining capacity for oil than any nation on the planet.

This era has to end now. It is not about just taking on China; it is about changing the way we think. It is not 2000 anymore. It is not 1999 anymore. This is a different world.

In a series of speeches over the next few weeks, I am going to attempt to outline a coherent alternative moving forward in the hopes that we don't just sit around here all day and try to outdo each other about who is going to ban "this" and who is going to block "that" from going to China. This is about a lot more than just banning "this" and stopping "that." It is about having a coherent approach to a difficult and historic challenge. Look, it is a complicated one, and complicated problems rarely, if ever, have simple solutions.

The simplest way I can describe how I think we should move forward—and I will have to describe it, obviously, in more detail—is that we need to fundamentally realign the assumptions and the ideas behind our economic and foreign policies. We need a new system of global economics where we enter into global trade agreements not with the goal of doing what is good for the global economy but what is good for us. If a trade deal creates American jobs or strengthens a key American industry, we do that deal. If it undermines us, we don't do the deal just because it would be good for the global economy or because, in the free market lab experiment, it is the right thing to do. We don't live in a lab. We are human beings of flesh and blood. We live in the real world.

In economic theory, when a factory leaves and a job is lost, it is just a

number on a spreadsheet. Realize, when a factory leaves and a job is lost, a dad loses his job or a single mom, for example, loses her ability to support her family, and a community is gutted. So we will need to enter into the world of trade agreements. We are not talking about isolationism here, but the criteria for every agreement needs to be, Is it good for our industries and workers or is it bad? It sounds pretty simplistic. I don't know how anyone could disagree that we should not enter into trade agreements that are bad for American workers and bad for key industries.

We also, by the way, need to enter into foreign policy alliances that reward our allies and strengthen those who share our values and our principles. That also, by the way, helps to create American jobs and strengthen American industry, and if it can't be here, then have it strengthen the ability of an ally to be the source of our supplies.

But I will tell you this at the outset: It will not be easy because those who have prospered and flourished under the status quo, they still have a lot of power, and they will use it to protect that status quo. But we have no choice but to change direction because our success or our failure is going to define the 21st century.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I am here to speak about the Congressional Review Act that the Senate and House passed this week on a bipartisan basis and particularly about the President's decision to veto that Congressional Review Act.

Now, protecting Americans' property is what government should do—period; end of story. The American people deserve to know that the property that they invest in for their retirement is going to go to its highest, best use; that the person managing that money is going to make sure they maximize the return so that the couple, the family, the individual investing in that retirement is making the wisest decisions for their future.

Instead, President Biden's new environmental and social governance rule authorizes those who manage that money to prioritize President Biden's political agenda over the long-term financial health of the retirement fund of that fellow American. Think about that. It isn't what is best for their retirement, in their golden years when they are 65, 70, when they have to retire. It is what President Biden wishes to do now as a political agenda. He is

willing to jeopardize the retirement of the 152 million Americans who are planning for their future to fulfill his political goal.

Now, it is easy to speak about 152 million people. Let's bring it down to the young couple. They are 28 years old. They just had their first child. They are feeling responsible. They are feeling like they need to put money aside so that—my gosh, it seems so far away—when they retire, they have taken care of their financial future.

And they read the literature. If the return on my investment is 1 percent more, I have a much better life. If it is 0.5 or 1 percent less, I have not as good of a life because that is the power of compounding. Over that long period of time, that little bit of extra which continues to compound makes the difference sometimes between having to continue to work and the ability to buy the RV, take off west, and to see the Grand Canyon. That is kind of putting a human face upon this. Congress knew that.

When the President said that he was going to endorse this rule—promulgated it, if you will, put it out there—that told the asset managers, "Don't prioritize the best return on the investment; prioritize what we tell you is the better way to invest the dollars for our political goals." Congress voted on a bipartisan basis to end this ESG rule and to stand up for that American worker and that American family who are diligently saving and depend upon the best rate of return to securely retire.

Now, instead of joining Congress and supporting the workers, protecting their retirement, the President announced he will veto the effort. Oh, he doesn't say that he is going to do it to hurt their long-term retirement plans, but that is absolutely what it does. It puts window dressing around it: He is saving the planet. You name this; you name that. He is hurting their retirement plan, and he knows it, but that is of secondary importance to him.

Now, by the way, for Louisiana energy workers, this is more than a betrayal of their retirement. It weaponizes their retirement accounts not just against their future but also against their present. Those energy workers who are helping to produce the natural gas and the oil that is fueling our modern economy, that is helping to send natural gas overseas to Europe so that they can better withstand the financial and the energy pressure exerted by Russia over their economies, they are going to be hurt because this ESG rule will tell these financial institutions not to put as much capital into the development of this essential oil and natural gas for both our economy, for our European allies, and, by the way, for natural gas, in terms of helping to decrease global carbon emissions, and—did I say it—for the retirement accounts of these workers.

It is another effort by Washington, DC, Democrats to dismantle America's

energy economy, which has the byproduct—the very unfortunate byproduct, I suppose—of killing the jobs of millions of Americans.

Those investment managers helping to plan the retirement of these workers should help these workers achieve their best retirement plans. That is not necessarily the goal of the Biden administration. It is not necessarily the goal of academia or the environmental activists. But it is the savers' money; it is not Joe Biden's.

There is still time for the President to rethink his veto threat. The President says he is for supporting workers. Then show it. He says he is for those who do less well in our economy. Then show it. This ESG policy will make things worse for them. Don't veto. Allow it to go through.

Supporting American workers means supporting their jobs now and supporting their retirement savings. I urge him to sign this bill.

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

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

MIFEPRISTONE

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, today, I begin an effort to provide regular updates to the Senate and the country about the devastating consequences for women in every State if Texas Judge Kacsmaryk issues a ruling banning mifepristone nationwide.

Two weeks ago, I stood on the Senate floor and laid out what has to happen if and when this decision comes down. President Biden and the Food and Drug Administration must ignore it. The Food and Drug Administration has the authority it needs to keep this medication on the market without interruption, regardless of what this ruling says.

I have already laid out the rationale for why the case is absurd, meritless, and lacks any legal standing, as well as the FDA's legal authority to ignore such a ruling.

Today, I am not going to rehash those important points. I want to discuss what I have heard over the last couple of weeks about the human cost if every woman in this country loses access to mifepristone. Republicans on the Supreme Court said that the issue of abortion ought to be returned to the States, that the country shouldn't have a "one size fits all" policy on this subject that is so essential to protecting the privacy rights of women in our country.

I am going to talk about the States for a minute or two.

My home State of Oregon has some of the strongest protections for reproductive health in the Nation. Abortion is legal. If you have health insurance, it

is required to cover this critical priority. If you don't, you can still access care. There are no waiting periods. You can get abortion medication via telemedicine and by mail, something that is crucial in large States and small States with very large rural populations, like mine. In fact, despite the dangerous Dobbs decision, access to reproductive care has been expanding in Oregon, partially to accommodate women traveling from nearby States whose own home State laws deny them this critical right to privacy.

Oregon has leaders like Governor Tina Kotek and Attorney General Ellen Rosenblum fighting to keep mifepristone legal and accessible to women in our State. I am proud to come from a State where the law reflects the fact that a woman's right to privacy is paramount and a woman's right to choose is hers and hers alone.

But if the plaintiffs and the anti-abortion activists prevail in that case in Texas, everything changes—everything changes—for the people facing important reproductive decisions every day and everywhere in the United States. We are talking about every single State—every one.

Despite strong laws on the books, women in my State of Oregon stand to lose mifepristone, a drug that is used now in more than 50 percent of abortions. So much for the idea of States' rights. All that talk about returning abortion law to the States is just going straight out the window.

I have said it before, and I will repeat it here. So often, the Republican Party often seems concerned about the States' rights only when they think a State is right. Otherwise, they seem happy to take over and tell the States what to do. Well, the people I am honored to represent, Oregonians, don't appreciate that selective application of their philosophy, but here it is.

Because of one judge, handpicked by Donald Trump, in the 16th largest city in Texas, there is serious potential that soon Americans, from one side of the country to the other and everywhere in between, will no longer be able to access the safest, most effective, and most relied on form of abortion care.

This is not leaving decisions to the States, like the U.S. Supreme Court told us would happen back in June.

Look at the Dobbs decision. That was the very foundation of the Dobbs decision. And, no shock to anybody, that is not what is being seen today. Here is what is going to ensue when the reckless decision in Texas comes down. We know that providers are already being stretched very thin. They are harassed and subject to vile threats. They are going to be thrown into a landscape of chaos and confusion.

Over the last few months, I have heard nonstop from these heroic medical professionals in my State. They worry there will be lines out the doors of women needing help. They worry about long wait times for the women

who are fortunate enough to eventually receive in-person care. They worry about the women who will never make it to a doctor's office because they live in a rural county or lack the means to make the journey that will now be necessary to receive abortion care. They worry about what will happen next. When will another judge in another State that looks nothing like Oregon make it so that these providers are not able to treat women seeking to exercise their privacy rights?

This is not some far-fetched slippery slope. It is happening now—now—right in front of our eyes.

Women have relied on mifepristone for more than 20 years. I held the first congressional hearing on this drug in 1990, when I was a Member of the other body. And finally—finally—there has been access to this drug, and it provides freedom to women to make their own private medical decisions and face far less stigma. That fundamental right is potentially about to be further gutted.

This is America. Aren't we for freedom—freedom to determine our own lives and futures, freedom to decide whether and when to have a family?

We have heard lots of horror stories of life before Roe. There are too many people with immense power in this country who tragically want to yank America back to those times. I doubt those people have given a moment's consideration to the danger women face when a pregnancy goes wrong, how their lives can be at risk.

This is about women's health and survival. This is about control over their lives, control over their bodies. It is about depriving Oregonians and women everywhere of their fundamental right to privacy.

I am here to say that, unfortunately, these anti-abortion activists aren't going to stop until abortion in every form and in every State is simply banned. The need to control women's bodies is not going to end at attacking mifepristone, which I would say, as I did earlier, has a long record—a long record—grounded not in political rhetoric but in scientific evidence for being safe and effective.

It will not end with the topic of abortion either. Rightwing extremists are coming after access to reproductive healthcare more broadly. Some lawmakers and their allies have filed legislation and lawsuits to block access to birth control—birth control.

I remember the President of the Senate helping us in this body to champion for so many years those priorities. And now we have legislation to block access to birth control, lifesaving cancer screenings, HIV prevention. The list goes on.

As these attacks go forward, we also know who is going to be hurt the most—people of modest means, people in rural areas, people of color, immigrants, LGBTQ Americans.

I said it 2 weeks ago when I was on the floor to discuss the case, I will say

it again: Enough, enough, enough. No more sitting back and just letting things happen. I don't want to be back here in a few days, but I fear that will be the case.

Let me talk about political change. Ever since the days when I was director at the Gray Panthers, the senior citizens group, I always said political change rarely starts here in Washington, DC, and trickles down. It starts at the grassroots level. What we really need now is a nationwide mobilization to protect a woman's right to privacy and the right to make these choices for herself. What I would like to ask today, for everybody who shares that view, is to go on out there and keep mobilizing. Talk to your city council member, talk to your mayor, talk to your State legislator, talk to anybody who has an election certificate about how important this is to you. Momentum is needed more now than ever to ensure that mifepristone stays legal and accessible.

I will close with this. The FDA, using the authority it already has, needs to keep mifepristone on the market without any interruption, regardless of Judge Kacsmaryk's ruling. And we the people need to mobilize in Oregon, in Michigan, in Florida, and in every nook and cranny of the Nation.

TRIBUTE TO JENNI KATZMAN

Madam President, before I yield the floor, just a note of thanks to Jenni Katzman, who has been in our office and her last day in the Senate, sadly, is today.

She served our office as chief of domestic policy and general counsel for the past 3 years, and she is moving on, always giving public service a good name.

It has been a pleasure to work with her to assist the people of Oregon and our country. During the time she has been with us, she assisted with the confirmation of stellar judges from my State, written legislation to make our judicial system more fair, and provided very valuable counsel to me and my staff.

I want to close, as we wrap up what is going to be an effort on my part to provide regular updates on the consequences of what will happen if this judge in Texas puts in place a nationwide ban—nationwide, every single State. I hope I don't have to come to the floor again and again and again. But I think it is important that people understand, as I have learned in the last couple of weeks, what the human consequences are of going backward here, after the Court said that there wouldn't be a nationwide ban, after they said it repeatedly that it is going to go to the States. It would be a huge mistake for America.

I want to also note that the President of the Senate has been the leader of this cause for many, many years. I admire her greatly for that leadership. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 31.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Robert Stewart Ballou, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 31, Robert Stewart Ballou, of Virginia, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Virginia.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Sheldon Whitehouse, Sherrod Brown, Margaret Wood Hassan, Raphael G. Warnock, Gary C. Peters, Jack Reed, Christopher A. Coons, Brian Schatz, Tina Smith, Ben Ray Lujan, Elizabeth Warren, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Tammy Baldwin, Alex Padilla.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 42.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Andrew G. Schopler, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 42, Andrew G. Schopler, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 43.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Arun Subramanian, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 43, Arun Subramanian, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Jeff Merkley, Jeanne Shaheen, Elizabeth Warren, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Jack Reed, Alex Padilla, Gary

C. Peters, Angus S. King, Jr., Mazie Hirono, Tim Kaine, Brian Schatz, Cory A. Booker, Margaret Wood Hassan.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 45.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Patrice H. Kunesh, of Minnesota, to be Commissioner of the Administration for Native Americans, Department of Health and Human Services.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 45, Patrice H. Kunesh, of Minnesota, to be Commissioner of the Administration for Native Americans, Department of Health and Human Services.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, March 2, be waived.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 37, confirmation of the nomination of Colleen Lawless to be U.S. District Judge for the Central District of Illinois. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted yea.

I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 38, motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Gordon P. Gallagher to be a U.S. District Judge for the District of Colorado. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted yea.

I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 39, Confirmation of the nomination of Jonathan James Grey to be a U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted yea.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

CONFIRMATION OF COLLEEN R. LAWLESS

• Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today, the Senate voted to confirm Colleen Lawless to a seat on the U.S. District Court for the Central District of Illinois in my hometown of Springfield.

Born in Joliet, IL, Judge Lawless received her bachelor's degree from Illinois Wesleyan University and her J.D. from Northern Illinois University College of Law. After graduating from law school, Judge Lawless joined the Springfield, IL, firm Londrigan, Potter & Randle P.C., where she represented plaintiffs and defendants in State and Federal courts, including the court to which she has now been nominated. In this role, she handled matters ranging from employment discrimination to medical malpractice to family law and tried four cases to verdict before a jury.

In 2019, the judges of Illinois' Seventh Judicial Circuit appointed Judge Lawless to serve as an associate circuit judge, and she is currently assigned to the domestic relations division. Since her appointment to the bench, Judge Lawless has presided over 125 domestic relations bench trials and many more proceedings implicating mental health commitments, small claims, evictions, and emergency protection orders. Notably, she has never been reversed or significantly criticized by a reviewing court.

Judge Lawless received a rating of "well qualified" from the ABA and a bipartisan vote in committee. She was also highly recommended by a judicial screening committee that Senator DUCKWORTH and I established to consider judicial candidates for the Central District of Illinois.

Judge Lawless will fill the Springfield-based seat that has been occupied over the past decade by Judge Sue Myerscough. I want to thank Judge Myerscough for her outstanding service

to the people of the central Illinois. She leaves big shoes to fill, but I am confident that Judge Lawless is more than up to the task. Given her significant trial experience and deep knowledge of the Central District, Senator DUCKWORTH and I strongly support Judge Lawless. I was glad to see her confirmed.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

CONFIRMATION OF JONATHAN JAMES CANADA GREY

• Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today the Senate confirmed Judge Jonathan Grey to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan.

Born in Poplarville, MS, Judge Grey attended Morehouse College and the Georgetown University Law Center before serving as a law clerk to both Judge Damon J. Keith of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit and Judge W. Louis Sands of the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Georgia. He then began his career in private practice as an associate at Seyfarth Shaw, LLC, a role in which he focused on labor and employment matters in Federal, State, and local courts, as well as before administrative agencies. As an Assistant United States Attorney for both the Southern District of Ohio and the Eastern District of Michigan, Judge Grey briefed and argued dozens of dispositive and nondispositive motions and also led several substantial investigations in cases that spanned multiple States and countries. In 2021, Judge Grey was appointed to serve as a magistrate judge for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, where he has written opinions in approximately 40 cases.

The American Bar Association rated Judge Grey as unanimously "well qualified," and he enjoys the strong support of Senators STABENOW and PETERS. Judge Grey's experience as both a litigator and a jurist in the Eastern District of Michigan demonstrates his deep knowledge of the district to which he has been nominated to serve, and he will make an outstanding addition to the Federal bench. I was glad to see him confirmed.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF "ARKANSAS WEEK"

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise today to celebrate the 40th anniversary of "Arkansas Week," the flagship public affairs program of Arkansas PBS.

Since its first broadcast in 1983, "Arkansas Week" has delivered consistent and reliable in-depth news and analysis of events in Little Rock and throughout our State to the Nation's Capital and beyond, as well as robust coverage of policies that impact all Arkansans.

In a recent column recognizing this milestone, long-time host Steve Barnes explained the focus of the program has always been the matters that matter. There is no doubt the discussions featured on this program have encouraged Arkansans to advocate for change, influenced policies and procedures at all levels of government and brought attention to undercovered issues.

Arkansans have had a front-row seat to the evolving political climate of the last four decades as a result of “Arkansas Week.” We have seen a lot of changes and the voices on this show have provided valuable insight. The “Arkansas Week” roundtable panel is a signature segment of the show that has brought together the best and brightest journalists and experts in the State to deliver unique perspectives in a manner that expands on the stories covered in print and allows for a broader discussion beyond the headlines. I have been honored to join this mainstay numerous times and talk with Steve as well as other hosts and guests to contribute to Arkansans’ awareness of the issues and events that directly affect them.

Throughout the years, “Arkansas Week” has brought together people from across the political spectrum to share their thoughts. The program has always fostered an atmosphere where its acceptable to disagree without being disagreeable, a feature truly appreciated by the viewers and guests alike. It is even more important at a time when polarization is too common.

As we celebrate its storied history of delivering information to citizens in all corners of our State, I applaud the dedication of Steve Barnes and the men and women who work tirelessly each week to create “Arkansas Week.” Our State is grateful to all those who have been part of this program over the past four decades on being a reliable, informative source for news.●

RECOGNIZING JILL’S HOMESTEAD

● Ms. ERNST. Madam President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Iowa small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week it is my privilege to recognize Jill’s Homestead of Chariton, IA, as the Senate Small Business of the Week for the week of March 6, 2023.

Jill’s Homestead is an example of the American entrepreneurial spirit at its finest. Before starting her own business, Jill Godby had a longstanding passion for leather crafting, and she had a special knack for creating trendy leather earrings that she often wore herself. Over time, her hobby grew as friends and family wanted their own leather earrings. Prompted by the demand from her family and friends, in 2018 Jill started to list some of her earrings on Facebook; shortly thereafter, interest in her products took off,

and her hobby turned into a side hustle. Given her products’ popularity online, Jill started to sell her earrings at local farmer’s markets and at any trade shows she could find. Eventually, her hobby-turned-side-hustle led her to quit her day job and turn her passion into a small business. However, Jill did not foresee the once-in-a-generation pandemic that was right around the corner. When disaster struck and businesses were forced to close, Jill refused to become discouraged. She doubled down on her products and ideas and worked long nights to grow the business. Today, that hard work has paid off; Jill has been able to scale up the company to employ a small, all-female, workshop crew. Furthermore, she now has her own workshop to make her leather goods on the town square in Chariton.

In a world that emphasizes the mass production of goods, Jill’s Homestead wants to craft products built to last a lifetime. They work to achieve this goal through using high-quality leather, experienced craftswomen, and an online shop to find customers that share their mutual values of sustainability, self-sufficiency, and natural living. Each member of her team of seven craftswomen are dedicated to creating the highest quality product possible. The business primarily sells their products online on their website created through the ecommerce platform Shopify. Additionally, they open their workshop once a month as they pride themselves on providing great customer service and thus want to form and maintain genuine connections with their customers in person. In fact, their commitment to customer relations is what initially grew the company, with Jill hosting weekly auctions on Wednesday nights of her products through Facebook Live. Jill’s Homestead has grown from only selling earrings to now offering luxury handbags, accessories, and home goods inspired by the lifestyle of rural Iowa.

As a small business, Jill’s Homestead recognizes the need to give back to the Chariton community. They are part of the Chariton Area Chamber/Main Street which is committed to revitalizing the community through economic and cultural endeavors. Through the chamber, Jill’s Homestead was able to give a significant donation to the Chariton Downtown Square Sidewalk Project in order to restore the historic town square. Additionally, the small business is very generous in offering their products to be used as prizes for fundraisers. Jill’s Homestead donated close to 10 items for the Hops for Hospice raffle fundraiser; the money raised went to an assistance fund to provide hospice care for those who cannot cover the cost. Additionally, they recently contributed a number of their handbags for the Designer Bag Bingo night fundraiser, the proceeds of which benefit the volunteer services at Lucas County Health Center which provides free and low-cost services to the community.

As a small business that will soon turn 6 years old, Jill’s Homestead has been able to achieve massive success, despite extraordinary challenges. Even after she faced unprecedented challenges at the very start of her business, Jill refused to give up hope and shifted her business to online selling. Through perseverance and grit, Jill grew her business during an uncertain economy, and her hard work has more than paid off. Not only has Jill achieved impressive growth, her business has been featured on Iowa news segments, and Jill was invited to our Nation’s Capital to tell her story and discuss the issues facing women business owners. Since the beginning of their operation, Jill’s Homestead has been motivated to offer the highest quality leather goods to their customers and consistently serve them with “Iowa Nice” customer service. I want to congratulate Jill Godby and the entire team at Jill’s Homestead and commend them for their continued commitment to excellence in their work both locally in Iowa and throughout the world. I look forward to seeing their continued growth and success in Iowa.●

RECOGNIZING PSC DISTRIBUTION

● Ms. ERNST. Madam President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Iowa small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week it is my privilege to recognize PSC Distribution of Iowa City, IA, as the Senate Small Business of the Week for the week of February 27, 2023.

The story behind the origin of PSC Distribution is one of hard work and knowing an opportunity when you see one. Jim Nesmith was born and raised in Jasper County in the early 1900s. Wanting to give back to his community, he became the State senator for Jasper County in the 1940s. During this time, he also became a salesman for A.Y. McDonald, a wholesale distributor of plumbing pumps and waterworks based in Des Moines. Both of these jobs exposed him to greater Iowa, outside of his native Jasper County. Jim recognized that there was a great opportunity for growth in Iowa City with the expansion of the University of Iowa, so he decided to take a chance and open his own wholesale plumbing distributorship on May 1, 1951.

For the past 70 years, PSC Distribution has been supplying eastern Iowa residents and businesses with the materials they need to excel in the plumbing industry. Currently under the fourth generation of family ownership, cousins Tom Balmer and Jennie Wunderlich, along with her husband Ben Wunderlich, continue to grow and guide the company with innovation and excellence. In 2010, the PSC plumbing showroom expanded and rebranded into a luxury showroom named Studio

H2O which emphasizes quality customer service and building a relationship of trust with each customer. Today, PSC Distribution prides itself as a family owned and operated whole-sale plumbing business services offering everything from heating controls and systems, air conditioning, geothermal systems, to water heaters, plumbing fittings, pipes, valves, and kitchen sinks.

PSC Distribution has always prioritized giving back to their community and employees. They actively support the Ronald McDonald House, the Iowa City Community School District Foundation, Table to Table, the Optimist Service Club, the Rotary Club, and are recognized as one of the original investors in Iowa City Area Development. Additionally, many of its employees have worked there for more than 20 years, with some working there for more than 40 years. Regardless of an employee's tenure at the company, whether it brief or long, PSC Distribution celebrates different work anniversaries by posting a tribute on social media to an employee they appreciate. They also take the time to honor veteran customers and employees with tribute posts thanking them for their service. Furthermore, PSC Distribution hosts community events in their showroom such as pampering nights for women in the industry and builders' and electricians' events to forge a strong community and inspire others to join the industry.

Through never compromising their commitment to being trustworthy, customer-focused, and growth-oriented, PSC Distribution has been able to thrive for decades. It has won a number of awards throughout the years, including the Roots Award in 2011, which was awarded by the Iowa City Chamber of Commerce to highlight their role as an anchor business of the Iowa City area for over 60 years and for exemplifying the importance of successful relationships between small businesses and the communities they serve. They also won the National Single-branch ICP Distributor of the Year in 2012, awarded by International Comfort Products, a leading manufacturer of HVAC equipment. In 2022, Studio H2O was honored to be named the 2022 Showroom of the Year by Wholesaler Magazine, an industry magazine which reaches 100,000 professional engineers, distributors, and contractors. It gives me great joy to see this family business receive their rightful recognition from industry experts and from their community at large. I want to congratulate the entire team at PSC Distribution for their continued commitment to loyally serving the needs of Iowans. I look forward to seeing their continued growth and success in Iowa.●

TRIBUTE TO JACK L. RIVES

● Mr. GRAHAM. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to an incredible legal professional and public serv-

ant—Jack L. Rives, who is stepping down from his position as executive director of the American Bar Association after almost 13 years. While Jack's strategic vision and caring leadership will be missed, he leaves behind a legacy of exceptional public service and commitment to protecting the rule of law and increasing access to justice.

The ABA is the largest voluntary association of lawyers and legal professionals in the world. Jack began his service as its executive director on Law Day—May 1—2010. He has been responsible for developing and implementing the association's strategic goals and programs and policy initiatives adopted by the ABA's board of governors and house of delegates.

Jack has also overseen the ABA's more than 1,050 talented employees working at its headquarters in Illinois, at its Washington, DC, office, and at program sites in California, Texas, and about 60 countries throughout the world. During the pandemic, he took great care of the ABA staff by strategically managing the challenges associated with moving to a fully remote environment and then back into the various offices with a hybrid workforce, all while maintaining high employee morale and avoiding any pandemic-related layoffs.

During Jack's tenure, the ABA has significantly expanded its domestic and international grant programs, thereby also expanding the incredible impact they have in helping people and justice systems globally.

For example, the ABA's Free Legal Answers platform—launched in 2016 as the first and only national pro bono legal advice portal—has now expanded to 41 jurisdictions, with over 11,000 pro bono attorneys registered to respond to the more than 250,000 civil legal questions posted by low-income Americans, especially in the wake of recent crises caused by the pandemic, natural disasters, and rising inflation.

ABA leaders, members, and State bar colleagues meet with their elected officials in Washington, DC, at least annually to advocate for important issues like funding the Legal Services Corporation, enhancing the judicial security for our Federal judges, and preserving the public service loan forgiveness program—a critical program that inspires lawyers to work in eligible public service positions for at least 10 years, often in rural communities, so more Americans have access to the legal help they need, where they need it—especially during the height of the COVID-19 pandemic when so many faced unexpected challenges.

In the international arena, Jack helped reorganize the ABA's primary international development, human rights, and United Nations entities into one cohesive Center for Global Programs. Under his leadership, the Center has grown its international portfolio to encompass more than 100 democracy, human rights, and governance programs in 60 countries. It has

also significantly expanded its impact through high-profile programs like Justice Defenders and Trial Watch, a partnership with the George and Amal Clooney Foundation that focuses on monitoring trials of at-risk human rights defenders.

Jack is a role model for legal professionals at all stages of their professional careers, always making time to meet with the many lawyers, law students, and interns who seek his advice. The ABA President recognized Jack's dedication and impact recently by saying that upon his departure, Jack will leave the ABA positioned to provide unparalleled service to lawyers worldwide and to advance the rule of law in the U.S. and globally. Jack's staff tell me they will miss his caring leadership and support, as well as his frequent communications on what was happening in the organization, his accessibility, and his willingness to answer all questions. I am not surprised by the amazing impact Jack has had at the ABA because I had the privilege to serve with him in the U.S. Air Force for decades, and I saw firsthand the extraordinary leadership, management, and people skills he had at the most senior levels of the military.

Jack was born in Georgia and received both his bachelor of arts in political science and his law degree from the University of Georgia. To this day, he remains a loyal and avid fan of his Georgia Bulldogs. Following graduation from law school, Jack began his 33-year career in the Air Force as a judge advocate. He served as the Judge Advocate General of the U.S. Air Force, the senior U.S. Air Force attorney, and was the first military attorney to attain the three-star rank of lieutenant general. Jack led about 4,600 military and civilian lawyers and legal professionals worldwide. Among his many military awards and decorations are the Distinguished Service Medal with oakleaf cluster and the Defense Superior Service Medal.

The American Bar Association and our entire Nation have been lucky to have had a champion for the rule of law like Jack Rives. He has not only been successful throughout his impressive career, but also has had a significant impact on people's lives, many of whom he will never meet. I feel fortunate to have crossed paths with Jack over the decades, both in his civilian and military leadership roles, and I wish him and his wife Marie both happiness and success in this next chapter of their lives. I also thank Jack for his years of service and his selfless commitment to improving the rule of law and our profession.●

REMEMBERING DAN CAMILLIERE

● Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I rise today to honor the memory of Mr. Dan Camilliere, who passed away earlier this year. Dan was a beloved husband, father, grandfather, pharmacist, State senator, and mayor who spent his

life dedicated to improving his beloved communities of Wethersfield and Hartford.

Born in Hartford in 1922, Dan spent his childhood there, attending Hartford Public schools, and graduating from the University of Connecticut College of Pharmacy in 1943. Shortly after his graduation, Dan enlisted in the U.S. Army. He was deployed to Paris, France, to the 217th General Hospital where he served on a medical train that carried wounded soldiers from Germany to France. After his service in World War II, Dan was honorably discharged in 1946 and returned to Hartford to continue serving those within his community as a pharmacist.

Upon his return to Hartford, he met his wife Rose DiSilvestro. After a short courtship, Dan and Rose would go on to marry, forming a lifelong bond that would continue for 66 loving years and would see them raise their daughter and son. Wherever he lived, Dan made a lasting impression. He was always immaculately dressed even when mowing the lawn, had a knack for building positive relationships with people from all walks of life, and was a great conversationalist.

In 1948, Dan and his brother-in-law opened their own pharmacy in Hartford, Rialto Pharmacy. Besides providing his knowledge and expertise to the public, Rialto Pharmacy turned into a hub for the area's Italian immigrants. Dan helped explain what each medication was and provided flexible payment plans for any immigrants that needed it. Dan's work in retail led him to pursue a second passion: retail politics. Dan was tapped by the Hartford powerbrokers to run for the city council. He was elected and became the youngest person to hold the seat at the time. This began Dan's long career in service to the community which would continue until his final days.

As a public servant, Dan was truly exceptional. After ably serving on the Hartford City Council, Dan was elected to the State senate, becoming public health chair where he championed the fluoridation of drinking water and screenings for newborns. He later became chief of the drug division for the State of Connecticut's Department of Consumer Protection.

The Camillieres moved to Wethersfield in 1970 where Dan and Rose raised their family. After Dan sold the pharmacy, he ran for the Wethersfield Town Council, serving as secretary for 17 years and, later, proudly served for two terms as mayor. Dan's trademark smile presided over town meetings on building new schools, repairing old buildings, and setting water rates. He was a regular sight at town Memorial Day parades and was a mentor to many in politics, serving on the Democratic State Central Committee.

I count myself as very lucky to have met Dan during my formative years in politics. I was probably only 16 when I first shook his hand, and I remember

with perfect clarity being put in charge of campaign lawn sign distribution as a 17-year-old volunteer for the Wethersfield Democrats. It was in that job where I discovered that no one had more friends—and more prime front lawn sites—in Wethersfield than Dan Camilliere. He treated me wonderfully during those early years. To me, he was the model American man—invested in his community, putting service over self, modeling responsible entrepreneurship. I think I decided to go into politics as a profession because of the example Dan Camilliere set in my hometown.

In reflection of the loss of a decorated public servant, veteran, husband, father, grandfather, and advocate for the communities of Hartford and Wethersfield, CT, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing and honoring the life of Dan Camilliere. ●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Kelly, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:34 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 347. An act to require the Executive Office of the President to provide an inflation estimate with respect to Executive orders with a significant effect on the annual gross budget, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 347. An act to require the Executive Office of the President to provide an inflation estimate with respect to Executive orders with a significant effect on the annual gross budget, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WYDEN for the Committee on Finance.

*Daniel I. Werfel, of the District of Columbia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue for the term expiring November 12, 2027.

*Brent Neiman, of Illinois, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury.

*Rebecca Lee Haffajee, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 620. A bill to provide for the distribution of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues to the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 621. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to clarify propane storage as an eligible use for funds provided under the storage facility loan program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 622. A bill to improve services provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs for veteran families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 623. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to exclude certain payments to aged, blind, or disabled Alaska Natives or descendants of Alaska Natives from being used to determine eligibility for certain programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. LEE, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. MULLIN):

S. 624. A bill to amend title X of the Public Health Service Act to prohibit family planning grants from being awarded to any entity that performs abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 625. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and reform rules relating to investigations and whistleblowers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 626. A bill to recommend that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation test the effect of a dementia care management model, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 627. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to limit the face value of coins;

to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. KELLY):

S. 628. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of direct primary care service arrangements as medical care, to provide that such arrangements do not disqualify deductible health savings account contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 629. A bill to provide the President with authority to enter into a comprehensive trade agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KING, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 630. A bill to establish a democracy advancement and innovation program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 631. A bill to protect the privacy of personally-identifiable health and location data, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 632. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives to establish an administrative relief process for individuals whose applications for transfer and registration of a firearm were denied, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 633. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Everett Alvarez, Jr., in recognition of his service to the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

S. 634. A bill to develop and disseminate a civic education curriculum and oral history resources regarding certain political ideologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. VANCE):

S. 635. A bill to protect children from medical malpractice in the form of gender transition procedures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 636. A bill to establish the Dolores River National Conservation Area and the Dolores River Special Management Area in the State of Colorado, to protect private water rights in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 637. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to apply child labor laws to independent contractors, increase

penalties for child labor law violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. SMITH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 638. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1934 to require country-by-country reporting; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. CANTWELL, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 639. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the historic rehabilitation tax credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 640. A bill to suspend the enforcement of certain civil liabilities of Federal employees and contractors during a lapse in appropriations, or during a breach of the statutory debt limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. RICKETTS, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 641. A bill to terminate the requirement imposed by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for proof of COVID-19 vaccination for foreign travelers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. WICKER):

S. 642. A bill to facilitate the development of treatments for cancers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 643. A bill to amend the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to modernize the farmers' market nutrition program under the special supplemental nutrition program for women, infants, and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 644. A bill to expand the take-home prescribing of methadone through pharmacies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. BROWN, Mr. HAWLEY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. OSSOFF, Ms. ERNST, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 645. A bill to require the Attorney General to propose a program for making treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder available to public safety officers, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 646. A bill to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to establish a Hydrogen Technologies for Heavy Industry Demonstration Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr.

HICKENLOOPER, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 647. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program to support the use of hydrogen- or ammonia-fueled equipment at ports and to require the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to conduct a study, together with the Secretary of Energy and the Secretary of Transportation, regarding the feasibility and safety of using hydrogen and ammonia as fuels in maritime applications; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 648. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, to establish a grant program to demonstrate the performance and reliability of heavy-duty fuel cell vehicles that use hydrogen as a fuel source, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 649. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a hydrogen infrastructure finance and innovation pilot program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ROUNDS:

S. 650. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to extend the authority of the Federal Communications Commission to grant a license or construction permit through a system of competitive bidding; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself and Mr. VANCE):

S. 651. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Inspector General for Ukraine Assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MARSHALL, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. LUMMIS, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WICKER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 652. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MARSHALL, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 653. A bill to lift the trade embargo to Cuba; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. COONS, and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. Res. 91. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the value of a tax agreement with Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 92. A resolution expressing concern that illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing threatens security, prosperity, and biodiversity in Latin America and the Caribbean and facilitates human trafficking, including forced labor, and other inhumane and criminal practices in the region; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. Res. 93. A resolution providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 106

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 106, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to States to improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 124

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 124, a bill to increase the rates of pay under the statutory pay systems and for prevailing rate employees by 8.7 percent, and for other purposes.

S. 156

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 156, a bill to expand the use of E-Verify to hold employers accountable, and for other purposes.

S. 176

At the request of Mr. KING, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 176, a bill to amend the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 to extend and expand the Market Access Program and the Foreign Market Development Cooperator Program.

S. 230

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 230, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to support rural residency training funding that is equitable for all States, and for other purposes.

S. 316

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 316, a bill to repeal the authorizations for use of military force against Iraq.

S. 427

At the request of Mr. TUBERVILLE, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 427, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Labor from constraining the range or type of investments that may be offered to partici-

pants and beneficiaries of individual retirement accounts who exercise control over the assets in such accounts.

S. 444

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 444, a bill to require any convention, agreement, or other international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response reached by the World Health Assembly to be subject to Senate ratification.

S. 448

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 448, a bill to codify the existing Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Program of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 453

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the names of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 453, a bill to prohibit the implementation of new requirements to report bank account deposits and withdrawals.

S. 497

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 497, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to exclude a basic allowance for housing from income for purposes of eligibility for the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

S. 537

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) and the

Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 537, a bill to preserve open competition and Federal Government neutrality towards the labor relations of Federal Government contractors on Federal and federally funded construction projects, and for other purposes.

S. 558

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 558, a bill to codify Executive Order 13950 (relating to combatting race and sex stereotyping), and for other purposes.

S. 582

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 582, a bill to make daylight saving time permanent, and for other purposes.

S. 597

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 597, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 613

At the request of Mr. TUBERVILLE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to provide that for purposes of determining compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in athletics, sex shall be recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth.

S. RES. 74

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 74, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of the Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 81

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 81, a resolution relating to the establishment of a means for the Senate to provide advice and consent regarding the form of an international agreement relating to pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 633. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Everett Alvarez, Jr., in recognition of his service to the United States; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise to introduce the Everett Alvarez, Jr., Congressional Gold Medal Act of 2023. This bipartisan legislation would award a Congressional Gold Medal to Everett Alvarez, Jr., in recognition of his service to the Nation.

This legislation would honor Navy Commander Everett Alvarez, Jr., the second longest held POW in American history, with a Congressional Gold Medal.

On August 5, 1964, while flying Operation Pierce Arrow, Commander Alvarez's A-4 Skyhawk was shot down, and he became the first aviator captured in Vietnam. He spent 8 years and 6 months in captivity, becoming the second longest held prisoner of war in U.S. history. While being held in Vietnam, Alvarez crossed paths with the late Senator John McCain, who was also being held as a POW at the Hỏa Lò prison, Hanoi Hilton.

Despite facing torture, isolation, and starvation, he encouraged and inspired fellow POWs to "Return with Honor" by not cooperating with the enemy and remaining loyal to the United States. Following his release and hospitalization, Commander Alvarez resumed his naval service, completing a 20-year career with the Navy and retiring in June 1980.

Our bill would recognize his incredible sacrifice by awarding him with the highest award that Congress can bestow.

This year marks the 50th anniversary of Commander Alvarez's release from captivity in Vietnam. It is time that Congress recognizes the second longest held prisoner of war in American history for his enduring commitment to the United States.

I would like to thank my colead, Senator LUMMIS, for her support to ensure we properly recognize, on a bipartisan basis, the profound impact of Commander Alvarez's service and support for other prisoners of war. I also thank Representatives PANETTA and FALLON for introducing companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact the Everett Alvarez, Jr. Congressional Gold Medal Act as quickly as possible.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 91—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE VALUE OF A TAX AGREEMENT WITH TAIWAN

Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Young, Mr. COONS, and Mr. ROMNEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 91

Whereas Taiwan is a democratic success story, an economic success story, a key part of global technology supply chains, and a close security partner of the United States;

Whereas the United States has pursued a robust unofficial partnership with Taiwan within the context of the current one-China policy of the United States;

Whereas the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.) has played an important role in promoting democracy and prosperity in Taiwan, peace and security in the Taiwan Strait, and close relations between the United States and Taiwan since 1979;

Whereas Taiwan is the eighth-largest trading partner of the United States, United States exports of goods and services to Taiwan support at least 188,000 American jobs, and Taiwan's cumulative investment in the United States is at least \$13,700,000,000;

Whereas the United States has ongoing economic dialogues with Taiwan that cover a range of trade, technology, and investment issues through the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement Council led by the United States Trade Representative, the U.S.-Taiwan Economic Prosperity Partnership Dialogue led by the Department of State, and the Technology, Trade, and Investment Collaboration framework led by the Department of Commerce;

Whereas the Biden Administration announced the "U.S.-Taiwan Initiative on 21st Century Trade" on June 1, 2022;

Whereas the United States has income tax treaties with 66 countries, including the People's Republic of China, and has agreements with other parties, including Taiwan, related to taxation, such as facilitating implementation of the Foreign Account Tax Compliance Act;

Whereas Taiwan is the United States' largest trading partner with whom we do not have an income tax treaty;

Whereas Taiwan has income tax agreements with 34 countries, including countries that have trade agreements with the United States and do not maintain diplomatic relations with Taiwan;

Whereas the United States signed a transportation income tax agreement with Taiwan in 1988, under the auspices of the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and the Coordination Council for North American Affairs, which has since been renamed as the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO);

Whereas an income tax agreement between the United States and Taiwan could boost bilateral trade and investment by reducing double taxation and increasing economic efficiency and integration; and

Whereas the American Chamber of Commerce in Taipei in its "2022 White Paper" called for the United States and Taiwan to continue exploring an income tax agreement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the importance of Taiwan's security and prosperity to the United States' own security and prosperity;

(2) encourages the President to begin negotiations on an income tax agreement with Taiwan;

(3) encourages the President and the House of Representatives to work with the Senate on a congressional-executive agreement to establish an income tax agreement between the United States and Taiwan, consistent with United States commitments under the Taiwan Relations Act (22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.); and

(4) encourages the President to proactively seek other ways to increase trade, technology, and investment ties between the United States and Taiwan.

SENATE RESOLUTION 92—EXPRESSING CONCERN THAT ILLEGAL, UNREGULATED, AND UNREPORTED FISHING THREATENS SECURITY, PROSPERITY, AND BIODIVERSITY IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN AND FACILITATES HUMAN TRAFFICKING, INCLUDING FORCED LABOR, AND OTHER INHUMANE AND CRIMINAL PRACTICES IN THE REGION

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. Kaine) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 92

Whereas illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing (referred to in this preamble as "IUU fishing"), which are defined in paragraphs 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 of the 2001 Food and Agriculture Organization International Plan of Action to Prevent, Deter, and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported, and Unregulated Fishing, includes fishing activities that—

(1) are in violation of applicable national, regional, or international laws, regulations, or obligations;

(2) are not reported or misrepresented to relevant authorities; and

(3) occur in areas or for fishing stocks for which there are no applicable conservation or management measures;

Whereas in 2020, the United States Coast Guard declared that IUU fishing has replaced piracy as the leading global maritime security threat;

Whereas the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime has expressed serious concerns about the fishing industry's vulnerability to several forms of transnational organized crime, including trafficking in persons, money laundering, and smuggling of drugs and weapons, which are often linked to IUU fishing;

Whereas, according to the International Labor Organization's 2022 Global Estimates of Modern Slavery, approximately 128,000 fishers are subjected to forced labor aboard fishing vessels around the world in conditions characterized by extreme isolation, hazardous working and living conditions, and gaps in regulatory oversight, and IUU fishing is closely linked to these and other forms of human trafficking;

Whereas IUU fishing threatens biodiversity and marine ecosystems, increases the risk of food insecurity, and creates unfair competition in the marketplace for lawful seafood industries;

Whereas approximately 600,000,000 people worldwide are partially dependent on fisheries and aquaculture for their lives and livelihoods, and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration reports that IUU fishing deprives law-abiding fishermen and coastal communities of up to \$23,000,000,000 in seafood products annually;

Whereas, according to the United States Government's Global Food Security Strategy, the percentage of stocks fished at biologically unsustainable levels increased from 10 percent in 1974 to 34.2 percent in 2017, with IUU fishing being a key factor affecting the sustainability of fisheries;

Whereas, according to a 2017 report by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations—

(1) IUU fishing off of South America's Southeast Pacific coast and Southwest Atlantic Oceans contributes to the second highest proportions of biologically unsustainable fishing stock levels in the world; and

(2) transformative changes are needed to address growing threats to sustainable fisheries and food security globally;

Whereas large-scale operations of distant-water fishing fleets, particularly such fleets that are provided with billions of dollars in subsidies annually by the People's Republic of China, are primarily responsible for IUU fishing along the Pacific Coast of South America and the Southwest Atlantic Ocean, while small-scale artisanal fleets are primarily responsible for IUU fishing in the Caribbean, Mexico, and Central America;

Whereas Chinese industrial fishing in the South Pacific coast of South America increased 13-fold between 2009 and 2020, contributing to a significant rise in IUU fishing in that region;

Whereas, between July and August 2020, 350 Chinese distant-water fishing vessels disabled required tracking systems and engaged in 73,000 hours of fishing off the exclusive economic zone of the Galapagos archipelago, which is a United Nations World Heritage Site;

Whereas, in November 2020, the Governments of Ecuador, of Chile, of Colombia, and of Peru—

(1) jointly condemned IUU fishing perpetrated by large fleets of foreign vessels; and

(2) pledged to increase cooperation through regulatory bodies, such as the Permanent Commission for the South Pacific;

Whereas the United States, Canada, and 12 countries in Latin America and the Caribbean are parties to the Agreement on Port State Measures to Prevent, Deter, and Eliminate Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing, Agreement, done at Rome November 22, 2009 (commonly known as the "Port State Measures Agreement"), which was facilitated by the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization and entered into force in June 2016, setting standards for the reporting and inspection of fishing activities of foreign-flagged vessels at port;

Whereas governments in Latin America and the Caribbean often lack the capacity to effectively monitor and prosecute IUU fishing, with many countries in the region investing less than 10 percent of their fisheries budgets on monitoring and surveillance;

Whereas regional fisheries management organizations, such as the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization and the Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism, establish conservation and management standards, but face difficulties in enforcing such standards and executing coordinated action to counter IUU fishing;

Whereas Uruguay is seeking to advance the creation of a regional fisheries management organization with Brazil and Argentina to combat IUU fishing in the Southwest Atlantic Ocean, which is the only sea area in the world without a fisheries management government structure;

Whereas the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, which was approved by Congress under section 101(a)(1) of the United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act (19 U.S.C. 4511(a))—

(1) prohibits subsidies for vessels or operators involved in IUU fishing;

(2) requires customs inspections for shipments at ports of entry;

(3) prohibits the importation of goods made by forced labor; and

(4) requires efforts to seek the elimination of forced labor;

Whereas similar provisions related to IUU fishing have not been enshrined in other free trade agreements in North America;

Whereas, at the 12th Ministerial Conference of the World Trade Organization in June 2022, member states reached a multilat-

eral agreement to prohibit certain harmful subsidies for fishing activities that threaten the sustainable use and conservation of marine resources, including subsidies to vessels engaged in IUU fishing;

Whereas, the Maritime SAFE Act (subtitle C of title XXXV of Public Law 116-92) established an interagency working group to develop a 5-year strategic plan to counter IUU fishing, which was released in October 2022, and has identified—

(1) Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Panama, and Peru as Tier I priority regions at risk for IUU fishing; and

(2) the rest of Latin America and the Caribbean as Tier II priority regions at risk for IUU fishing; and

Whereas the United States Government has undertaken several initiatives to counter IUU fishing in Latin America and the Caribbean, including—

(1) conducting joint cooperation exercises in January 2021 involving the United States Southern Command, the United States Coast Guard, and partners in Brazil, Guyana, Portugal, and Uruguay;

(2) certifying countries based on their actions to curb the flow of IUU fishing through the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, including issuing a negative certification in August 2021 for Mexico and a positive certification for Ecuador;

(3) issuing National Security Memorandum 11 on June 27, 2022, which directs Federal executive departments and agencies to coordinate with each other, foreign governments, multilateral organizations, and other public and private stakeholders to combat labor abuses and other crimes associated with IUU fishing;

(4) carrying out the first United States Coast Guard IUU fishing patrol under the auspices of the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Organization, in August 2022 off the exclusive economic zone of the Galapagos archipelago, during which the Coast Guard conducted high seas boardings and inspections of vessels suspected of engaging in IUU fishing;

(5) issuing sanctions on December 9, 2022, against entities based in the People's Republic of China that are implicated in global activities related to IUU fishing, including activities in Latin America and the Caribbean; and

(6) proposing that Chinese flagged vessels suspected of engaging in IUU fishing that refuse to allow on sea boarding and inspection be included in the South Pacific Regional Fisheries Management organization's IUU vessel list: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) underscores the urgency of combating IUU fishing and its associated crimes, including human trafficking, and protecting oceanic biodiversity, the livelihoods of coastal communities, regional licit economies, human rights, and hemispheric security from the People's Republic of China, other extra-regional actors, and transnational criminal organizations engaged in IUU fishing in Latin America and the Caribbean;

(2) calls on the United States Government and governments in Latin America and the Caribbean to incorporate concerns regarding human trafficking and violations of labor rights, when determining whether activities qualify as IUU fishing;

(3) encourages greater coordination among the Governments of Latin America and of the Caribbean to facilitate information sharing and law enforcement responses to IUU fishing, including by acceding to the Port State Measures Agreement, strengthening existing regional fisheries management organizations, and creating a regional fisheries

management organization for the Southwest Atlantic Ocean;

(4) encourages the Office of the United States Trade Representative, in coordination with the Department of State, to consider the implementation of IUU fishing provisions within current and future free trade agreements with countries of Latin America and the Caribbean to enhance accountability over such activities; and

(5) calls on the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development and the heads of other relevant Federal departments and agencies, to counter IUU fishing by—

(A) undertaking public education initiatives in Latin America and the Caribbean to elevate awareness of the harms caused by IUU fishing and its associated crimes;

(B) assisting with the monitoring and dissemination of information regarding the activities of Chinese and other distant-water fishing fleets, and using multilateral fora, including regional fisheries management organizations, to address such concerns;

(C) limiting the importation and consumption of fish and seafood caught by IUU actors, and use the United States' role and influence in global markets to drive change in global seafood supply chains;

(D) using sanctions and visa restriction authorities to hold accountable entities that are credibly suspected of engaging in IUU fishing, including—

(i) distant water fishing fleets from the People's Republic of China;

(ii) other extra-regional actors; and

(iii) transnational criminal organizations; and

(E) utilizing available resources to support and assist the Office of the United States Trade Representative in reaching a final multilateral agreement under the World Trade Organization that—

(i) addresses the use of forced labor on IUU fishing vessels;

(ii) strengthens relevant reporting requirements; and

(iii) addresses harmful subsidies that contribute to fishing fleet overcapacity.

SENATE RESOLUTION 93—PROVIDING FOR MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 93

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the following joint committees of Congress:

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING: Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Padilla, Mrs. Fischer, and Mr. Hagerty.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY: Ms. Klobuchar, Mr. Warner, Mr. Ossoff, Mrs. Fischer, and Mrs. Hyde-Smith.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I have three 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 ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 2, 2023, at 9:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 2, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

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 Thursday, March 2, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Jonathan Hayes, a fellow from Senator DURBIN's office, be granted floor privileges for the duration of the 118th Congress.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 347

Mr. SCHUMER. I understand there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 347) to require the Executive Office of the President to provide an inflation estimate with respect to Executive orders with a significant effect on the annual gross budget, 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

FIGHTING POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER ACT OF 2023

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 645, which is at the desk.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 645) to require the Attorney General to propose a program for making treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder available to public safety officers, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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. 645) was passed as follows:

S. 645

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 "Fighting Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Public safety officers serve their communities with bravery and distinction in order to keep their communities safe.

(2) Public safety officers, including police officers, firefighters, emergency medical technicians, and 911 dispatchers, are on the front lines of dealing with situations that are stressful, graphic, harrowing, and life-threatening.

(3) The work of public safety officers puts them at risk for developing post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder.

(4) It is estimated that 30 percent of public safety officers develop behavioral health conditions at some point in their lifetimes, including depression and post-traumatic stress disorder, in comparison to 20 percent of the general population that develops such conditions.

(5) Victims of post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder are at a higher risk of dying by suicide.

(6) Firefighters have been reported to have higher suicide attempt and ideation rates than the general population.

(7) It is estimated that between 125 and 300 police officers die by suicide every year.

(8) In 2019, pursuant to section 2(b) of the Law Enforcement Mental Health and Wellness Act of 2017 (Public Law 115-113; 131 Stat. 2276), the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice developed a report (referred to in this section as the "LEMHWA report") that expressed that many law enforcement agencies do not have the capacity or local access to the mental health professionals necessary for treating their law enforcement officers.

(9) The LEMHWA report recommended methods for establishing remote access or regional mental health check programs at the State or Federal level.

(10) Individual police and fire departments generally do not have the resources to employ full-time mental health experts who are able to treat public safety officers with state-of-the-art techniques for the purpose of treating job-related post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder.

SEC. 3. PROGRAMMING FOR POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) PUBLIC SAFETY OFFICER.—The term "public safety officer"—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 1204 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (34 U.S.C. 10284); and

(B) includes Tribal public safety officers.

(2) PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATOR.—The term "public safety telecommunicator" means an individual who—

(A) operates telephone, radio, or other communication systems to receive and communicate requests for emergency assistance at 911 public safety answering points and emergency operations centers;

(B) takes information from the public and other sources relating to crimes, threats, disturbances, acts of terrorism, fires, medical emergencies, and other public safety matters; and

(C) coordinates and provides information to law enforcement and emergency response personnel.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the Department of Justice, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on—

(1) not fewer than 1 proposed program, if the Attorney General determines it appropriate and feasible to do so, to be administered by the Department of Justice for making state-of-the-art treatments or preventative care available to public safety officers and public safety telecommunicators with regard to job-related post-traumatic stress disorder or acute stress disorder by providing public safety officers and public safety telecommunicators access to evidence-based trauma-informed care, peer support, counselor services, and family supports for the purpose of treating or preventing post-traumatic stress disorder or acute stress disorder;

(2) a draft of any necessary grant conditions required to ensure that confidentiality is afforded to public safety officers on account of seeking the care or services described in paragraph (1) under the proposed program;

(3) how each proposed program described in paragraph (1) could be most efficiently administered throughout the United States at the State, Tribal, territorial, and local levels, taking into account in-person and telehealth capabilities;

(4) a draft of legislative language necessary to authorize each proposed program described in paragraph (1); and

(5) an estimate of the amount of annual appropriations necessary for administering each proposed program described in paragraph (1).

(c) DEVELOPMENT.—In developing the report required under subsection (b), the Attorney General shall consult relevant stakeholders, including—

(1) Federal, State, Tribal, territorial, and local agencies employing public safety officers and public safety telecommunicators; and

(2) non-governmental organizations, international organizations, academies, or other entities, including organizations that support the interests of public safety officers and public safety telecommunicators and the interests of family members of public safety officers and public safety telecommunicators.

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

PROVIDING FOR MEMBERS ON THE PART OF THE SENATE OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING AND THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 93, which was introduced earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 93) providing for members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Committee on Printing and the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I further ask that the resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 93) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2023

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, March 6; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Ballou nomination; further, that cloture motions filed during today's sessions ripen at 5:30 p.m.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 6, 2023, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, if there is no further business to come be-

fore the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:27 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 6, 2023, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

XOCHITL TORRES SMALL, OF NEW MEXICO, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, VICE JEWEL HAIRSTON BRONAUGH.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

JARED BERNSTEIN, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS, VICE CECILIA ELENA ROUSE.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 2, 2023:

THE JUDICIARY

COLLEEN R. LAWLESS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

JONATHAN JAMES CANADA GREY, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN.