United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 11, 2022 *No. 79*

Senate

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 10, 2022)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Honorable CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, in a divided nation and world, use our lawmakers to bring order from chaos, harmony from discord, and truth from falsehood. Remind them that You alone are the way, the truth, and the life in good or bad times.

Lord, give our Senators wisdom to provide our Nation and world with exemplary models of excellence, integrity, and faithfulness. Keep them from stumbling or slipping as they face the precarious challenges of today and tomorrow. Lord, do for our legislators more than they can ask or imagine.

And, Lord, continue to strengthen Ukraine.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 11, 2022.

To the Senate:

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

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A motion to discharge the nomination of Charlotte N. Sweeney, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, from the Committee on the Judiciary.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, before the day is over, every Member of this body will make a choice: vote to protect the fundamental rights of women across the country or stand with five conservative Justices ready to destroy these rights in one fell swoop.

For half a century, Roe v. Wade has been the bedrock upon which women have secured the freedom to make their own decisions when it comes to their bodies. Few questions are more personal, more private, and more complicated than those involving a pregnancy. Few decisions should be more out of bounds to the whims and judgments of elected politicians, but that is precisely the doomsday scenario that now faces our country.

Today's vote is one of the most consequential we will take in decades because for the first time in 50 years, a conservative majority—an extreme majority—on the Supreme Court is on the brink of declaring that women do not have freedom over their own bodies—one of the longest steps back in the Court's entire history; a decision, if enacted, that will go down as one of the worst Court decisions ever. The name of the decision will live in infamy.

This morning, reports came out that the draft decision of last week remains the only one under discussion by the Court's conservatives. If the Supreme Court follows through on that decision, it will be the greatest contraction of individual rights in generations. Our children will grow up in a world where they have fewer liberties than those who came before them. The United States, which has always aspired to expand freedoms, will take a shameful step backward. As I said, this decision will live in infamy.

So when we say that today's vote is one of the most important we have taken in decades, when we say it is not an abstract or theoretical exercise, when we say the consequences would be real and immediate and far-reaching, it is the truth.

At least 80 million women live in States that would either instantly or very quickly ban abortions should Roe come to an end. If you are a woman seeking an abortion, a provider administering one, or even a friend giving a ride to a clinic, you could be prosecuted as a criminal and be thrown in jail. This is not an exaggeration; it is

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

Printed on recycled paper.

already being proposed by many legislatures and in some cases is already the law on the books. If, God forbid, you are the victim of rape or incest, in many States, you discover that the laws in place could force you to carry your pregnancy to term against your will.

This is a cruel, repressive, and dangerous vision for our country, but it is precisely the future that MAGA Republicans are working toward. It is precisely the outcome that extreme Republicans have planned for.

For years, Senate Republicans rubberstamped one extreme judge after another, plucked right out of the Federalist Society list, with the admitted goal to ''pick away at Roe v. Wade,'' as Leader MCCONNELL stated. Without Senate Republicans skewing our courts to the hard right, Roe would not be on the brink of extinction.

At the State level, radical MAGA Republicans have pushed or enacted restrictions that ban abortions as early as 6 weeks, ban abortions with no exceptions for rape or incest, criminalize women and doctors, and prevent other States from offering reproductive care. The immensely cruel law in Texas could even punish doctors who prescribe certain drugs to women in cases of a miscarriage.

It gets worse. It gets worse. Leader MCCONNELL says that under a Republican Senate, a national ban on abortion is ''possible'' without Roe. Let that sink in, America. A national ban on abortion is the extreme of extremes, and it is now possible in a Republican Senate, according to Leader MCCONNELL. Americans should listen to that.

For the hard right, this has never been about States' rights. This has never been about letting Texas choose its own path while California takes another. Those arguments have now been exposed for what they are: hypocrisy. For MAGA Republicans, this has always been about making abortion illegal everywhere, about making the bans in Texas apply equally to New York and California and Minnesota and everywhere in between.

For all the times we heard Republicans oppose expanding healthcare because ''the American people want healthcare decisions left up to their family and doctors,'' the same hard-right radicals are now telling American women: Healthcare decisions will now be made by politicians and judges, not doctors, not families. MAGA Republicans are telling American women: Your body, our choice.

These laws are far outside the mainstream of the country. According to a poll released this morning by POLITICO and Morning Consult, just 28 percent of voters support overturning Roe v. Wade. Nearly 75 percent of Americans, including a majority of Republicans, oppose the radical notion of imprisoning women who receive an abortion. Nearly 60 percent of Americans say they want political candidates to support access to abortion. That is why this issue will be one of the most important issues facing the voters in November.

As Americans make their decisions in this year's election, this question will not go away. Americans strongly oppose getting rid of Roe, and they will be paying close attention from now until November to Republicans who are responsible for its demise.

So to my Republican colleagues who have spent the last week trying to talk about anything other than Roe, it is time to go on record.

I ask my colleagues to think carefully about their vote and to reckon deeply about the consequences of a world where Roe is a thing of the past. Tens of millions of women are watching what will happen to the rights they have relied on for decades, and all of us will have to answer for this vote for the rest of our time in public office.

Before the day is over, every Member of this body will make a choice: Stand with women to protect their freedoms or stand with MAGA Republicans and take our country into a dark and repressive future.

UKRAINE

Madam President, now finally on a different note, yesterday, the House voted on an overwhelmingly bipartisan basis to approve a $40 billion emergency aid package to support the people of Ukraine in their fight against Putin's aggression.

This package is large, it is very much needed, and I am going to work with my colleagues to make sure we can move forward on this package as soon as we can. The President has called on both Chambers of Congress to act quickly, so act quickly we must. The House vote was overwhelmingly bipartisan, and it should be no different in this Chamber.

Time is of the essence because President Biden has made clear that the aid provided by Congress a few months ago is now near its end. As we acted quickly and decisively a few months ago, we must do so again very, very soon, and I will make sure this is a priority for the Senate.

We have a moral obligation to stand with our friends in Ukraine. The fight they are in is a struggle between democracy and authoritarianism itself, and we dare not relent or delay swift action to help our friends in need.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

INFLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the country just received yet another terrible inflation report. Yet again, overall inflation came in higher than expected: 8.3 percent. Inflation continues to stick right around its worst level in 40 years.

The measure that the Bureau of Labor Statistics calls ''core inflation'' increased in April by twice as much as it increased in March. Food costs are way up. Housing costs are way up once again.

President Biden has presided over one of the most expensive years for working families in modern American history. The national average gas price is the highest it has ever been in the history of our country. Americans are paying an average of $4.33 per gallon for regular. Diesel has also hit a record high; it is now $5.62 per gallon—a huge blow to Americans with trucks and tractors, to small businesses and family farms. And, of course, it forces up the price of practically everything that travels on a truck to reach the scene of a store or a supermarket. Inflation on top of inflation.

In my home State, Kentuckians are paying 34 percent more for propane and 112 percent more for home heating oil than they were paying when Democrats took control of the government.

Let me say that again. The price of home heating oil has more than doubled since President Biden took office, a crushing blow—a crushing blow—to rural America, especially in States like Pennsylvania, Vermont, and New Hampshire.

Democratic policies have fueled this runaway inflation. Their mistakes are why inflation has hit America much harder than other developed countries.

Expert calculations say Democrats' $2 trillion spending spree last March is directly responsible for as much as 3 percentage points of our current inflation. Even the prominent Democratic economist Jason Furman puts the number at 2.5 percent. If just one—one—Senate Democrat had the courage to vote with Republicans in March of 2021, inflation today would be closer to 5 percent instead of almost 8½ percent.

Steve Rattner was a top economic adviser to President Obama. He says the Democrats' $2 trillion disaster will ''go down in history as an extraordinary policy mistake'' that put us ''way behind the curve on inflation.'' That is Steve Rattner, top economic adviser to President Obama.

Everyone knows where this inflation came from, but President Biden just can't seem to admit it. He just makes excuses that no one is buying.

Listen to a Democratic political adviser, David Axelrod. He said:

> [Biden] was saying, you know, everything is Putin's price hikes, inflation is Putin's fault. People [simply] don't believe that.

According to David Axelrod:

> They know that we had inflation before this. They know that gas prices were high before this. . . . You can't blame everything in the economy on Putin.

David Axelrod.

So it is this President and his all-Democratic government who have drained American families' pocketbooks. And every poll—every poll—shows our citizens understand that sad reality all too well.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Madam President, now on another matter, today on the Senate floor,

Democrats will prove their party has been totally captured by the far-left branch.

My colleague, the Democratic leader, controls the schedule. He decides what we vote on. From inflation to the border crisis, to violent crime, there is no shortage of problems that deserve attention, but, alas, today Democrats have decided to line up behind an extreme and radical abortion policy. Our Democratic colleagues want to vote for abortion-on-demand through all 9 months, until the moment before the baby is born—a failed show vote that will only prove their own extremism.

The Democrats' radical bill is as extreme as extreme gets. It ignores modern science. It is tone-deaf to public opinion. Nothing about their bill merely codifies the current case law on this issue. Their extreme proposal goes way, way beyond codifying the status quo. It would roll back many existing laws.

Democrats' bill would functionally allow elective abortion through all 9 months, abortion until the moment of birth. We are currently one of only seven countries worldwide that allow elective abortion after 20 weeks. It puts us in a group with China and North Korea. This bill would take us to an even more extreme and darker place.

Only 19 percent of Americans believe that abortion should be legal in most or all cases into the third trimester—only 19 percent of the American people. But 97 percent of House and Senate Democrats have cosponsored this bill that would have exactly that effect. Ninety-seven percent of Washington Democrats stand with the most radical 19 percent of the country. Almost half the Senate is about to walk the plank for a position that fewer than one in five Americans actually support.

In addition to 9 months of functional abortion-on-demand, the Democrats' extreme bill would roll back basic health and safety regulations. It would roll back overwhelmingly popular safeguards such as waiting periods and informed consent laws. Parental notification would likely go out the window as well. Democrats would even rule out restrictions on sex-selective abortions. And their legislation takes direct aim at conscious protections and religious freedoms that protect Americans of faith who practice medicine.

So let's sum it up. This legislation would allow abortion to viable babies in the ninth month, with no waiting period or informed consent, at the hands of a nonphysician. Taxpayers could be forced to pay for it, and Catholic hospitals would be forced to perform it.

Democrats could not have written more extreme legislation. They have let fringe activists lead them far away from the American people. More than 60 percent of Americans support 24-hour waiting periods and requiring that doctors have admitting privileges. Even majorities of self-identified Democrats actually support those things. But Washington Democrats want to roll them back. Only 19 percent of Americans want abortions to be entirely or mostly legal into the third trimester, but 97 percent of Washington Democrats back this bill.

Democrats are melting down because the Supreme Court may—may—uphold a Mississippi law that would limit abortion after 15 weeks. That law would still be more liberal than the abortion laws in Switzerland, Germany, or France. Today's Democratic Party is extreme on an international scale.

So, Madam President, it is chilling that anybody would write legislation like this in 2022. It is even more disturbing that 97 percent of Washington Democrats have put their names on it. But the American people need to see what the far left has become.

So I am glad—glad—the Senate will vote today. We will stand with the American people, stand with innocent life, and block the Democrats' extreme bill.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I have to disagree with the distinguished minority leader.

The bill that we are going to vote on this afternoon is legislation that would ensure that the decisions about whether or not to have a child are made by women. It would codify Roe v. Wade to ensure that women make those decisions—not the minority leader, not Justice Alito, not some politician someplace but women. And that is who should make those decisions.

I rise today to add my voice to the chorus of American women who are standing together, arm in arm, to loudly and clearly declare that we will not surrender our rights.

Like the majority of women in New Hampshire and across this country, I was outraged by the leaked draft Supreme Court decision by Justice Alito that said that the Supreme Court would overturn Roe v. Wade; that they would overturn almost 50 years of rights that have been guaranteed to women. So I rise today on behalf of the women of New Hampshire and the women across this country, including my daughters and granddaughters and the generations that will follow them.

I rise today that we must preserve a woman's fundamental right to make our own decisions about our own bodies, about our futures, and about our health.

Like millions of women across the country, I was shocked to see that opinion, written by Justice Alito, indicating that five Justices would vote in favor of overturning Roe. That decision, if it stands, would upend nearly 50 years of precedent that says a woman's healthcare decisions are ours and ours alone, in consultation with our families, with our physicians, with our clergy.

This Nation is built on the bedrock of liberty. Our founding declaration holds that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is among the most essential of unalienable rights that are guaranteed to all Americans. The fundamental right to make decisions about our own bodies touches on each of these.

The decision to have a child is one of the most personal and private that women and families make. And that is exactly who should make that decision, not some extreme politician in Washington or in State capitals across this Nation, not some Supreme Court Justice—people who know nothing about the circumstances that women and their families are facing.

How dare they presume to substitute their judgment? What does it say about the moral righteousness, the self-righteousness of a politician or an unelected jurist over individual women on a matter that is so ultimately personal, so pivotal to every single aspect of the lives of women and families?

We have already heard from the minority leader that Republicans, if they gain control of the Senate and the House, will seek a nationwide ban on abortion. It is a sad day when people at the highest levels of government, who are entrusted to defend our Constitution, to safeguard our citizens, can no longer be trusted to do either.

Unfortunately, we know today that nearly half of the States in this country have already pushed through what we are calling trigger laws that would automatically roll back the clocks by half a century if Roe is repealed. That would immediately jeopardize the fates of millions of women across this country. Seventeen of those States would outlaw abortions even in cases of rape and incest. This is the extreme position, the position that says that we should leave up to government, we should leave up to elected officials the decision about whether families should have children, the decision about whether a woman should have a child. That is who should make that decision, not a politician here, not a politician in my State capital of Concord, not a Supreme Court Justice but a woman—and her family—who understands her own circumstances, who knows what she and her family need.

We need to ensure that the freedom for women to make these decisions is guaranteed. That is what this vote is about this afternoon to codify Roe v. Wade.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, let's get two things straight about the abortion legislation on the floor before us

today. One, this legislation does not represent the views of a majority of the American people, and two, this legislation is some of the most extreme abortion legislation in the world.

It is a little hard to believe we are having a vote on this bill again mere weeks after it was defeated in the Senate, but I guess when the abortion lobby calls, our Democrat colleagues come running.

The bill before us today, the so-called Women's Health Protection Act, would prop up the abortion industry and make abortion-on-demand—at any time, for essentially any reason—the law of the land.

My Democratic colleagues would like to convey the impression that, with this legislation, they are merely attempting to codify a widely held belief from which no reasonable American dissents. That is baloney. The American people don't even come close to supporting abortion-on-demand up until the moment of birth.

Gallup has been polling on abortion for decades. In all that time, the percentage of Americans who believe abortion should be legal under any circumstance has always remained under 35 percent. An Associated Press poll from this past June found that 65 percent of Americans believe that abortion should generally be illegal in the second trimester—or from about 13 weeks of pregnancy—while a whopping 80 percent of Americans believe that abortion should generally be illegal in the third trimester. Why? Well, I suspect it is because the American people are well aware that when we are talking about abortion, we are talking about the killing of human beings, innocent human beings, and that is not exactly something most Americans are comfortable with. Americans are used to defending the weak and the innocent, not killing. So it is not exactly surprising that Americans are not joining the Democratic Party and wholeheartedly embracing abortion up until the moment of birth.

Democrats do everything they can to run away from the humanity of the unborn baby, but they are fighting a losing battle because science and medical technology and plain old common sense all point inexorably to the humanity of the unborn child.

It is pretty hard to look at a fully formed baby on an ultrasound kicking her feet and sucking her thumb and think she is anything but a human being. Once you have acknowledged the self-evident truth that baby is a human being, it is pretty hard to argue that she shouldn't be protected. So it is no surprise that, almost 50 years after Roe, Americans still do not wholeheartedly embrace abortion.

In addition to being totally out of step with the American mainstream, Democrats' ''Abortion on Demand Act'' is also far outside the mainstream of abortion law globally. Thirty-nine of the forty-two European countries that allow elective abortion limit such abortions to 15 weeks or earlier. Thirty-two of those countries limit elective abortion to at or before 12 weeks' gestation. Meanwhile, Democrats here in the U.S. Senate want to enshrine abortion-on-demand up until the moment of birth.

Thanks to Roe v. Wade, our country is already outside the global mainstream when it comes to protecting unborn human beings. In fact, we are currently one of just a tiny handful of countries in the world that allow elective abortions past 20 weeks of pregnancy. Who is on that list among those other countries? China, North Korea—not exactly the kind of company we want to be keeping when it comes to defending human rights.

But the so-called Women's Health Protection Act is even more extreme than Roe. Not only would it allow abortion through all 40 weeks of pregnancy, it would sweep away almost every commonsense restriction that has been upheld since Roe—parental notification, informed consent, waiting periods. All of those would be gone under Democrats' abortion-on-demand bill. Plus, it would open the door to Federal funding of abortion, forcing Americans who oppose abortion to subsidize it with their tax dollars—something that has been bipartisan consensus, again, for decades in this country.

Furthermore, under this legislation, conscience protections for doctors and hospitals who do not want to perform abortions would be in jeopardy. The Democratic leader has suggested that this bill would not jeopardize the right of Catholic hospitals to refuse to perform abortions. I would like to believe it, but it is pretty hard to do so when this bill removes the right to invoke the Religious Freedom Restoration Act as a defense.

The Religious Freedom Restoration Act, of course, is a 1993 law passed by Congress to ensure that Americans' constitutional right to live in accordance with their religious beliefs is protected. That law was actually sponsored by the Democratic leader—back, I should add, when the Democratic Party still believed in protecting religious freedom.

While I would love to believe the Democrats are still interested in protecting conscience rights, it is pretty hard to believe when their bill takes steps to prevent providers from claiming protection under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act. Why would you include such a provision in your legislation unless you intended to make sure that healthcare providers could not cite their religious faith to ensure that they are not forced to participate in abortions?

With the legislation before us today, Democrats aren't attempting to codify some widely held consensus on abortion; rather, they are attempting to codify the most extreme views of the extreme pro-abortion lobby, make no mistake about it.

It is pretty sad that the Democratic Party has come to this. The party that has historically portrayed itself as the defender of the little guy is now the party seeking to deny even the smallest protections to the littlest and most vulnerable guys and girls among us, unborn human beings. But, hey, I guess Democrats can at least claim that they are standing up for the abortion industry.

I believe that we are better than this. We have to be better than this.

I hope that not only Republicans but some of my Democratic colleagues will stand up today and say that we can do better than a law that rips away even the smallest protections for unborn Americans.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask for one minute before the vote.

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

Ms. STABENOW. I find it just very frustrating to hear from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about how we are extreme because we are supporting a woman's freedom to make her own reproductive health decisions. That is the vote today. The vote today is about who decides, who decides under Roe v. Wade when the third trimester—which, by the way, abortions can only be done to save the life of the health of the mother—who decides that? The people on this floor? The Republicans who think it is their right to decide it? Who decides it? The United States Supreme Court? Who decides in the most personal decisions—and sometimes those agonizing decisions—a woman will ever have to make, the question is: Who decides? Fifty years of freedom is what we are talking about Republicans eliminating with this vote. Fifty years of freedom for women to decide what we need to do as it relates to our own healthcare and reproductive freedom.

So I strongly support the women of this country. I believe in them. I believe in us. I trust them. I trust us. And this is about their choice, not a bunch of politicians deciding what is best for them.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 167 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—49

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The nomination is discharged and will be placed on the calendar.

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. 848, Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Cory A. Booker, Elizabeth Warren, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Brian Schatz, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Chris Van Hollen, John W. Hickenlooper, Richard J. Durbin.

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 Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 168 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being evenly divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019.

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

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I come to the floor today at a pivotal time for women's rights in this country. I want to thank Senators BLUMENTHAL and MURRAY and many others, including Senator BALDWIN, for their leadership on this issue and on the Women's Health Protection Act.

We learned last week that it is very likely that the Supreme Court will overrule Roe v. Wade. The leaked opinion made it clear. It means the Supreme Court is on track to completely overrule Roe, stripping women of their constitutional right to seek an abortion. It will also be, I note, against the wishes of the somewhere between 70 and 80 percent of Americans who believe that this is a decision that should be made between a woman and her doctor—not with Senator CRUZ, not a bunch of politicians in Washington, but a decision that should be made between a woman and her doctor.

Fifty years stripped away of women's rights, and the fall will be swift. Over 20 States already have laws in place that could be used to restrict access, including 13 which will automatically go into effect if the Supreme Court issues the decision. We have also seen States preparing to take even more extreme steps if Roe is overturned. Last week, Republican lawmakers in Louisiana advanced a bill to immediately classify abortion as homicide and allow the State to prosecute women—prosecute women—for receiving care. Earlier this year, a bill was introduced by Republican legislators in Missouri to allow private citizens to sue people who help women leave the State to get care. This comes on top of the 19 States that already have laws in place to ban or restrict access to medication abortion.

What this all comes down to is a fundamental question: Who is making these personal decisions—politicians or a woman? And are women equal citizens under the law? If Roe is overturned, women in this country will receive different treatment under the law than men, and our access to critical care will be at the mercy of a patchwork of laws.

We have all seen what happens on the ground when these kinds of restrictions are enacted. Texas's law last year denies access to at least 85 percent of patients seeking abortion-related services. Some women in Texas have had to drive nearly 250 miles one way to get care. No one should have to take a bus across the country to make a personal healthcare decision. A woman in Louisiana or in Missouri or in Texas should not be treated differently than a woman in Minnesota.

While we are all deeply disturbed by the impact this decision will have on women and the men who stand with them, unfortunately, many of us have seen this coming. Republicans have been methodically preparing for this moment, stacking the courts with judges who want to overturn Roe and introducing over 500 bills in States across the country limiting access to care.

While this is still a draft decision, I am seriously concerned that the Court's apparent willingness to disregard nearly 50 years of rights will not only put women's health at risk but will undermine the rule of law.

This draft leaked opinion brings us back to the fifties. The issue is, we always thought it would be the 1950s when it is truly the 1850s. The people of this country do not want to go backwards when it comes to their freedoms, because that is what this is about—their freedom to make their own decisions.

So what can the Senate do in the face of this threat to freedom? All three branches of the government have a responsibility to protect people's rights, and if one branch doesn't do its job—that is how this system was set up constitutionally—then it is up to another to step in.

Congress must act to codify the principles of Roe v. Wade into law, and we

will have the opportunity to do just that on the floor today when we cast our votes on the Women's Health Protection Act. These protections are desperately needed, and it is our responsibility to take action so that this fundamental right remains real for the women and the men who stand with them across this country.

Freedom and equality under the law, for the first time in generations—and I want young people out there to think about this—we may live in a world where women have fewer rights than their moms or their grandmas. That is not the world we want.

I urge my colleagues to stand up with the majority of Americans who support a women's right to make her own healthcare decision, the freedom to make her decision, by enshrining the protections of Roe v. Wade into law.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have never seen so much furor over a case that has not been decided, based on a leaked draft dated February of this year which does not reflect a final decision by the U.S. Supreme Court.

Unfortunately, this egregious leak of this draft opinion has created serious security threats for members of the Supreme Court and their families. Over the last few days, angry protesters have shown up at three of the Justices' private family homes. Sadly, the majority leader of the Senate said he is OK with peaceful protest outside the Justices' homes.

I disagree, and so does his second in command. This morning, Senator DURBIN called this practice ''reprehensible.''

The threats to Justices remain high because emotions are high, and the Chief Justice has asked Congress take action to protect the Justices and their families by simply providing the same sort of authorities that the Capitol Police have to provide protection to Members of Congress and our families.

Last week, I introduced legislation that would do that. I asked my friend and frequent collaborator, Senator COONS, if he would be interested in cosponsoring the bill to make it bipartisan.

Initially, he raised concerns with one of the provisions, but we worked in good faith to address his concerns and introduced a new version of the bill that could gain broad bipartisan support.

And, clearly, we were successful because our bill passed the Senate unanimously on Monday, and now it is time for our colleagues in the House to follow suit.

Yesterday, Congressman ISSA and Congressman CORREA introduced this bipartisan bill in the House, and Speaker PELOSI should act quickly to bring this bill up for a vote as soon as possible.

Unfortunately, some in the House disagree. They have chosen to ignore the bipartisan bill that received unanimous support in the Senate and have introduced a partisan version, which is guaranteed to slow down the protections needed by the Supreme Court Justices and their families.

This partisan bill in the House ignores the good-faith work that was being done here in the Senate to build consensus and expands this legislation to include divisive provisions, like potentially extending police protection to the very person who leaked the draft opinion.

Well, this stands no chance of becoming law.

At the end of the day, here is where we are: The Supreme Court Justices and their families are facing serious security threats, and the Senate unanimously passed a bill to provide them with the protection that they need and they deserve. I can't think of any good reason why House Democrats would delay a vote on this bipartisan bill, or, worse, allow the safety of the Justices' families to become a political football.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. President, on another matter, later today, the Senate will vote on a radical abortion-on-demand bill, which our Democratic colleagues are trying to sell as a codification of Roe v. Wade.

But the truth of the matter is, this bill sweeps aside all of the protections, for example, for conscience, for religious liberty, for opposing taxpayer funding of abortions, and partial birth abortions. It sweeps all that aside and essentially makes abortion available on demand from the time of conception until the time of delivery.

Now, this isn't the first time our friends across the aisle have tried to opportunistically capitalize on events to check items off of their liberal wish list. In fact, we have witnessed this strategy numerous times.

When the pandemic first hit, the House Democratic whip referred to the crisis as a ''tremendous opportunity to restructure things to fit [their] vision.'' And to their credit, our Democratic colleagues certainly didn't squander that opportunity.

Last year, they crafted a nearly $2 trillion spending bill that included most of the far left's outbox, their biggest priorities, and they tried to brand it as necessary pandemic relief, which it was not. Backdoor funding for Planned Parenthood, a blank check for mismanaged union pension funds, money for climate justice—it was easy to see through this COVID relief facade because, in the end, less than 10 percent of the money was directly related to the pandemic, and less than 1 percent supported vaccination efforts.

We saw the same play when it came to election law. States across the country established temporary measures during the pandemic to ensure that voters could cast a ballot during some of the most worrisome days of the pandemic.

When those temporary procedures were rolled back to what they were before the pandemic, our colleagues tried to frame that as voter suppression. They resurrected a bill that would force a one-size-fits-all election formula out of Washington, DC, on every State and community in the country and, in the process, hand Democrats a permanent governing majority.

And Democrats tried to cast anyone who opposed their partisan bill as attacking the sacred right to vote, which it was not.

But here we are seeing the same play once again. Our colleagues are now trying to seize on the political firestorm from a stolen Supreme Court draft opinion to push their radical abortion agenda. And no doubt about it, it is truly extreme.

Just as they did with their pandemic spending spree and election takeover bill, Democrats have taken things to the very nth degree, and they are pushing for a bill that is far out of line with the views of most Americans over this divisive and emotional topic.

Only 19 percent of Americans say that abortion should be available in all cases, with no exceptions—19 percent. That means 81 percent disagree.

Even though the vast majority of Americans oppose unrestricted abortion access, that is exactly what this bill would provide. This bill would allow for abortions at any stage of a pregnancy. All it takes is one healthcare provider who says having the baby would present a potential harm to the mother's health, including her mental health.

And I mentioned yesterday the case of Kermit Gosnell, who ultimately was serving life in prison for running an abortion factory involving late-term abortions and other illegal abortions performed in Pennsylvania.

So where is the line here? Where is the line?

Democrats see no line. They don't credit an unborn child with its very humanity or else they would see some sort of balancing against the mother's right to physical autonomy and the child's right to life guaranteed in our Declaration of Independence.

Is anxiety about motherhood a strong enough diagnosis to allow a woman who is 39 weeks pregnant to abort her baby in a late-term abortion? Anxiety can be a serious struggle that many prospective mothers face. There is no question about that. That is why I have been advocating for better access to mental healthcare services for all Americans, including expecting and new moms.

But this legislation is written so broadly that in practice, it legalizes abortion for virtually any reason up until the time the baby is actually delivered.

Now, the American people aren't the only ones who oppose unlimited abortion on demand. This bill doesn't just codify Roe v. Wade; it goes far beyond the abortion policies among other countries, like those in Europe, for example.

In most European countries, abortion access is restricted after a certain point in the pregnancy—in Sweden, it is 18 weeks of pregnancy; in France, it is 14 weeks; in Germany, it is 12 weeks; in Portugal, 10 weeks. Each of these limits are more restrictive than the current law in a number of American States, including blue States like Massachusetts and Nevada, where abortions are restricted after 24 weeks. In California, Washington, and Illinois, abortions are restricted after viability, an arbitrary line, roughly, 20 weeks of gestation—20 to 23 weeks of gestation.

But under this extreme bill, one healthcare provider could stop an otherwise constitutional State law protecting the life of this unborn child in its tracks.

Even though most Americans oppose late-term abortions, our Democratic colleagues are running full speed ahead in order to permit it under this extreme bill. They are so desperate to make abortion-on-demand the law of the land that this legislation has the support of all but a handful of Democrats in Congress.

As the Republican Senate leader pointed out earlier this week, 97 percent of Washington Democrats are pushing for policies that only 19 percent of Americans support. This is proof, once again, that today's Democratic Party is simply not listening to the American people; it is taking its marching orders from the most radical—most radical—and extreme members of their own political party.

Our colleagues are trying to frame this legislation as codifying Roe v. Wade, a 1973 opinion 50 years ago. But in reality, this radical bill goes much, much further. It doesn't just maintain the status quo; it moves abortion policies in the direction of those in the People's Republic of China and North Korea and away from those of our friends and allies in Europe.

I would think that is not company we would feel comfortable keeping, with the People's Republic of China, run by the Chinese Communist Party, and North Korea, the home of Kim Jong Un.

In addition to allowing abortions up to the time of delivery, this bill allows abortions to be used as a method of sex selection, a shameful practice that became common in China under its one-child policy.

A number of States have laws on the book that prevent someone from having an abortion based on the baby's sex. In other words, the parent who is hoping for a son cannot just have an abortion because the baby is a girl. But this bill would change that. It would invalidate State laws that prevent sex-selective abortions.

This bill would make further changes that endanger the very women who are receiving abortions. For example, it rolls back a commonsense provision including requirements that only a licensed physician can perform or prescribe an abortion. It removes guidelines for how abortion facilities are regulated and maintained, and it removes commonsense safeguards like consent laws and waiting periods.

Along with all of these radical and extreme changes, this legislation comes with no guarantees that taxpayers won't be asked to foot the bill for these elective procedures, and it provides no protection for babies who survive a botched abortion.

It puts healthcare providers with religious or moral opposition to abortion in an impossible position. They have to disregard their sincerely held religious or moral briefs or they get sued.

This isn't the Woman's Health Protection Act; it is the ''Abortion on Demand Act,'' without restrictions, without limitations.

It promotes abortion at a scale far beyond Roe v. Wade and far beyond what the vast majority of the American people are comfortable with.

So this is not a serious effort to codify Roe, and it certainly isn't an attempt to reinstate policies that are in line with most Americans' view on this very emotional and divisive issue. What this is, is pandering to the most radical elements in their party.

The good news is that Democrats still don't have the votes to pass this bill. Given the opposition of the vast majority of Americans, I doubt they ever will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is a debate about the Women's Health Protection Act—protecting women's health, protecting half of America's population in their right to seek the healthcare they require, protecting their ability, half of America, to make decisions about their own bodies. How is this a question even up for debate?

Today, the Senate considers the Women's Health Protection Act. A woman's right to make choices about her own body is a constitutional right. It was affirmed by the Supreme Court nearly 50 years ago. Polling—as if that should be the benchmark by which we legislate—shows that nearly two out of three Americans believe the fundamental right established in 1973's Roe v. Wade should be upheld. Yet here we are today—a body of 100, 76 percent of which are male—making decisions about the private lives of the nearly 168 million women in this country. That is ludicrous.

The right of any woman to receive the healthcare they choose and seek should be important to each and every one of us. Women—our mothers, daughters, sisters, aunts, friends—they know what is best for them in their own lives. How patronizing to suggest otherwise. How patriarchal. How insulting. How dangerous.

I am the dean of the Senate; I am the longest serving Member of this body today. I have worked for decades to support legislation that affirms a woman's right to access comprehensive healthcare from a trusted provider without interference. The right to comprehensive family planning resources—whatever those resources may be—is not only a fundamental right to privacy for these women, but it is an important public health policy as well.

In 2019, the Vermont House and Senate, by wide margins, approved the Freedom of Choice Act, which guarantees the right to access safe abortion care in Vermont. Governor Scott—a Republican—signed that bill into law in June 2019. If the Court does overturn Roe, the Freedom of Choice Act would protect this healthcare right in Vermont, just as the Supreme Court case that was ahead of Roe v. Wade, Beecher v. Leahy, does the same. Once again, Vermont is a leader on an issue of national significance.

The unfortunate reality is that 26 other States stand ready to ban abortion rights in the absence of Roe. What are the women of these States to do? And prominent Republican voices in the Senate even now say they would not rule out the possibility that a future Senate and Congress would overrule such State laws in Vermont and elsewhere and impose a national ban on women's choice.

And what laws are these States prepared to pass—what resources are they prepared to provide—to support these women and the children they will bear? The answer we know, and I fear, is none. States will determine what you do, but they won't do anything to help you afterwards.

The implications of the Supreme Court's opinion, should a final decision mirror the leaked draft, go far beyond reproductive rights. For decades, the Supreme Court has stood as an independent arbiter in this country. Striking down a constitutional right that has supported millions of Americans, not just women, will cause many to lose confidence in the integrity of our judicial system. Worse still, it could threaten the rights protected under the precedent set by Roe and affirmed in other cases. I acknowledge the fear that many are feeling right now about that possibility. Certainly, I hear it in my office. And that is why we need to pass the Women's Health Protection Act.

What would the suffragists say of us today? What would the icons of the civil rights movement say of us today? A vote against the Women's Health Protection Act is a vote against equality. It is a vote against women, plain and simple. It is a vote against the progress we have made to right the wrongs of inequality. And it is at odds with what an overwhelming majority of the American public believes. It says, in many States in this country, women will be treated differently than men.

You know, my sons and grandsons can travel anywhere in the United States knowing the law is the same for them. My daughter and granddaughters, under this, would know they

could not be treated the same as they travelled around the country. What does that say about America, that our sons and our grandsons will be treated differently than our daughters and our granddaughters? Our daughters and our granddaughters will be told by some States: You have less rights than your brothers or your fathers or your uncles.

Shame on this Senate today. I stand with women—my wife, my daughter, my granddaughters—when I say that I trust them to make the health decisions that are best for them. And I will fight against any effort to erode those fundamental, constitutional rights. That is what the Senate should do; that is what we should do if we truly are going to be the conscience of the Nation. That is what this Vermonter intends to do.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, last week, we learned that the United States Supreme Court is preparing to issue a ruling that would fundamentally roll back the constitutional rights of millions of American women. It has been reported that a group of anti-choice Justices on the Supreme Court are planning to overturn Roe v. Wade, the landmark case decided nearly 50 years ago which recognized the reproductive rights of women.

This decision centered on one of the most fundamental rights we have as Americans—the right to control our own bodies. For nearly half a century Roe has protected a woman's right to make extremely personal decisions about her own body, her own healthcare, her own family. But now—now we are seeing a clear, coordinated attempt by anti-choice politicians to roll back the clock on the rights of American women, control what happens to their bodies, and strike down reproductive freedom.

If the Supreme Court moves forward with this action, it will have immediate—immediate and devastating—consequences for women's health.

So let's get something straight: overturning Roe isn't going to stop abortions. It is only going to stop women from getting safe abortions, and women will die as a result. This will also have a severe impact on how miscarriages and other life-threatening medical issues related to pregnancy are handled.

For example, if Roe is overturned, ectopic pregnancies could become a death sentence for women in States that ban abortions. This is just one example of the harm this will cause.

This will disproportionately impact women who lack the resources to go to other States to seek care, and this will also make it harder for women of color to access the care they need.

Unfortunately, many States across our country already have rigid and extreme restrictions on the books, and if Roe falls, many of those laws will go immediately into effect. In the States that don't have those restrictions, extreme legislatures are pushing new, dangerous, and restrictive anti-choice laws as we speak.

In my home State of Nevada, abortion rights have been enshrined as a State law since Nevadans overwhelmingly voted for it in a ballot initiative in 1990. This means women across Nevada will continue to have access to reproductive care if Roe is overturned. But this year, anti-choice politicians are working to eliminate this protection from our State code and take away Nevadan women's rights to make decisions about their own bodies. This is exactly why the Senate needs to pass the Women's Health Protection Act today, to ensure that women in all 50 States continue to have the right to make their own reproductive healthcare choices.

I helped introduce the Women's Health Protection Act last year because it is the best option we have to codify Roe v. Wade into law. This bill will codify the right to receive and provide reproductive healthcare, and it will prohibit States from enacting rigid, medically unnecessary restrictions that make it harder—make it harder—for women to access care.

We are not living in a hypothetical anymore. We are staring a post-Roe world in the face and the time to act is now.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle have also made it clear that if they regain control of this Chamber, they will pass a national ban on abortion rights and they may go even further.

I urge every Senator who cares about women, who cares about women's health, who cares about women's autonomy and their rights—I urge them all to join me in voting to pass the Women's Health Protection Act. Nevadans are watching, the American people are watching, and women everywhere are depending on us. We cannot let them down.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

INFLATION

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about inflation and the impact it is having on American citizens across the board and particularly energy prices and how the energy policy of the Biden administration is a big part of the problem in terms of creating the inflation that we face.

I once again urge the Biden administration to reverse course on its harmful energy agenda and instead take the handcuffs off our domestic energy producers.

Americans are struggling to afford to fill their tanks and to keep the lights on. Higher energy prices are fueling record inflation. We saw the latest statistic of 8.3 percent, which is driving up the costs of goods across the entire economy.

Yesterday, gasoline prices hit an all-time high of $4.37 a gallon nationwide, and gas is up to an average of $4.06 a gallon in my home State of North Dakota. Today, gas prices are even higher. That is about an 80-percent increase since President Biden was inaugurated, and that increase—the vast majority of that increase came before Russia invaded Ukraine.

Two years ago, our country was producing almost 13 million barrels per day of oil. Today, our country is producing about 11.3 million barrels a day—again, a direct result of the Biden administration's energy policies making it more difficult to produce energy in America.

President Biden's Green New Deal policies and hostile approach to American oil and gas have curtailed production, and Americans are paying for it every day. It began with the administration's moratorium on new energy leases—closing off access to our abundant, taxpayer-owned energy reserves.

The administration continues to hold up our ability to move more oil and gas across the country by blocking pipelines like the Keystone XL Pipeline. In 2015, the Senate and the House passed my bill, S. 1, to approve the Keystone XL Pipeline. If the Obama-Biden administration had not vetoed that bill, this pipeline would have been bringing in more than 800,000 barrels of oil a day from our closest friend and ally, Canada.

We have stranded natural gas resources in North Dakota and in other parts of the country, like West Virginia and Pennsylvania, because we can't get the permits to build the gathering systems and the pipelines to get it to market, let alone to our allies. We need LNG facilities to help our allies in Western Europe and to help Ukraine as they continue their valiant fight against Russian aggression.

If we really want to cut off the Russian war machine, we need to cut off their ability to sell energy, and that means once again embracing our Nation's most critical economic and national security assets—our country's vast oil and gas reserves. A good start would be to pass my American Energy Independence from Russia Act, which is bicameral legislation that I introduced with nine of my colleagues in the Senate. Our commonsense approach takes immediate action in encouraging U.S. energy production, including increasing access to taxpayer-owned energy reserves on Federal lands, authorizing the construction and operation of the Keystone XL Pipeline, and removing regulatory hurdles to increase liquefied natural gas exports.

North Dakota and other energy-producing States can and should be empowered to unleash the full potential of our abundant oil and gas and coal reserves as well—all of these resources.

No one does it with better environmental stewardship than we do here in America, and we need to produce that energy here in America.

It is long past time for the Biden administration to get out of the way and take the handcuffs off American energy production. Producing more energy here at home is the solution to helping lower energy costs and providing hard-working families with relief from rising inflation.

I saw that either the President or one of his spokesmen talked about the large amount of energy costs and inflation. Well, we have a solution for that. Why isn't the administration taking steps so that we can produce more energy here at home? That is what needs to happen, and that will benefit every single consumer across this great Nation.

I yield the floor.

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

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, abortion is a heavy issue. We are used to, in this body, debating marginal tax rates and debating spending bills, but this issue is different. This debate cuts to the heart of who we are, what we owe each other, what kind of society we want to preserve, and what kind of society we want to build. The moral weight of this debate is heavy.

Social media, of course, makes it worse; makes it ugly; makes it stupid. There is too little grace. There is not enough compassion. Honesty and genuine good-faith disagreements are really hard to come by. To talk about abortion well, we need to actually listen to each other, and we need to try to understand the best arguments of the other side's and take those arguments seriously.

For Democrats, debating well has to start with recognizing that most Americans believe that unborn lives deserve to be protected at some point during a pregnancy. It is deeply human and deeply compassionate to recognize the humanity of an unborn life. Scientific advances like ultrasounds give us a glimpse into the lives of the unborn, first in black and white and now in 3D, and it is going to be clearer and clearer over time what that little baby is. Any honest conversation about abortion must grapple with the fact that every abortion begins with two lives and destroys one of them. It is deeply wrong to ask Americans to participate in an act that they know takes an innocent life.

For Republicans to debate well, we need to be willing to be honest about the fact that, for some women, pregnancy can be frightening and painful. Many situations are not ideal situations. Pregnancy changes a woman's life in a way that is absolutely unique in the human experience. There is no equivalent to pregnancy. There is no example we can compare it to. That is why the pro-life cause is not and cannot ever primarily be about legislation or about policy, as important as those can be. The pro-life cause must start with active compassion for moms and babies and especially women whose first thoughts upon learning that they were pregnant was: I can't do this.

To the pro-life movement, I want to recognize your patience and your perseverance over decades. We should commend the ethic of love, persuasion, and prudence that has brought us to the place we are today.

Pro-lifers show up for women and for babies every single day. I see it all over Nebraska, and I know that it is true across all 50 States.

Pro-lifers and especially pro-life women support women through pregnancy care centers. They work in local communities to build support networks. They are persuading their neighbors and are growing a movement that supports life.

We don't have the massive war chest, the army of lawyers, or the fancy PR shops that Planned Parenthood does, but what we do have is truth and love.

Thousands of pregnancy care centers provide women and their babies with free help—with lots of free help. The volunteers who show up every day to help these women obviously don't do it for money; they do it out of love.

Thousands of pro-life families adopt kids every year, and their hearts overflow with love as they welcome a new child into their families. That is the core meaning of the pro-life movement. It is not about legislation first or about legislation second or about legislation third.

Advocates for abortion-on-demand are doing a lot of fearmongering. We have heard some bizarre speeches on the floor in the last couple of days that are so disconnected from the reality of the text of the legislation that is before us. So much of what they are pushing is wildly out of touch with the public and wildly out of touch with modern science.

We already know that America's abortion laws are far, far more permissive than Europe's and that, on this subject, our laws have a lot more in common with the human rights abusers China and North Korea than with anything in French law. The legislation before us today would make our laws even more extreme. Depending on how you count, we have the fourth to seventh most extreme pro-abortion laws of any of the 200 nations on Earth, and the legislation before the Senate today would make the U.S. position even more extreme.

There was a time when the Democratic Party talked about abortion as being safe, legal, and rare—safe, legal, and rare. Not anymore. This legislation is not from your mom's Democratic Party.

In recent years, we have taken votes on my legislation, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. It is a pretty simple, straightforward bill that aims to protect babies who survive botched abortions. There are no restrictions on abortion access in my bill, just a simple requirement that, if a baby is born alive in an abortion clinic, she must receive the same level of care she would have received had she been born in a hospital. That is it. Yet Senator SCHUMER and the abortion lobby have filibustered this legislation over and over. It is so weird.

So here we are today. The abortion industry's lobbyists have bullied Leader SCHUMER and all but one courageous Democratic Senator, my friend JOE MANCHIN, into an extreme position that doesn't reflect even the majority opinion of the Democratic Party today, let alone the position of Americans.

This bill today is ugly, winner-takes-all politics. It is full of aggressive pro-abortion provisions. Let's consider just a few.

One, it would formally create a national right to abortion up until the moment of birth in all 50 States, and it would undo even State-based partial-birth abortion bans.

Two, today's legislation would prohibit States from requiring parental consent to perform abortions on a child.

Three, it would prohibit States from passing any laws to ban sex-selective abortions. It would ban any laws that States would have to try to prevent sex-selective abortions.

It would create a right for nondoctors to perform abortions, putting women at severe risk of complications and botched procedures.

It would remove conscience protections that keep Americans from being forced to perform or fund abortions if they have moral objections. Think about that. It would force Catholic hospitals to perform abortions. That is new. That is gross.

Where is the tolerance? Where is the compassion? Where is the humanity? Where is the attempt to understand that the majority of Americans want there to be prohibitions on abortions at some point in the pregnancy?

Americans don't want the kind of radicalism we see in this bill before us today. In recent polling, 65 percent of Americans say they support banning abortion in the second trimester, and 80 percent of Americans support banning abortion in the third trimester. Why? Well, one of the reasons is because they have seen a lot of images of what a baby looks like in utero in the second and third trimester.

Just to reiterate, contrary to the last, I guess, couple of speeches ago, the last speech on this topic on the floor, 80 percent of Americans want to see abortion banned in the third trimester. It is hard to get 80 percent of Americans to agree on anything, and yet 80 percent agree that third-trimester abortions—the kind of thing that this bill wants to make sure is explicitly championed—States could not prevent and prohibit third-trimester abortions. That is what this bill is about.

This bill is incredibly extreme. There is no moderation in this bill, just brutal indifference hiding behind euphemisms. Fortunately, it won't pass. Unfortunately, our debate about it isn't very honest here. Fortunately, the pro-abortion lobby isn't winning. Majority Leader SCHUMER will earn kudos from Planned Parenthood for this show vote today, but he is not going to convince anyone.

As we look beyond today's gross vote, as we look to the future, our focus should be on continuing to grow the pro-life coalition in this country. We can and we must build support across the country for an ethic that protects life.

I want to lock arms with pro-life Democrats and work to build a culture of life. If we can pair certain pro-life laws with increased spending on prenatal care and safety nets for struggling moms, count me in. I am for that kind of big, new coalition. Let's do it.

This movement is about hearts and minds. We have got to have difficult conversations and love, and we have got to reject the kind of extremism that Senator SCHUMER is putting on the floor today pursuing this bill. We have got to focus our work on our local communities, on changing our neighbors' minds, on understanding each other, and on setting an example by putting moms and babies first.

The answer, after this bill fails today, is to remember that love is stronger than power, and that is why life is going to win. Being pro-life means being pro-science, pro-mom, and pro-baby. It means starting with love, not with legislation. Happily, it definitely doesn't mean starting with the grotesque legislation that will be voted down this afternoon.

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

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, last week, a draft opinion was leaked out of the Supreme Court, which never happens. It literally has not ever happened until now. The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court called it a betrayal of the Court.

That leak sparked protests all over the Nation and in Washington, DC, but not because two centuries of protocol in the Supreme Court was violated; it was because the Court dared to say that when the Supreme Court ruled in 1973 on Roe v. Wade, it made a mistake. In the draft opinion that was released, it stated that the opinion of 1973 exceeded the constitutional boundaries.

For 200 years, legislatures determined when life began, but in 1973 the Court determined that States cannot protect its youngest citizens of their State and created a new standard called viability, a standard that had no statement in the Constitution and no statement in Federal law. They literally created the viability standard on the spot.

The draft opinion from February of this year states that that should not have been done in 1973 and that the people in each State, in the legislatures, should determine when life begins and that they should have that decision based in law.

Apparently this body, including the Democratic majority, agrees at least with the basic finding of the Court's draft decision because the Court says these issues should be settled in legislative branches, not in the Court. And so today, a week after that draft opinion is out, Senator SCHUMER has called up a bill to actually vote on Roe v. Wade—and not just vote on Roe v. Wade, vote on a very simple decision: When does life begin?

The real question that comes up is, ''When is that child a child,'' because in the most simple of questions, for those two little ones whom I know, only a short time before would have been in the womb. So the simple question that this body is dealing with today is pretty straightforward: Who gets to decide whether she lives or dies? Who gets to pick that?

I think she should live, and for that simple statement that I believe she should have a chance at life, I have been called a totalitarian, radical extremist because I believe her life is valuable. What kind of upside-down world do we live in, when people who believe children are valuable are the extremists, are the radicals, are the totalitarians?

The day before Mother's Day, the headquarters for Concerned Women for America, a pro-life organization that speaks up for the millions of women who believe children are valuable, was attacked and vandalized. On Mother's Day—Mother's Day—just let that soak in for a minute. On Mother's Day, someone tried to burn down a pregnancy resource center in Wisconsin that provides baby formula, baby clothing, and diapers to new moms and provides ultrasounds to expectant moms. That facility they attempted to burn down, and then they spray-painted on the wall outside the building: ''If abortions aren't safe then you aren't either.''

Instead of that being condemned by the media, a journalist from Rewire saw the news story on the attack in Wisconsin and immediately tweeted out:

> More of this. May these people never know a moment of peace or safety until they rot in the ground.

Also, on Mother's Day, protesters showed up at Catholic churches around the country to protest the Catholic Church's stand for this little girl and for life. Protesters also showed up over and over in the last week at the Justices' homes to chant on bullhorns and to threaten the Justices because they dare to follow the Constitution.

A CNN commentator tweeted out:

> Concrete barriers being put up around the Supreme Court. Now we just need to lock them in there and keep them away from us—and cut off their internet access so they can't send us more opinions based on pro-rape judicial theory from the 1600s.

I have heard it all week—all week long on this floor, tweeted out by journalists, tweeted out by activists—simple statements like this: equity, privacy rights, bodily autonomy, healthcare decisions, freedom to choose, reproductive rights, basic civil rights.

All those are euphemisms for she dies. Why are people so passionate about this? Because it is not just a person in this conversation; she is in this conversation. Her future, her opportunities—that is what this conversation is about. And, for that, I am being called a radical extremist because I believe she is valuable.

Last weekend, when I was at home, I ran into someone just out and about who wanted to talk to me about this issue, about life, who was very passionate about the freedom to be able to take her life just hours before she is born. And in that conversation, as we got back and forth on it, I asked him very simply: You know it is Federal law right now that we protect turtle eggs. Turtles—if you destroy a turtle egg, it is a Federal offense with a very big fine. If you destroy an eagle egg, it is a very big offense with a Federal fine. Do you find that odd?

I am just in dialogue with this person: Do you find that odd that in Federal law we protect an eagle egg, acknowledging that is an eagle inside that egg, and we protect a turtle egg, saying we acknowledge that is a turtle inside that egg, but we allow the destruction of children?

And, to my shock, they responded: Well, turtles and eagles are endangered so they should be protected.

And I am called the extremist because I happen to believe she is precious and, just because there are billions of other humans around, I don't think she is disposable.

What are we really talking about? We are talking about the right for people to be able to speak out to their elected officials, in every State, and for each State legislature to decide on the issue of life. That is what we are talking about.

If the draft opinion ends up being the final opinion from the Court, it doesn't end abortion in America; it pushes it back out to every State and every legislative branch, including this one, to be able to have a State-by-State and a national dialogue on this simple question: When does life begin?

Some people will say at conception, as I do, and, quite frankly, as science also agrees with. That is cell division. That is unique DNA. All the makeups of her life and of my life and every other person in this room's life were there at cell division and conception in the earliest days.

Every single cell in the woman's body is exactly the same, has the same DNA in it, except for those cells. Those cells are different. They have different DNA in them. Why is there different DNA in those particular cells than

every other cell in the mom's body? Because that is a different body that is there. That is why.

Some people believe that life begins at conception. Some people believe at heartbeat. Some people believe at 15 weeks, as the Mississippi law is challenging. Some people believe at viability, others at birth.

Why don't we have that conversation? Why don't we have that dialogue? Because, quite frankly, as I think about life and I look at this baby and I look at this baby—for some reason, there are a whole bunch of people who say that baby is alive and that baby is tissue and not alive. Some people would look at this baby and this baby and would say: totally different, completely different; this baby is alive and needs to be protected, and that baby is just tissue—which is so strange to me because that baby and that baby look a lot alike to me.

I can count fingers on both. In fact, as funny as it is, they are both in the same position, which, by the way, for my wife and I, we call this the touchdown position, how babies sleep with their hands up over their heads. And lots of babies do that, including mine did. This baby is in the touchdown position and sleeping, and this one is too.

What is the difference between these two? I don't see this as alive and tissue. That looks a lot like a baby to me. And, for that, I am called the extremist and the radical.

This baby sucks their thumb in the womb, responds to their mom's voice, feels pain, has unique fingerprints, has unique DNA, kicks around like crazy. What is the difference between those two? Time. That is it. That is the only difference. Just time.

So what has been brought to the floor today? What has been brought to the floor today is this bill—this bill—the Women's Health Protection Act of 2022. Interestingly enough, that is the last time this bill uses the word ''woman.'' It doesn't use the word ''woman'' anytime after the title. It stops after that. I find that interesting.

Let me talk you through a couple of things that are in this bill. Section 2 of the bill defines ''abortion services'' and details it out but also has a nice little note that is tucked into the definition here. It defines ''viability'' and says:

> The term ''viability'' means the point in a pregnancy at which, in the good-faith medical judgment of the treating health care provider, based on the particular facts of the case before the health care provider, there is a reasonable likelihood of sustained fetal survival outside the uterus with or without artificial support.

Interestingly enough, it just basically says the doctor that is there that is providing the abortion can determine when the child is viable or not viable.

We all get the joke on this. We know what this really means. This bill is not about viability; this bill is about whatever age, at whatever time anyone wants to perform an abortion—at any moment.

In my State, we are a State that has medical marijuana laws. They say it is not recreational marijuana; it is medical marijuana. You have to have a medical prescription from a doctor to be able to get it. Do you know how you get it? The medical marijuana place actually has a doctor that you can just call that will write a script for you that will write it for no matter what. You can say: My left toe hurts every other Thursday. And they would say: Great, that is a medical condition, and you get a medical prescription for it.

We get the joke. If the person actually selling the product is the one actually prescribing it, that means you can do it at any point. This bill, itself, protects that individual, saying they can define viability and they are protected in their definition of it.

This bill is not about protecting children prior to viability. This bill is about aborting at every single stage of pregnancy, all the way up to the end, no matter how late that abortion is.

The bill doesn't just stop there. Not only is there no limit for restriction on abortion, it gives a statutory right to abortion. Even though 71 percent of Americans believe there should be some limits to abortion, this bill says no, there can't be.

Then it reaches into every State and abolishes any restrictions that may be on abortion at all in any State. For instance, if a State says there has to be more information given to a woman, like an ultrasound or just information about this child, it abolishes that, so a State cannot inform the mom before the abortion. That is prohibited.

It also abolishes any other restriction on telemedicine. It abolishes any requirement any State has on safety or health. It used to be—I heard the term from the pro-abortion crowd—''safe, legal, and rare.'' This strips away the ''safe'' term on it and says every restriction that is out there on safety has to be stripped away; no State can put a restriction out there on this.

It takes away any right of any State to actually restrict abortions being carried out on minors without parental consent. It strips away any kind of waiting period laws.

It also strips away religious exemptions. What does that mean? If a doctor or physician says: I don't want to carry out an abortion; I believe that is really a child right there, not just a lump of tissue, then that doctor says for their conscience sake—through this bill: I am sorry, your conscience doesn't matter any more. It strips away all conscience protections.

What is interesting is the Religious Freedom Restoration Act was passed in 1993. It has never ever been accepted until this bill. This bill, literally, reaches into the Religious Freedom Restoration Act and says: Your religious conscience doesn't matter. It is an abortion. Get over it. That is what this bill says.

This is not some simple codifying Roe bill. This is telling the Nation: I am sorry, you may think that little girl is a little girl and is valuable; we think she is disposable. No.

Listen, pro-life Members here, like myself, have fought to make adoption more affordable, expand the child tax credit for the unborn, continue to provide assistance, food, healthcare to needy families, maternal health. We should all be working to support women in very difficult days, but she matters in this conversation. We can't lose track of that.

Mother Teresa once made the comment:

> [I]f we accept that a mother can kill even her own child, how can we tell other people not to kill one another?

You may say, well, that is Mother Teresa's opinion that that child is a child. I would also tell you, it is Joe Biden's, as well. Joe Biden also made the statement just last week. The Dobbs' decision is about the ability to abort a child—to abort a child was President Biden's statement. I agree.

The conversation right now on the floor is what is her future? What happens next will decide a lot. I can assure you, I am going to speak about the rights for every single child and will declare, again, any child is valuable. If people call me a radical for believing children are valuable, so be it, but I think it tells us a lot about our culture that I am the radical one because I believe she has a hope and a future.

I yield the floor.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, like many Americans, I was profoundly disappointed to learn from news reports last week of the Supreme Court's draft opinion that would overturn Roe v. Wade. Roe has been the law of the land for nearly 50 years. Generations of women have relied on its protections in shaping their lives. In fact, most American women have lived their entire lives knowing they have the right to make decisions about their own bodies.

Now, the Supreme Court appears ready to take that right away with the stroke of a pen. If it does this, I believe that this Court would be ignoring precedent and gutting a half-century of progress for women. And in doing so, the Court would devalue women's health and women's lives.

Make no mistake: If this draft opinion becomes final, the consequences would be serious and would affect women throughout our country. The impacts could be devastating. According to an analysis by the New York Times, approximately half of U.S. States are poised to ban or severely restrict access to abortion if this opinion becomes final.

Some States, including Texas and Oklahoma, have already passed laws banning abortion after the sixth week of pregnancy. That is before many women even know they are pregnant. Those laws are unconstitutional today under Roe, but could be put into effect immediately if the Court strikes Roe down. Other States may go even further, either by banning abortion after

the moment of conception or by making abortion a homicide, as a Louisiana bill would do.

And several across the country have bans in place that lack any exceptions, including for rape or incest. These would take effect immediately if Roe were overturned. If these draconian State laws go into effect, women would lose the ability to make a decision about a pregnancy after experiencing a traumatic sexual assault; women could be forced to endure a pregnancy, even if that pregnancy could possibly kill them; and women could lose access to important fertility treatments like in vitro fertilization, a medical advancement that many people rely on to build their families.

These State laws could also add to the already monumental pain associated with miscarriage by dangling the threat of criminal charges over the head of any woman who loses a child during pregnancy.

The majority of Americans alive today do not remember a time before Roe became the law of the land. They don't know what it was like before the United States recognized this important right. I remember the days when abortion was illegal. I remember passing a hat in college to collect money so a classmate could go to Mexico for an abortion.

Women who could not afford to travel were forced into even more dangerous alternatives at home. They were often forced to self-induce, sometimes with a fatal result. It is these women, many who cannot afford to travel to another State for an abortion, who will be harmed the most by the Supreme Court's decision if it becomes final.

If this draft opinion should become final, around half of all American women would find themselves living in States that make access to safe abortion care difficult or impossible. And the harm from this decision will fall disproportionately on low-income, at-risk, and minority women. Forty-nine percent of women who have had an abortion live below the poverty line. And these women would be forced to travel long distances at great cost in order to secure an abortion.

For example, women who live in Mississippi now have to travel an average of 67 miles, one way, to receive an abortion. If the Court were to strike down Roe and abortion clinics were forced to shutter, women would have to drive on average nearly 500 miles, one way, to reach an out-of-state abortion clinic. That much travel would be impossible for many women, particularly those who already have young children at home, those who cannot afford the cost of the flight or gas money, or those who cannot take time off from work.

Furthermore, studies have shown that there is a direct link between lack of abortion access and maternal mortality. An analysis by the Center for American Progress shows that between 2010 and 2015, when several States enacted new laws restricting abortion access, the maternal mortality rate rose by 136 percent.

Let's be clear: Restricting a woman's legal access to abortion healthcare will not stop women from seeking out that care. It will only make the process of seeking an abortion much less safe. Many women will be forced to endure unregulated and dangerous procedures, while others will attempt self-managed medication abortions at home. Lives will be lost.

In conclusion, this potential decision by the Supreme Court would have dangerous consequences for millions of Americans. We reduce the value of a woman's life when we take away her ability to control her own body.

Now, Congress must do everything it can to ensure that individuals are able to access critical medical care and make the best decisions possible for their health. It is more important than ever that Congress passes the Women's Health Protection Act to safeguard Federal protections for women seeking abortion care. We cannot stand idly by and allow the lives of women everywhere to be endangered by this ill-conceived effort to overturn our fundamental rights.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I come to the floor in support of codifying Roe v. Wade through the Women's Health Protection Act.

As the Senate considers this vital piece of legislation today, I feel duty bound to impress upon my colleagues the grave implications should we fail to protect a women's freedom to choose.

After all, the right to choose is a fundamental right. It is the right to bodily autonomy—to decide when and how and with whom to start a family.

It is a right that, when faced with one the hardest decisions of their lives, grants women in America the peace of mind of knowing the decision is between them, their doctor, and their faith—no one else.

Last January marked 49 years since Roe v. Wade was decided—49 years since the fundamental right for women to make their own medical decisions became the law of the land.

For nearly half a century, Roe v. Wade has been decided, affirmed, and reaffirmed as a legal bedrock of the constitutional right to privacy.

Overturning it would take us back to a place no one wants to go. A dark place in history that would open the door to overturning settled decisions on critical issues.

It would jeopardize fundamental rights like the right to gay marriage, to private consensual sex between adults, and even contraception.

Voting rights, civils rights, and LGBTQI rights would all be on the chopping blocks.

It is an existential threat, not just to women, but to EVERY American.

I, for one, refuse to accept this version of our country.

I refuse to go back to the days when women, particularly low-income women and women of color, were subjected to government intrusion by male politicians who think they know best.

One of these women is named Dorothy Carlos, an 81-year old constituent of mine in Englewood, NJ. After graduating from high school, Ms. Carlos planned to go to nursing school and then maybe become a doctor. The year was 1958. After weeks without a checkup, she went in for an exam and found out she was pregnant. Ms. Carlos was 17 years old at the time. In an instant, her dreams of going to nursing school were dashed. This was before Roe v. Wade and before the right to choose.

The day Ms. Dorothy Carlos' life completely changed was nearly 65 years ago, but she still remembers it like it was yesterday. Not going to nursing school meant that she had to go on public assistance, relying on Medicaid and food stamps to provide for her family. Not having the freedom to choose stopped her career in its tracks—and when she called my office last week, her main concern was for the women who would be put in a similar position without the right to choose.

So I say again, I refuse to go back to the days when women like Ms. Carlos had their dreams deferred because they didn't have control over their own bodies. I refuse to go back to the days when abortion was illegal and, therefore, unregulated—when thousands of women a year were hospitalized and even died as a result of unsafe procedures—because, make no mistake, banning abortion does not stop abortions from happening; it just stops safe ones from being carried out. Despite what others refuse to accept, abortion is an integral part of maternal healthcare.

Just ask Monica Attias, who bravely shared her story just a few days ago about how an abortion saved her life. Twenty-two years ago, Monica had complications during her second pregnancy that left her in a medically induced coma. Her husband Philippe was told that she had a one in four chance of survival and to prepare for the worst. She thankfully survived, albeit with a heart condition that required medication.

However, 9 months after a pregnancy nearly killed her, she became pregnant again. Neither her cardiologist nor her obstetrician could guarantee that she would survive another one. The best decision for Monica Attias was to have an abortion.

As she puts it, ''I loved the children I had too much to possibly allow them to grow up without a mother because she risked her life trying to have another child.''

Given what would happen if Roe v. Wade is struck down, Monica wonders if she would have been judged at-risk enough to qualify for a legal abortion.

Thankfully, in New Jersey, the freedom to seek and obtain abortion care is protected under law. But in far too many States, 22 to be exact, overturning Roe would immediately roll

back the fundamental right to choose. Many of them would not have exceptions for rape, incest, or risks to the mother's life like Monica Attias. Some of them would ban abortions after just 6 weeks, before women like Dorothy Carlos realize they are pregnant.

I refuse to go back to patchwork of laws. Rights are rights, and I refuse a version of our country where some women have fundamental rights while other women are left behind. I refuse to stand by and let our healthcare system be split further between the wealthy and the working poor.

The freedom to make medical decisions with your healthcare provider belongs to all Americans. Every American has the right to privacy, whether you live in Nebraska or New Jersey. We will not be silent as it is stripped away.

It is why we will be voting on the appropriately named Women's Health Protection Act, to protect bodily autonomy and prevent government bans. The Women's Health Protection Act would end the undue restrictions on abortion by repealing the slew of harmful State laws that have shut down healthcare clinics and providers all across the country in recent years. It would ensure that the protections granted by Roe today are the protections granted tomorrow.

A strong majority of Americans—over 70 percent—have consistently agreed that the constitutional right to choose should be the law of the land. They support Roe v Wade, despite my Republican colleagues who are hell-bent on policing women's bodies.

These are the same colleagues who call themselves pro-life but refuse to fund maternal care, childcare, family leave, access to healthcare, education, and will never prioritize equal pay—the same Republican colleagues who would force women to give birth while opposing policies that benefit mothers, those who, after waging a decades-long war on the rights of 169 million women in our country, are now more focused on a leak than on the consequences of their misguided actions.

Today, let us reaffirm that women deserve to have the full range of options available when it comes to something as personal as the decision to start a family. Let us unequivocally and unapologetically say that reproductive rights are human rights and that an attack on the rights of women and girls is an attack on all of us.

Let us pass the Women's Health Protection Act and ensure that reproductive freedom is the law of the land across our country for this generation and for generations to come.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 10 minutes, followed by Senator MURRAY up to 5 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall votes.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Senator LANKFORD just said this bill is all about legalizing abortion any time, any place in this country. He is right, but I am going to add that this legislation is being discussed for political purposes, and we are wasting time on this issue because we could be spending time on things that people want.

I have been hearing the Democrats speak for a year and a half about the necessity of getting prescription drug prices down. Why couldn't we be talking about that instead of wasting time on this legislation that is to make a political point instead of accomplishing something?

I would like to speak, then, about the very extreme legislation being pushed by Democrats—the Women's Health Protection Act. Democrats are using a leaked Supreme Court draft—not even a final decision—as an excuse to push a very radical legislation that goes beyond public opinion or even common sense on abortion. This bill goes much further than its stated position to codify Roe v. Wade decision.

As ranking member of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I have raised many concerns about this legislation. The so-called Women's Health Protection Act would invalidate hundreds of abortion-related laws in our various States, such as clinic regulations, admitting privileges requirements, regulations on abortion-inducing drugs, reflection periods, conscience protections, sex selection bans, and limitations on the use of State funds and facilities for abortion training.

Iowa and many other States have taken action on their own to enact commonsense restrictions. I don't think this bill is common sense because it allows late-term abortions, which could be up even to the day of birth. Some States have protected individuals from having to perform abortions against their own religious beliefs.

We can't stand by as those commonsense laws are under attack by the Democrats. And this legislation attacks those laws. The bill before us would invalidate these State laws and would allow abortion providers to set the standard of care for their patients with no oversight from the States. It would allow healthcare workers to determine when a life is viable, which will lead then to inconsistent practices across the country and endanger the lives of mothers everywhere.

If the bill before us were to be signed into law, the Federal Government would send a message to States that enacting laws to protect patients and regulate the health and welfare of their citizens is not the right of the Federal Government.

It would allow Congress to intrude on States' rights and nullify lifesaving laws on the books. It would invalidate the police powers of the State under the 10th amendment in regard to those police powers affecting the health of its citizens. In addition, this bill establishes no private right for women harmed by abortions.

How can we, as Congress, stand up and say that we are protecting women when, really, this bill disregards any loss of life of babies, including full-term infants and even some mothers? Democrats claim this bill is a necessary and moderate step. How can a sweeping piece of legislation that would overrule dozens of State laws and establishing terminating a pregnancy as the only option be classified as a moderate piece of legislation? No, this proposed legislation is an example of extreme extremism.

It is unfortunate that the majority is using this issue to appear compassionate and concerned about women's rights when, in reality, the bill disregards popular and commonsense laws that protect women and children across the country. Large majorities of Americans support strong abortion restrictions this bill would overturn.

I understand and appreciate the robust debate around this subject. However, I am uncomfortable with the rhetoric of some of my colleagues. They refuse to discuss important priorities of what the American people want and only want to push one extreme option. Let me be clear. Abortion should not be promoted as a default contraception and family-planning tool. Let's have a productive discussion on what can be done to support women and families. It is important to be open with our colleagues and peers on our differences, but we must unite to protect life because every single life is precious.

The Women's Health Protection Act is an extreme piece of legislation that completely disregards human life. I intend to vote against the motion to proceed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator SCHUMER be recognized following my remarks prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, last week, the country learned that the Supreme Court is preparing to overturn Roe v. Wade, and the constitutional right to abortion, and make this the first generation of women in this country to have fewer rights than their mothers. Think about that for a second. My daughter, my granddaughters will have fewer rights than I did. I truly never thought I would say that and it breaks my heart.

These past few days have just been heart-wrenching. I have seen the emotion and I have felt it. Let me tell you something. As heartbroken as people are, they are also mad and you can't blame them. And I am mad, too, because we are watching the Supreme Court prepare to drag this country backward by half a century.

Across the country, Republicans and State legislatures are banning abortion and they are making it crystal clear they are going to go even further. They

are coming after your mail because they want to make it illegal to send abortion medication in the mail. They are coming after your birth control. They are coming after Plan B and IUDs.

And right here in the Senate, they are talking about a Federal abortion ban—a Federal abortion ban. That means a ban even in States like mine where the right to abortion is now protected. Senate Republicans want to make sure women from Seattle to New York cannot make their own healthcare decisions.

For many Republicans, this is just the beginning. But to everyone who is scared, everyone who is furious, know this: They have some big roadblocks in their way. Me, Senate Democrats, House Democrats, and millions of patients across this country who are going to stand up and speak out.

So I rise today to make sure women across the country have their voices heard. I rise to make sure Republicans have to show their true colors, to make sure every single one of them is forced to go on the record when it comes to the right to abortion, when it comes to the right of every patient to make their own decisions about their body, every mother to make their own decisions about their family, every woman to make their own decisions about the future, because while Republicans have constantly been attacking the right to abortion—and they have been pushing that day in and day out for decades, by the way—they have been almost silent on what overturning Roe v. Wade will actually mean for people.

Taking away a woman's bodily autonomy—which, let's be clear, is exactly what Republicans are talking about here—impacts her whole life. Forced pregnancy limits a woman's entire economic future. It takes away her ability to determine the direction of her own life. It forces women to be pregnant and give birth when they don't want to, no matter their individual circumstances. It hurts people in real and irreparable ways.

I know, after so many decades of precedent, an end to the right so many women have lived with their entire life seems completely unthinkable, but this is real. This is happening. And Republicans have been preparing for this for decades.

We are about to see a tidal wave of abortion bans across the country, so this vote today will force Republicans to face up to the hurt and suffering they have caused and will cause, the lives that hang in the balance.

We all know that if Roe falls, the heaviest burdens will land on those who already face the greatest challenges: mothers who are barely scraping by. It is Black women who already face a severe maternal mortality crisis. It is indigenous women, especially those on Tribal lands, who suffer from violence at unprecedented levels. It is women with disabilities, who may already face discrimination in routine medical care. It is women in rural communities, who have less resources and are often already forced to drive miles to get the care they need. It is immigrant women, especially undocumented women. It is our gay and trans neighbors, whom Republicans never seem to miss an opportunity to scapegoat or bully.

People in my State need to know this will impact them, too, and many of my colleagues know I am not one to grandstand or exaggerate the scope of a crisis that comes before the Senate. When I said this was a five-alarm fire, I meant it. We need to be clear-eyed that this will impact all of us.

For one thing, we know the healthcare crises caused by abortion bans—and that is what they are: crises—will stretch across State lines. When Texas passed a law letting people sue strangers for getting or providing an abortion, desperate patients rushed to Oklahoma, only for that State to pass an extreme ban as well, meaning more patients traveling even farther, with fewer options to get the care they need. We are seeing this firsthand in my home State of Washington. After Idaho passed a draconian abortion ban of its own, my State had to brace for incoming patients surging into Washington.

So there can be no question, if Roe is struck down nationally, if individual States across the country ban the right to abortion, people in every single State will live with the painful consequences of that decision, and they will not forget that Republicans are the ones responsible for this.

Let's also remember that Republicans have been clear, they have been explicit even, that they are not going to stop at Roe, they are not going to stop at the State level, and they are not going to stop at abortion. I can't say this enough. Republicans are already talking about passing a Federal ban on abortion. Republicans are already talking about how Griswold, the case that struck down a ban on birth control, might have been ''wrongly decided.'' Republicans are already talking about banning IUDs, Plan B. They even held a vote a few weeks ago to undermine our Federal Family Planning Program and make it harder for people to get birth control.

It is clearer than ever that because of Republicans' extremism, not only is the right to abortion at risk but other important rights are as well. That is why people are so scared, and that is why they are so shocked.

Someone back home said to me last week: What can I tell women in our State so they don't worry?

I said straight up: I am not telling anyone not to worry. I am scared, and I am frightened for women in this country more than I ever have been before.

I am very fearful, but I am also determined, and I know people across the country do not want to go backwards. They do not want politicians planning their families for them. They do not want politicians forcing people to stay pregnant. They do not want this to be the first generation of women with fewer rights than their mothers, which is why today we are now voting on the Women's Health Protection Act.

What this bill does is simple. It follows the Constitution and nearly half a century of precedent and gives the patient the right to get an abortion no matter where in America that patient or doctor lives. And the question every single Senator today is asked is simple as well: Do you trust women? Do you trust patients? Do you trust doctors? Do you believe every American should be able to make deeply personal decisions about pregnancy and parenting according to their own beliefs, without government interference?

If your answer is yes, then your vote on this bill should be as well. If your answer is no, if you think women should have fewer rights, if you think it is OK for Republican politicians to force someone else to stay pregnant or give birth when they don't want to, you are going to have to go on the record and let your constituents know that you think your personal opinion matters more than their own medical decisions. And you better believe no one will forget this.

I yield the floor.

(Disturbance in the Galleries.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senate will be in order. Thank you.

Expressions of approval are not allowed by the Gallery.

The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, may I first thank my dear friend and colleague from Washington for her powerful and heartfelt words and for her leadership as well.

Now, the question before the Senate is simple. As women's rights face their greatest threat in half a century, will this Chamber step into the breach and protect the basic right to choose? Will we enshrine into law what courts have held for decades—that decisions women make about their pregnancies belong to them and them alone—or will five unelected Justices, presiding without accountability in a courtroom across the street, take a fundamental right away from millions upon millions of women in this country?

In a few minutes, it will be time for Members to vote. The legislation before this Chamber is straightforward. It would codify what Americans already believe: that the right to choose whether or not to have an abortion belongs to women, not elected politicians. It will preserve the safeguard that conservative Justices seem ready to strike down in just a few weeks.

If they follow through with their decision, the United States, which has always aspired to the expansion of rights, will take a shameful and repressive step backward. Our kids will grow up in a country with fewer rights than those who came before them.

This decision, if formalized, would be remembered as one of the worst and most damaging cases in the entire history of the Supreme Court. So this is not a theoretical exercise, oh, no. Protecting the right to choose at this critical moment is one of the most consequential votes we could possibly take, and the American people are watching. The public will not forget which side of the vote Senators fall on today. They will not forget who voted to protect their freedoms. And they will not forget those responsible for the greatest backslide of individual liberties in half a century.

Across the country, the hard right is hell-bent on sending women's rights back to the stone age, and we in the Senate must respond. We must respond to radicals who want to ban abortions as early as 6 weeks—before many women know they are pregnant. We must respond to extremists who want to prosecute and imprison women and doctors for carrying out an abortion, and even friends who merely provide rides to clinics could end up in jail. We must respond to the swell of hard-right ideologues who openly champion restrictions without exceptions for rape or incest. We must oppose the vision that MAGA Republicans clamor for—forced pregnancies, punishment for women and doctors, and zero exceptions for rape or incest. This is not what America wants. I hope it is not what Members of this Chamber want either.

I implore everyone whose conscience has been jolted over the past week to vote in favor of today's measure. Indeed, I implore everyone who cares about the rights of not just women but of all Americans to support this measure because if five unelected Justices are allowed to decide the fates of millions of women, if the rights women have relied upon for 50 years wither away like ash, if we do not take a stand now to protect a woman's right to choose, then, mark my words, it will be open season—open season—on our God-given freedoms in this great and grand country. Today, it will be Roe. Tomorrow, it will be a national ban on abortion and beyond that, something even more dreadful.

We cannot allow this shameful backslide to happen. We cannot allow the whims of MAGA Republicans to bully the rest of the country into submission.

I urge my colleagues, take a stand. I urge my colleagues and Americans to fight back. I urge Americans and everyone here to defend the right to choose. I urge my colleagues to vote yes.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON BEDOYA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent on the Bedoya nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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 executive clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 169 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

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

(Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the nomination is confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 362, S. 4132, a bill to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard Blumenthal, John W. Hickenlooper, Jacky Rosen, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Tina Smith, Tammy Baldwin, Alex Padilla, Margaret Wood Hassan, Ben Ray Luján, Catherine Cortez Masto, Patty Murray, Elizabeth Warren, Benjamin L. Cardin, Debbie Stabenow, Tammy Duckworth, Richard J. Durbin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 4132, a bill to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 51, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 170 Ex.]

YEAS—49

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

NAYS—51

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

(Ms. BALDWIN assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. HICKENLOOPER assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 51.

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

The motion was rejected.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 865, Julia Ruth Gordon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

Charles E. Schumer, Jacky Rosen, Cory A. Booker, Elizabeth Warren, Benjamin L. Cardin, Patty Murray, Brian Schatz,

Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Chris Van Hollen, John W. Hickenlooper, Richard J. Durbin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Julia Ruth Gordon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 171 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

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

(Mr. OSSOFF assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being evenly divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julia Ruth Gordon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The majority whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all postcloture time on the Gordon nomination expire at 6 p.m. today and that upon disposition of that nomination, the Senate immediately vote on confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 809, the nomination of Philip Nathan Jefferson to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate took one of the most significant votes I have been a part of in my time in public service. While the Women's Health Protection Act didn't pass, this vote made it very clear where every Senator stands. The Republicans unanimously voted to criminalize abortion in more than half the States in America in just a few weeks. Democrats vowed to stop the Alito Court from turning the clock back on women's health by a century.

Let's be very clear about the consequences of this ruling when it becomes final. It will immediately criminalize abortion in many States. It will allow Republicans to pass a law criminalizing abortion in all 50 States. It will throw out the constitutional right to privacy—a right upon which marriage and choice and many other civil rights depend. It will put government and governments in control of women's bodies for millions and millions of people across America. This is a terrifying prospect.

It is no secret that people have been considering what would happen if and when this far-right Supreme Court would throw out Roe. Less than a month ago, I was on the floor talking about the end of Roe and the danger to Griswold v. Connecticut, the case that affirmed the right of married people to use contraception. However, it is still a shock—a gut punch—to see how eager our colleagues on the other side are to strip women of their constitutional freedoms and endanger their lives.

They are going a lot further—a lot further—than simply overturning Roe. All the talk about States' rights seems to have gone out the window. The goal is a Federal abortion ban, Federal criminalization.

Already, Republicans, including Governors and statehouse leaders, are talking about banning birth control. I will say that again. This year, 2022—not 50, 75 years ago; 2022—they are talking about banning birth control. Already, there are plans to restrict people's freedom of movement, criminalizing women who travel to other States for an abortion and even the person who gives them a ride. No sugarcoating can be done here. We are talking about enacting laws that reach beyond State borders, hearkening back to the darkest days of our history.

This far-right Alito Court has already given far-right lawmakers a green light to do what it wishes to do when it comes to abortion. There is no reason to trust this Court to draw the line at restricting women's freedom of movement.

Another closely related issue that ought to frighten millions of women is the prospect that, with abortion criminalized, women's personal data is going to be weaponized against them by bounty hunters and the government.

I have been sounding the alarm for years about the abuse of location data taken from people's cell phones. In a world where Sam Alito is in charge of abortion laws, that is one massive, massive crisis. Shady data brokers are already tracking women who go to Planned Parenthood clinics, and they will sell that data to anybody around who has a credit card. Imagine for a moment what not just prosecutors but these deranged far-right vigilantes can do with this data. The apps women use, the websites they visit, the places they go—all of it can be used against them by prosecutors.

In short, this is uterus surveillance. That is what is coming down the pike unless Congress acts and gets serious about consumer privacy and prohibiting the government from making end runs around the Fourth Amendment.

It is a shock to me how little concern there seems to be for some of these big issues. It is a full-out sprint toward massive government overreach and severe restrictions on women's freedom and privacy.

There is zero thought—zero—given to victims of rape. There is zero thought—zero thought—given to victims of incest. There is zero thought to women being exploited after being forced to seek back-room abortions, zero thought given to how many more women will die—die—as a result of this ruling. Complications during pregnancy could become a death sentence in States like Texas, where law enforcement has already shown the willingness to arrest a woman for having a miscarriage. A woman's tragedy of losing a baby can be compounded by the very real threat of criminal prosecution.

Through all of this, abortions will still happen; they will just happen in conditions that are much less safe than they are now.

I know that there are Members on the other side who are always quoted as saying they care about these issues. They have been saying it for years. Yet now the Senate is at this moment. Not a single Republican Senator voted to protect the law as it stands today.

The vast majority of people in Oregon and all across the country oppose what the Alito Court is inflicting on them by tossing out Roe. This is extreme judicial radicalism, proof that these Justices were pretty much blowing smoke when they told Senators they would respect precedent if they were confirmed.

The bottom line now is this: If you don't have control over your own body, you are not free. The Alito Court is denying women control over their own

bodies. This is an attack on their freedom, a denial of Americans' right to privacy.

Criminalizing abortion is wrong, plain and simple. And you have to ask and certainly people from one end of the country to another tonight are going to ask, how can this be allowed to stand?

Tonight is not the end of this battle. The Senate has taken one vote. Now Americans must cast their vote and make it clear whether they want to be part of MITCH MCCONNELL's new reality.

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

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

INFLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about America's inflation crisis. And it is a crisis.

Today, Americans woke up to basically two gut punches: One, they found that gas prices are the highest they have ever been—ever—in the history of this country and, the second, that the inflation number is still incredibly high and actually higher than was anticipated by the government's so-called specialists.

Well, last week, the senior Senator from Illinois came to this floor, and he said Republicans want the midterm elections to be about inflation and the border. I think the Senator intended his comments to be a criticism of Republicans, but I would point out to the Senator from Illinois, that is exactly what the American people say this election ought to be about: inflation and the border. It is not Republicans who are making that the election issue for 2022. No, it is what the American people say they want to vote on.

Frankly, it is also the Democrats because they created both of these crises. So this is going to be an up-or-down vote on how well the Democrats have done with the border and with our economy and the inflation that is crushing so many families at home all across the country.

Nobody forced the Democrats to vote to cram a $2 trillion spending bill through Congress last March. Oh, no. Party-line vote—the Democrats in this body, NANCY PELOSI and the Democrats in the House, and Joe Biden only 2 months into his Presidency. Democrats said: Oh, no, no. It is coronavirus.

That is what they said it was for, but when you take a look at that bill, only $1 out of every $11 actually went for medical care. The rest went to a big Democrat wish list that includes government checks to illegal immigrants. These are criminals behind bars who received checks from the government in the name of coronavirus relief. Nobody forced the Democrats to open the southern border. So the crisis that we have of inflation and the crisis that we have on the border are both crises of choice by the Democrats.

Now, here we are, 15 months into the Democrats' administration. The No. 1 issue in America today is inflation—40-year-high inflation numbers. Nine out of 10 Americans—Mr. President, I would just point out 9 out of 10 Americans hardly ever agree on anything, but 9 out of 10 Americans are concerned and upset about inflation. It is really not hard to see why.

This week, just like last week, terrible economic news for working families: gas prices, again, at an alltime high. The price of a gallon of gasoline today is $2 higher for each and every gallon when people go to fill up than the day Joe Biden became President. This morning, a new alltime high. Yesterday an alltime high. Higher yet this morning for gasoline. Inflation, a 40-year high.

The prices are going up much faster than wages. In fact, this gap between prices and wages continues to grow. People are falling further and further behind. The average family is poorer today than they were the day Joe Biden took office in terms of their ability to buy goods and services in our economy from the dollars they have in their pockets. This is even for people who have gotten raises.

People can't afford necessities like baby formula, if they can find baby formula—a hard time finding that all across the country. It finally made the national news last night, but I have been hearing about it in Wyoming now for a number of weeks.

Credit card debt is also near an alltime high. Why? Because people in the Biden economy are having to borrow more and more money just to get by. And the interest rates on these credit cards are also at an alltime high. So people are being punished again and again and again in so many ways that they turn in the Biden economy. People are paying more and more and getting less and less, and people are not happy.

People have been pushed to the breaking point, and they are angry. And they are angry at the Democrats, who put us, as a Nation, into this mess. Americans haven't been this pessimistic about the economy since the great recession. When they look at Washington, DC, they see a Senate with CHUCK SCHUMER claiming to be in charge, a majority in the Senate; they look at NANCY PELOSI claiming to be in charge of the House and Joe Biden in the White House saying he is in charge there.

Yet the President spoke yesterday and spoke today, and for the people in charge, he wants no responsibility for what is happening in this country with this economy. He said it yesterday. He said it again today. He was full of blame, full of excuses, full of not telling the truth to the American people. He blamed somebody else.

It took him just 30 minutes in his speech. Joe Biden blamed—let me go through this whole list of the folks he blamed in just 30 minutes. He blamed coronavirus. He blamed Russia. He blamed meatpacking. He blamed shipping. He blamed Republicans. He blamed oil companies. He blamed everybody but himself.

At the same time, he actually admitted in the speech that Democrats are in power. They don't have power to do anything other than blame other people. He admitted that Democrats control the White House and the House and the Senate.

We do not have a Harry Truman moment here, who said, ''The buck stops here.'' Oh, no, no. Joe Biden keeps trying to pass the buck. He has been finger-pointing at Republicans, and in doing so, he earned three Pinocchios from the Washington Post. Those are the people who look into this and say, Is the President really telling the truth? No, no, no. Three Pinocchios.

Yet Joe Biden, after receiving that grade, the failing grade from the Washington Post, he repeated the same lie yesterday, finger-pointing again and again. He is telling people that he cut spending. He hasn't. In fact, Joe Biden has been the most economically reckless President in the history of this country—reckless.

The American people remember that Joe Biden took $2 trillion on the credit card with a bill that he had passed by the House and the Senate and signed in March. He was gleeful at the signing ceremony. He signed the single most expensive spending bill in the history of the country.

Inflation started soon thereafter. The crisis mounted month after month after he had signed the bill. Oh, you remember when the President said: Oh, it is transitory. Forget about it. Don't look over there. Go away quickly.

Month after month after month, the President dismissed it, ignored it, denied it. The American people remember that, just 6 months later, Joe Biden tried to pass another massive spending bill. Joe Biden has never cut a dime of spending in his life, but he has added trillions of dollars to our debt.

What did he get us? The worst inflation in 40 years and a stagnant economy. There are still a million fewer Americans working today than there were before the pandemic struck.

Under Joe Biden, we have created a lot fewer jobs than the economists expected. The economists have gotten it wrong again and again. They got it wrong in terms of how many jobs they expected to be made, and they got it wrong today when they thought what the inflation rate would be. And, in both cases, their projections were more optimistic than the actual results turned out to be.

Last year, we created fewer jobs in America than were projected without the spending bill, and he said the

spending bill was going to get us more jobs.

Economists' projections of our economy just keep going lower and lower and lower. Now the experts are predicting a recession. A recession is when the economy shrinks for 6 months. We are already halfway there. In the first 3 months of this year, the economy did shrink. Why? Well, because of inflation.

As former Obama economic adviser Austan Goolsbee said on Friday, it is an awful situation. Oh, yes, it is. High inflation is going to lead to higher interest rates, which will slow down our economy even more.

Last week, the Federal Reserve issued the biggest hike in interest rates in 22 years. The Fed also indicated that it is just the beginning; we are going to have more rate hikes coming. This will slow down the economy even further.

And on top of all this, this may be too little, too late by an administration that is very slow on the trigger. The damage of inflation has been done. The average American family today is paying $100 a week more just to buy the same things that they bought last year. That is $5,200 a year more this year than last year because of the way Joe Biden has mishandled and mismanaged our American economy.

Prices are going up. Interest rates are going up. The economy is slowing down. What is Joe Biden going to do? Regrettably, he is trying to double down.

So to the senior Senator from Illinois, the midterm elections, as he said, will be about inflation and will be about the crisis and the chaos at the southern border, whether the Senator likes it or not.

The American people are suffering. They feel stuck. They feel stressed. They feel squeezed. They are begging and pleading with Democrats in Washington: Stop the reckless spending. Unleash American energy. We have plenty of it in the ground. Let us get it out and bring this Democrat inflation nightmare to an end.

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

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

NOMINATION OF JULIA RUTH GORDON

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on the nomination of Julia Gordon to serve as HUD Assistant Secretary and Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration, or FHA.

First, some context. Under President Biden, inflation has risen to an astounding 40-year high, as we all know and as we are reminded every day by prices all around us. But inflation isn't the only thing rising under President Biden's watch; so is violent crime. Many cities across the country saw a rise in murders last year, continuing a surge in the national homicide rate to its highest level in over two decades.

We are facing a crimewave, and how have our local Democratic leaders responded? Well, often, we have radical prosecutors who recommended lenient sentences for violent felons. Some are even declining to prosecute whole categories of offenses. Some States have adopted so-called bail reform that is designed to keep offenders from jail entirely. And we can't forget the Democrat efforts to defund the police.

Police have been vilified for easily 2 years now, and what has been the result? Shootings, assaults, and killings of police officers have been on the rise since 2020. Budget cuts have forced veteran police officers into retirement. Municipalities are having real trouble finding new police recruits and, in many cases, keeping the police they currently have on their force.

We should be doing everything we can to support the police who risk their lives to keep us safe.

Despite these terrible developments, the administration has repeatedly nominated individuals with these strong anti-police views. Consider some examples. There is Federal district court judge Nusrat Choudhury, an ACLU lawyer who falsely claimed that ''cops kill unarmed Black men in America every single day.'' When Senator KENNEDY confronted her 2 weeks ago about this demonstrably false anti-police statement, she defended it as ''rhetorical advocacy.'' In addition, multiple Biden administration nominees have expressed support for defunding the police, including HUD nominee Solomon Greene and Kristen Clarke and Vanita Gupta.

With National Police Week starting this Sunday, what a terrible message the Senate is sending to law enforcement by having voted yesterday to confirm Lisa Cook for the Federal Reserve. Professor Cook publicly called for the firing of a professor—a colleague of hers—because he dared to criticize the ''defund the police'' movement. She actually encouraged donations to the very bail funds that were helping criminals get out of jail during the riots after George Floyd was killed. She also insulted U.S. police officers by comparing their actions to the ''heavy-handed tactics'' of the Russian police.

Now, to make matters worse, the Senate is being asked to confirm Julia Gordon for FHA Commissioner. Ms. Gordon has a history of very troubling statements denigrating the police. Among other things, she retweeted an inflammatory post that described police officers as ''the people killing us.'' That is how she describes the police.

She also suggested in a letter that she wrote—not a tweet or retweet, a letter she wrote—that cases of police violence are not just outliers but ''stem from flawed and biased systems that require structural change.'' Ms. Gordon's insinuation that the institution of policing itself requires structural change because police officers are racist—that idea is offensive and, in my view, should disqualify her from holding a senior position in the Federal Government, and that view is shared by the National Sheriffs' Association, a leading law enforcement group which has publicly opposed her nomination.

Ms. Gordon has also spread caustic rhetoric about her fellow Americans residing in Southern States. She retweeted an article that asserted that the South ''has rejected nearly everything that's good about this country and has become one big nuclear waste site of choleric, and extremely racialized, resentment.''

She has repeatedly disparaged elected Republican officials, including our colleagues Senator GRAHAM and Senator PAUL and former Vice President Pence. Having spread such partisan views, it is hard to imagine her working cooperatively with both parties in Congress to help all American households.

Unfortunately, we don't know the full extent of Ms. Gordon's public statements because she deleted some of her previously public tweets before being nominated. I asked her to try to recover her deleted tweets from Twitter because that is possible, but she refused to comply with this very reasonable request. It kind of makes you wonder, what does she have to hide?

During the nomination process, Ms. Gordon has tried to walk back her past statements, but I think we should focus on what she said before she was nominated and needed the Senate's approval.

I am reminded of something that the poet Maya Angelou said:

> When someone shows you who they are, believe them the first time.

That is good advice when it comes to nominees, especially Ms. Gordon.

If Ms. Gordon's anti-police views and hostility toward one of our two political parties are not sufficient for some of my colleagues to oppose her, I urge them to look at her record on housing policy.

Despite record home and rental prices, Ms. Gordon advocates for throwing more taxpayer money at the housing market despite the fact that it is government intervention that has caused the massive inflation we have seen or a large part of the massive inflation we have seen in the housing market.

As we prepare to start National Police Week this Sunday, I urge my colleagues: Stand up for law enforcement by opposing Julia Gordon.

I ask President Biden to nominate a less radical nominee, someone who supports the police, someone who can garner bipartisan support and who won't exacerbate rising housing costs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks before the vote.

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

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to support Julia Gordon, who is very, very qualified.

There is a pattern of Republicans blocking very qualified women in this body—very qualified women nominees for all kinds of jobs. We see it night after night after night. I could cite lots of examples. They will say, ''Well, we support women for jobs that aren't quite as important,'' but these really key, extraordinarily important jobs—the Federal Reserve, FHFA, the Ex-Im Bank, certainly this job at HUD—we know—we can read between the lines. Let's just leave it at that.

Ms. Gordon made clear that she doesn't support defunding the police. People have done all kinds of things on social media on both sides, left and right. We can make all our decisions based on something somebody retweeted, but it is not the way to run a government. We know that.

I urge my colleagues to support Ms. Gordon, who is highly qualified—decades of experience—and has broad support from the Mortgage Bankers Association, the Manufactured Housing Institute, and Habitat for Humanity. Her support is bipartisan. Brian Montgomery, FHA Commissioner under George W. Bush and HUD's Deputy Secretary under Donald Trump, wrote in support.

Ms. Gordon served as president of the National Community Stabilization Trust, the nonprofit that supports neighborhood revitalization and affordable home ownership. Before that, she served as the manager of the single-family policy team at the Federal Housing Finance Agency, FHFA, working to help families stay in their homes.

She has devoted her life to housing. She has helped people get an opportunity to live decent lives in clean, affordable, safe housing.

She has led a whole team of policy analysts overseeing all aspects of single-family mortgage policy at Fannie and Freddie. Hundreds of thousands of homeowners and seniors with FHA loans and reverse mortgages are at risk of losing their homes, either because they are falling behind or they are exiting forbearance. At this critical time, we need her on the job immediately.

Unfortunately, my colleagues on the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee thought it important to delay, delay, delay, to slow-walk, slow-walk, slow-walk, to boycott, boycott, boycott. The Presiding Officer today has seen it up close as a member of that committee.

Her breadth of experience will help her work with a variety of stakeholders to design policies across the Office of Housing that will strengthen families and communities and help us bring down the cost of housing.

I urge my colleagues to confirm Julia Gordon today. Let's do our jobs. Let's focus on the results Americans care about and expect from their public servants.

WOMEN'S HEALTH PROTECTION ACT

Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of keeping Roe v. Wade, the legislation that the Senate failed to pass earlier today. I will enter my remarks in the RECORD. I just want to highlight a couple of things that we don't want MITCH MCCONNELL, we don't want Governor DeWine in my State making personal health decisions for Ohio.

I want Ohio women to make those decisions. I certainly don't want the State legislature in my State making those decisions, when these decisions are the most personal decision that a woman and perhaps her religious counselor, perhaps her doctor—her doctor and her partner should be making those decisions.

Men often don't understand how women's bodies work and how preventive care like birth control works. This is not just about Roe. This ruling would open the door to all kinds of other government interference into people's most personal, private decisions.

I would—and I have seen—a State legislator in Ohio said if a woman is raped and gets pregnant, there is an opportunity for that woman. That was said by sort of a typical far-right legislator in Ohio, and she is one of the leaders in the next step—what they are going to do on issues of women's health in my State legislature. It is important we act.

I know there are other things we are going to do in this body, and I will support those efforts to make sure that women—not MITCH MCCONNELL and Mike DeWine—make decisions about women's health.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON GORDON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All postcloture time has expired.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gordon nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 172 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

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

(Ms. SMITH assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative, and the nomination is confirmed.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will report the next nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Philip Nathan Jefferson, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2022.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 1 minute prior to the vote.

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

NOMINATION OF PHILIP NATHAN JEFFERSON

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I urge my colleagues to vote for Dr. Philip Jefferson.

Dr. Philip Jefferson is one of the country's leading thinkers on the economics of poverty, and he will be a key voice on the Fed as it tackles inflation. He is the vice president for academic affairs, dean of faculty, and a Paul B. Freeland professor of economics at Davidson College. He will serve alongside Dr. Cook. It will mark the first time ever that two Black Governors will have served on the Board at the same time. Dr. Jefferson grew up here in Washington in the shadow of RFK Stadium. His first job out of school was to work at the Federal Reserve. He literally wrote the book on the economics of poverty.

He was voted out by the presiding officers of my Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee, unanimously, on a strong bipartisan vote. He will fiercely guard the Fed's independence.

I urge my colleagues to vote for Dr. Philip Jefferson for the Federal Reserve.

VOTE ON JEFFERSON NOMINATION

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

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Ex.]

YEAS—91

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Barrasso	Hickenlooper	Risch
Bennet	Hirono	Romney
Blackburn	Hoeven	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Booker	Inhofe	Rubio
Brown	Johnson	Sanders
Burr	Kaine	Sasse
Cantwell	Kelly	Schatz
Capito	Kennedy	Schumer
Cardin	King	Scott (SC)
Casey	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cassidy	Lankford	Shelby
Collins	Leahy	Sinema
Coons	Lee	Smith
Cornyn	Luján	Stabenow
Cortez Masto	Lummis	Sullivan
Cramer	Manchin	Tester
Crapo	Markey	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Duckworth	Menendez	Van Hollen
Durbin	Merkley	Warner
Ernst	Moran	Warnock
Feinstein	Murkowski	Warren
Fischer	Murphy	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murray	Wicker
Graham	Ossoff	Wyden
Grassley	Padilla	Young
Hagerty	Peters	
Hassan	Portman	

NAYS—7

Boozman	Hawley	Tuberville
Braun	Paul	
Cotton	Scott (FL)	

NOT VOTING—2

Blunt	Carper

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY).

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

The Senator from Washington.

CONFIRMATION OF ALVARO M. BEDOYA

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I rise tonight to highlight the significance of the vote we took earlier today, and that is to confirm Alvaro Bedoya to be Commissioner of the Federal Trade Commission.

Not only is this a critical moment for us to act and help American consumers, Alvaro Bedoya is the right person to get this job.

The FTC is the first line of defense for consumers. And if a company is lying to its customers about their products and what they can do or teaming up with competitors to keep prices high, the FTC is the officer on the beat to stop bad actors and to protect those consumers.

Now we need the FTC more than ever. We needed them during the COVID pandemic when scammers were looking to capitalize on the pandemic and stole $5.9 billion out of the pocketbooks of Americans. That is just the amount that was consumer reported. It doesn't include people who never knew they were scammed or were too embarrassed to report their losses.

Just as we needed them then, we need them to continue to help us during the pandemic to stop scammers from selling fake cures and counterfeit masks. We need them to tackle rising prices that threaten all of us today.

Protecting consumers is a bipartisan issue. In the Senate, we worked across the aisle to support the FTC, and Congress pumped the FTC's power at the end of 2020 when we passed the COVID–19 Consumer Protection Act to help root out the promoters of dangerous fake treatments and cures. We also gave the FTC $30 million in the American Rescue Plan to protect Americans against these scams.

Today, we will take this important step in helping to protect consumers by having Mr. Bedoya fill the last seat on the Federal Trade Commission. He has the right experience to tackle some of the most complicated and pressing issues that we have, that we are facing regarding a variety of issues from privacy to online privacy.

Being the Founding Director of the Center of Privacy and Technology at Georgetown Law where he was a professor, he did amazing work. And prior to joining Georgetown, he served as Chief Counsel of the U.S. Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology, and the Law.

Many of my colleagues know Mr. Bedoya; and I am glad his nomination finally has passed here in the Senate, and we look forward to working with him.

NOMINATION OF ADMIRAL LINDA L. FAGAN

Mr. President, I also want to speak about the historical significance of another nominee that will be voted on shortly. Tonight, hopefully, in the wrap-up, we will be passing on the nomination of Admiral Linda Fagan to be the next Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard. The Coast Guard serves the American people by safeguarding life at sea, protecting the environment, and ensuring our national security.

The role of Commandant is to lead the Coast Guard's approximately 55,000 Active Duty, reserve, and civilian workers, and approximately 26,000 volunteers in the execution of the Coast Guard's 11 different missions.

From managing vessel traffic, to tackling drug smugglers, to saving lives in rough seas, to protecting endangered marine life, no military service does more with fewer resources. Yet the Coast Guard's mission is only growing. The Coast Guard faces unprecedented environmental and geopolitical challenges.

Due to the increasing threat of climate change, men and women of the Coast Guard must respond to increasing and frequent severe weather disasters. In the Arctic, where melting ice sheets provide new opportunities for shipping and tourism and transportation, it is very important that the Coast Guard play a major role in making sure that we know how and have the capacity for the United States to lead in icebreaking capacity through the Arctic.

Admiral Fagan assumed the role of Vice Commandant in June of 2021, and she led the largest modernization and shipbuilding effort of the Coast Guard fleet since World War II.

But I want people from the Northwest to know she started her career on the *Polar Star*, a 399-foot icebreaker homeported in Seattle. During her career, she served on all seven continents.

She has held numerous leadership positions, including more than 15 years as a marine inspector and commander for Sector New York, commander for Coast Guard District 1 where she led all Coast Guard operations in New England, and Commander of the Pacific Area in charge of Coast Guard operations across the entire Pacific.

She has an impressive science background, with a bachelor's degree in marine science from the Coast Guard Academy and two master's degrees—one of which is from the University of Washington—in marine affairs.

In addition to her extraordinary qualifications, Admiral Fagan will be the first woman and mother to lead the Coast Guard. She will also be the first woman to lead any branch of our armed services.

Now, more than ever, we must have a strong, tested leader as Commandant. It is clear from her record that Admiral Fagan is the right woman to do her job.

I look forward to working with her to ensure the men and women of the Coast Guard have the tools they need to execute their mission and support their families. And it means continuing to make investments on shore infrastructure, aircraft, and, as I mentioned earlier, our polar icebreakers.

But just as we have fought hard to work with the Coast Guard and their people, it is time to work with Commandant Fagan to continue the hard work to expand paid family leave policies, to improve access to childcare, to champion efforts to retain women and underrepresented minorities serving in the Coast Guard.

Recently, we helped secure $429 million for the Coast Guard infrastructure in the infrastructure bill and $120 million of that investment will go to construction of onsite childcare facilities.

As our working mothers and working daughters serve in the Coast Guard, Admiral Fagan knows the realities of a

Coast Guard family. She knows that with 40 percent of the Coast Guard being women, we need to have good policies that will continue to encourage them to stay in the Coast Guard and move up in leadership, just as she has done. I know under her, we will build world-class, state-of-the-art facilities to help all our Coasties and all our Coast families. I know that we will continue to be proud of the mission of the Coast Guard in continuing to have those many, many challenges that they help us deal with every single day.

But tonight, we are doing more than just helping. We are confirming Admiral Fagan. We are sending a strong message to women serving in the Coast Guard. We are sending a strong message to women cadets and the Academy and training people at Cape May. We are sending a strong message to young girls who dream of someday serving in the Coast Guard. We are saying now, that the leader of this organization, that your service matters, your contribution to the Coast Guard and to the country matters, and, yes, you too can be Commandant someday.

I want to thank Admiral Fagan for her tremendous service, and I thank my colleagues for joining me tonight to vote to confirm Admiral Linda Fagan to be Commandant of the U.S. Coast Guard.

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.

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

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

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, pursuant to S. Res. 27, the Committee on Commerce being tied on the question of reporting, I move to discharge the Committee on Commerce from further consideration of the nomination of Mary T. Boyle, of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions of S. Res. 27, there will now be up to 4 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided, between the two leaders or their designees, with no motions, points of order, or amendments in order.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 777, Christopher Joseph Lowman, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense; that the Senate vote on the nomination without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be notified immediately of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 909, 910, 911, 912, 913, 914; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Coast Guard to the grade indicated under title 14 U.S.C., section 2121(d):

To be rear admiral

Michael H. Day

The following named officer for appointment as Deputy Commandant for Operations, a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 305:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Peter W. Gautier

The following named officer for appointment as Vice Commandant in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated pursuant to the authority of title 14, U.S.C., section 304:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Steven D. Poulin

The following named officer for appointment as Commandant in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated pursuant to the authority of title 14, U.S.C., section 302:

To be admiral

Adm. Linda L. Fagan

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 305:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Kevin E. Lunday

The following named officer for appointment to a position of importance and responsibility in the United States Coast Guard and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 305:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Andrew J. Tiongson

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MASSACRE AT AHUAS, HONDURAS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, 10 years ago today a joint counternarcotics team of Honduran security agents and U.S. Drug Enforcement Administration—DEA—officers opened fire on a water taxi as it approached Ahuas, a small town located in the remote Mosquitia region of northeastern Honduras.

The canoe-like taxi was carrying families traveling between the indigenous Miskito villages that populate the shores of the Patuca River when it was shot at repeatedly by the counternarcotics officers, leaving two women, a teenage boy, and a 21-year-old man dead and several other passengers injured. While the Honduran police announced that a ''successful'' drug interdiction mission had taken place, journalists and human rights advocates reported the victims were unarmed and had no known links to drug trafficking.

Instead of taking responsibility, assessing their mistakes, and examining their methods and partnerships with Honduran security forces, DEA and State Department officials obstructed U.S. and Honduran investigations of the incident and falsely reported to Members of Congress, including my staff, that the boat's passengers had fired on security forces. They also insisted that the DEA bore no responsibility for the discharging of weapons and had only played a supportive and advisory role during the mission. After the horrifying events of May 11, 2012, the DEA continued joint operations using battlefield tactics in the area that resulted in two more fatal shootings. Following one of these incidents, the Honduran police team leader was reported to have been instructed by his superiors to plant a weapon into evidence.

It was only thanks to a joint Department of Justice and Department of State Inspector General investigation report—published 5 years ago—that Congress was able to learn the truth about Ahuas and the two other fatal shootings. DEA agents had in fact played a central, leading role in the lethal operation. They had ordered a Honduran machine gunner to open fire on the water taxi and never verified whether DEA weapons had been discharged. The DEA's repeated assertions that someone on the boat had fired a weapon were found to not be credible.

As senior DEA officials obstructed the work of the inspector generals, it was not until 5 years after the Ahuas shooting that the victims were finally cleared of any wrongdoing. But justice for the victims and their families remains elusive. Though the lives of those left behind have been shattered, some by debilitating injuries and others by the loss of parents and breadwinners, they have not received fair compensation, and they have languished in dire poverty. The wrongful actions that resulted in their injuries or the death of their loved ones have not been punished in any way. Those who misled Congress, willfully concealing their agencies' deadly errors, were not disciplined at all, and one senior official even received a promotion. The U.S. Embassy and the DEA coordinated this operation with the Honduras National Police Director Juan Carlos Bonilla. Today, Bonilla is in custody after being extradited to the U.S., charged with ordering assassinations in support of drug traffickers protected by former President Juan Orlando Hernandez.

In honor of these and other victims of deadly errors committed by U.S. counternarcotics agents abroad, it is imperative that we hold ourselves and our institutions accountable and that we recognize our mistakes and correct them. If we claim to believe in justice and the rule of law, we cannnot allow Federal officials to misrepresent the facts and cover up their wrongdoing when reporting to Congress.

We must also provide support to victims of the so-called drug war, not stigmatize and slander them, and examine the impact that our approach to drug interdiction has on areas like the Moskitia. It was obvious soon after the massacre that those who had directed and carried it out had minimal knowledge of the people and communities of that isolated area. They rushed to judgment, assuming that anyone traveling that river, no matter how impoverished, must be in some way involved in trafficking drugs and therefore a legitimate target of lethal force. Those who pay the price for militarized policing and for the corruption and violence drug trafficking organizations use to protect their activities are the most vulnerable: indigenous communities like Ahuas and the human rights activists who defend the rights of those caught in the crossfire.

I wish I could say that the DEA and the State Department have learned the lessons of Ahuas. But that will not be possible until those who fired on those innocent people and lied about it are brought to justice and until the victims are properly compensated and cared for. That is the shared responsibility of the U.S. and Honduran Governments.

RECOGNIZING THE 2022 AMERICAN AMBULANCE ASSOCIATION STARS OF LIFE

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the paramedics, emergency medical technicians—EMTs—and other emergency medical services—EMS—professionals across the country who provide vital 9–1-1 emergency and nonemergency medical care across this country. These healthcare professionals are on the frontlines and put the needs of their patients before their own. I would like to recognize, in particular, those EMS professionals being honored last week as ''Stars of Life'' by the American Ambulance Association.

Every year, the dispatch of an ambulance is the first response to millions of medical emergencies. Often, the survival of a patient hinges on the prompt medical attention provided by paramedics and EMTs prior to the arrival at an emergency room. As a result of the selfless acts of these courageous and devoted individuals, thousands of Americans lives are saved each year. This was especially true during the COVID–19 pandemic as paramedics and EMTs provided medical care, vaccinations, testing, and ambulance transport for 24 hours a day and 7 days a week. These professionals deserve our utmost gratitude.

For the past 30 years, the American Ambulance Association has honored those paramedics, EMTs, dispatchers, and other ambulance service personnel who exemplify what is best about the EMS field. The American Ambulance Association has appropriately designated these exceptional individuals as ''Stars of Life.''

I am especially proud of the six Stars of Life from our State of Arkansas. Devin Holland, Kenneth Jenkins, Randy Murry, Amanda Nesbitt, Alvin Short of Pafford EMS in Hope, and Benny Ford of Medic One Ambulance in Jonesboro. These six professionals help ensure that Arkansans have vital and often lifesaving ambulance services within their communities.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:04 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7691. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the situation in Ukraine for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 3182. An act to provide that inclined sleepers for infants and crib bumpers shall be considered banned hazardous products under section 8 of the Consumer Product Safety Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6023. An act to require the United States Postal Service to continue selling the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp until all remaining stamps are sold, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

At 11:53 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 1097. An act to establish a Federal rotational cyber workforce program for the Federal cyber workforce.

S. 2201. An act to manage supply chain risk through counterintelligence training, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6015. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Benjamin Berell Ferencz, in recognition of his service to the United States and international community during the post-World War II Nuremberg trials and lifelong advocacy for international criminal justice and rule of law.

H.R. 6614. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4744 Grand River Avenue in Detroit, Michigan, as the ''Rosa Louise McCauley Parks Post Office Building''.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 6614. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4744 Grand River Avenue in Detroit, Michigan, as the ''Rosa Louise McCauley Parks Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

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

S. 4190. A bill to provide for the independent and objective conduct and supervision of audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to Ukraine for military, economic, and humanitarian aid.

S. 4191. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for the establishment or operation of the Disinformation Governance Board in the Department of Homeland Security.

H.R. 7691. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the situation in Ukraine for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME (LEGISLATIVE DAY MAY 10, 2022)

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 7691. An act making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the situation in Ukraine for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

S. 4190. A bill to provide for the independent and objective conduct and supervision of audits and investigations relating

to the programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to Ukraine for military, economic, and humanitarian aid.

S. 4191. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for the establishment or operation of the Disinformation Governance Board in the Department of Homeland Security.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4078. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting six (6) legislative proposals relative to the President of the United States' Fiscal Year 2023 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4079. A communication from the General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2021 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4080. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Equal Employment and Workplace Inclusion, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's fiscal year 2021 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4081. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; FAR Case 2016–002, Applicability of Small Business Regulations Outside the United States'' (RIN9000–AN34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–4082. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of the Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Operation Allies Welcome Afghan Evacuee''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4083. A communication from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting legislative proposals relative to child exploitation and obscenity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4084. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Temporary Increase of the Automatic Extension Period of Employment Authorization and Documentation for Certain Renewal Applications'' (RIN1615–AC78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2022; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4085. A communication from the Section Chief of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of 5F–EDMB–PINACA, 5F–MDMB–PICA, FUB–AKB48, 5F–CUMYL–PINACA, and FUB–144 in Schedule I'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–491)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2022; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4086. A communication from the Section Chief of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Requiring Online Submission of Applications for and Renewals of DEA Registration'' ((RIN1117–AB58) (Docket No. DEA–587)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2022; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4087. A communication from the Section Chief of the Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Daridorexant in Schedule IV'' ((21 CFR Part 1308) (Docket No. DEA–949)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2022; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–4088. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on the Social and Economic Conditions of Native Americans, Fiscal Year 2018''; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–4089. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Modernization of the Labeling and Advertising Regulations for Distilled Spirits and Malt Beverages'' (RIN1513–AB54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 28, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4090. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting six (6) legislative proposals relative to the President of the United States' Fiscal Year 2023 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4091. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–22008'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (FAA–2021–1169)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4092. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21973'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (FAA–2021–0828)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4093. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–22014'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (FAA–2021–1078)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 6, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4094. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 565'' ((RIN2120–AA63) (Docket No. 31426)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4095. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment and Removal of Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Eastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1021)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4096. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment and Amendment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route Q–73; Twenty Palms, CA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0704)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4097. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of J–9, and V–140, and Establishment of T–422 in the Vicinity of Kingfisher, OK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0632)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4098. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V–161, V–190, and V–307, and Revocation of VOR Federal Airway V–516 in the Vicinity of Oswego, KS'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0849)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4099. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–251; Central United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0918)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4100. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4006'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31425)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4101. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4005'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31424)) received in the Office of the President

of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4102. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4002'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31421)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4103. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4001'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31420)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4104. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4003'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31422)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4105. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4004'' ((RIN2120–AA65) (Docket No. 31423)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4106. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Establishment and Amendment of Area Navigation (RNAV) Route T–354, and T–421; Eastern United States'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0914)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4107. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greenville, PA'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0038)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4108. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hallock, MN'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1146)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4109. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Multiple Michigan Towns'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1145)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4110. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Pembina, ND'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1147)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4111. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Springfield, OH'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1148)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4112. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Amendment of Class E Airspace; Watonga, OK'' ((RIN2120–AA66) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1150)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4113. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–21001'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0386)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4114. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes; Amendment 39–21980'' (RIN2120–AA64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4115. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–22009'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0400)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4116. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH (AHD) Helicopters; Amendment 39–22018'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (FAA–2022–0100)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4117. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Hamilton Sundstrand Corporation Propellers'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0032)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4118. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Yabora Industria Aeronautica S.A.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22010'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0451)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4119. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Helicopters; Amendment 39–21958'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0008)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4120. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bell Textron Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Limited) Helicopters; Amendment 39–22027'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0145)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4121. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, inc., Airplanes; Amendment 39–22021'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0090)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4122. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. (Type Certificate Previously Held by Cessna Aircraft Company) Airplanes; Amendment 39–22006'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0014)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4123. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39–21981'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1068)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4124. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Helicopteres Guimbal Helicopters; Amendment 39–22000'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0020)) received

in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4125. communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG (Type Certificate Previously Held by Rolls-Royce plc) Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39–22019'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1164)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4126. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft Inc., Airplanes; Amendment 39–22033'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0022)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4127. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Viking Air Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier Inc, and de Havilland, inc.) Airplanes'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0007)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4128. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–22024'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0102)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4129. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–21997'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0018)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4130. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–22004'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0096)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4131. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters; Amendment 39–22005'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0097)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4132. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21993'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (FAA–2021–0957)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4133. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes; Amendment 39–21995'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (FAA–2020–1022)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4134. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21987'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–1063)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4135. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21998'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0383)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4136. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21996'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2021–0663)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4137. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–21003'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0389)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–4138. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39–22011'' ((RIN2120–AA64) (Docket No. FAA–2022–0091)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Ms. CANTWELL for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*Coast Guard nomination of Michael H. Day, to be Rear Admiral.

*Coast Guard nomination of Rear Adm. Peter W. Gautier, to be Vice Admiral.

*Coast Guard nomination of Vice Adm. Steven D. Poulin, to be Admiral.

*Coast Guard nomination of Adm. Linda L. Fagan, to be Admiral.

*Coast Guard nomination of Rear Adm. Kevin E. Lunday, to be Vice Admiral.

*Coast Guard nomination of Rear Adm. Andrew J. Tiongson, to be Vice Admiral.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 4180. A bill to direct the Technological Advisory Council of the Federal Communications Commission to prepare a report on a 9–1–1 disability alerting system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEAHY (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BENNET, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KING, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 4181. A bill to amend title VI of the Social Security Act to allow coronavirus State and local fiscal recovery funds to be used for low-income housing credit projects; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 4182. A bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 4183. A bill to establish the National Energy Transition Endowment and Community Revitalization Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 4184. A bill to provide for the implementation of a system of licensing for purchasers of certain firearms and for a record of sale system for those firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4185. A bill to set forth limitations on exclusivity for orphan drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 4186. A bill to provide compensation for victims of the fire initiated as a prescribed burn by the Forest Service in the Santa Fe National Forest in San Miguel County, New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 4187. A bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to make improvements to that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 4188. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for a code of conduct for justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 4189. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to improve agricultural productivity, profitability, resilience, and ecological outcomes through modernized data infrastructure and analysis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 4190. A bill to provide for the independent and objective conduct and supervision of audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to Ukraine for military, economic, and humanitarian aid; placed on the calendar.

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

S. 4191. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for the establishment or operation of the Disinformation Governance Board in the Department of Homeland Security; placed on the calendar.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. Res. 629. A resolution celebrating the 200th anniversary of United States diplomatic relations with Colombia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. KING, Mr. WARNOCK, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. DAINES, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 630. A resolution expressing the support for the designation of the week of May 1, 2022, through May 7, 2022, as ''National Small Business Week'' to celebrate the contributions of small businesses and entrepreneurs in every community in the United States; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 98

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 98, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for neighborhood revitalization, and for other purposes.

S. 377

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 650

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 650, a bill to enable the payment of certain officers and employees of the United States whose employment is authorized pursuant to a grant of deferred action, deferred enforced departure, or temporary protected status.

S. 749

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 749, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance tax benefits for research activities.

S. 828

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 828, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 834

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 834, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 852

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 852, a bill to provide for further comprehensive research at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke on unruptured intracranial aneurysms.

S. 870

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 870, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program.

S. 1388

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1388, a bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to study the role of intermediaries in the pharmaceutical supply chain and provide Congress with appropriate policy recommendations, and for other purposes.

S. 2427

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2427, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report examining the feasibility of funding the Universal Service Fund through contributions supplied by edge providers, and for other purposes.

S. 2858

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2858, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts, to award grants for arts and creative workforce programs.

S. 2876

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2876, a bill to prioritize the efforts of, and to enhance coordination among, United States agencies to encourage countries in Central and Eastern Europe to improve the security of their telecommunications networks, and for other purposes.

S. 3017

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3017, a bill to expand the provision and availability of dental care furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 3215

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3215, a bill to amend the Act of August 10, 1956, to provide for the payment of pay and allowances for certain officers of the Army who are assigned to the Corps of Engineers.

S. 3278

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3278, a bill to protect children and other consumers against hazards associated with the accidental ingestion of button cell or coin batteries by requiring the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety standard to require child-resistant closures on consumer products that use such batteries, and for other purposes.

S. 3421

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3421, a bill to clarify that section 107 of the Countering America's

Adversaries Through Sanctions Act applies sanctions with respect to unmanned combat aerial vehicles following a 2019 change by the United Nations providing additional clarity to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

S. 3429

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3429, a bill to establish an Alaska Salmon Research Task Force.

S. 3625

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3625, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to temporarily reinstate the employee retention credit for employers subject to closure due to COVID–19.

S. 3628

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3628, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a grant program to promote comprehensive mental health and suicide prevention efforts in schools, and for other purposes.

S. 3726

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3726, a bill to address research on, and improve access to, supportive services for individuals with long COVID.

S. 3838

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 3838, a bill to authorize the confiscation of property of certain Russian persons subject to sanctions imposed by the United States and the use of that property for the benefit of the people of Ukraine, and for other purposes.

S. 3840

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3840, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the threshold for the de minimis exception for information reporting by third party settlement organizations.

S. 3907

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3907, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to identify obstacles to identifying and responding to children missing from foster care and other vulnerable foster youth, to provide technical assistance relating to the removal of such obstacles, and for other purposes.

S. 3920

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3920, a bill to protect consumers from price-gouging of gasoline and other fuels, and for other purposes.

S. 3938

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) were added as cosponsors of S. 3938, a bill to reauthorize the READ Act.

S. 4010

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4010, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a code of conduct for the justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 4105

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4105, a bill to treat certain liquidations of new motor vehicle inventory as qualified liquidations of LIFO inventory for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

S. 4115

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4115, a bill to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending.

S. CON. RES. 38

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. Con. Res. 38, a concurrent resolution declaring a state of emergency due to the Russian invasion of Ukraine, in order to establish a waiver of the minimum tonnage requirements of section 55305 of title 46, United States Code.

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 38, supra.

S. RES. 377

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 377, a resolution urging the European Union to designate Hizballah in its entirety as a terrorist organization.

S. RES. 446

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 446, a resolution commending the Government of Lithuania for its resolve in increasing ties with Taiwan and supporting its firm stance against coercion by the Chinese Communist Party.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 629—CELEBRATING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED STATES DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS WITH COLOMBIA

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 629

Whereas, on August 7, 1819, Colombia (formerly known as ''The Great Colombia'') concluded its campaign for independence from Spain with the Battle of Boyacá;

Whereas, on March 18, 1822, the United States House of Representatives approved two resolutions that recognized the independence of Colombia and appropriated funds for the establishment of a diplomatic mission in Colombia;

Whereas, on June 19, 1822, the United States and Colombia formally established diplomatic relations, and the accreditation of Colombia's Manuel Torres made Torres the first chargé d'affaires from a Latin American country to the United States;

Whereas, on December 16, 1823, the United States appointed its first chargé d'affaires to Colombia, Richard Clough Anderson, Jr.;

Whereas, on October 3, 1824, the United States and Colombia signed the first commercial agreement between the two countries, the Anderson-Gual Treaty, which entered into force in May 1825;

Whereas, in 1943, during World War II, Colombia declared war on the Axis Powers, fighting in cooperation with the United States and the Allies;

Whereas, in 1945, Colombia was one of 51 nations that participated in the San Francisco Conference and ratified the Charter of the United Nations;

Whereas, in 1947, during the Ninth International Conference of American States in Bogotá, Colombia, 21 countries, including the United States and Colombia, adopted the Charter of the Organization of American States, the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement, and the American Declaration on the Rights and Duties of Man;

Whereas, from 1950 to 1954, Colombia was the only country in Latin America that sent armed forces to South Korea to join the United Nations' effort to defend South Korea against North Korea;

Whereas the United States enacted the Andean Trade Preference Act (19 U.S.C. 3201 et seq.) on December 4, 1991, and the Andean Trade Promotion and Drug Eradication Act (title XXXI of division C of Public Law 107–210; 116 Stat. 1023) on August 6, 2002, granting duty-free access to a wide range of exports from Colombia and other Andean countries, with the objective of promoting commercial relations and combating illicit narcotics production and trafficking;

Whereas, in 2000, the United States and Colombia launched Plan Colombia, a transformational security and economic development initiative to reduce crime, narcotics trafficking, and violence and strengthen state capacity in Colombia;

Whereas, in April 2012, the United States and Colombia launched the United States-Colombia Action Plan on Regional Security Cooperation, using the lessons learned from

Plan Colombia to counter the proliferation of transnational criminal organizations throughout the Western Hemisphere;

Whereas, on May 15, 2012, the United States-Colombia Trade Promotion Agreement entered into force, which expanded commercial ties, economic growth, and employment opportunities in both the United States and Colombia;

Whereas the United States is Colombia's leading trade partner;

Whereas, on June 25, 2013, Colombia signed an agreement with the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on security cooperation and information sharing and in May 2018, became the first and only global partner country of NATO in Latin America;

Whereas, since 2012, the United States and Colombia have cooperated to bring peace and end a half century of armed conflict in Colombia, the longest armed conflict in the Western Hemisphere;

Whereas, since 2018, Colombia and the United States have led the Orion international naval campaign to combat maritime narcotics trafficking, and the jointly led campaign has strengthened the narcotics interdiction capabilities of 38 countries and 88 institutions, including in northern Central America;

Whereas, on April 28, 2020, Colombia became the 37th member and third country in Latin America to join the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD);

Whereas Colombia is one of the most consistent and reliable allies of the United States because of Colombia's support for shared diplomatic and security objectives;

Whereas Colombians and Colombian Americans residing in the United States have greatly contributed to enriching the society, culture, economy of, and science developed by, the United States and have helped further strengthen the ties between the United States and Colombia;

Whereas, on February 8, 2021, Colombia granted temporary protected status to more than 1,800,000 Venezuelans for 10 years, a measure that was welcomed by the United States and the international community and will ensure Venezuelan migrants and refugees in Colombia have access to health care, education, housing, and formal employment opportunities;

Whereas, following that announcement, Secretary of State Antony Blinken commended Colombia's humanitarian leadership and innovative response to the worst refugee crisis in Latin America; and

Whereas, on March 10, 2022, the United States announced it would designate Colombia as a major non-NATO ally: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 200th anniversary of diplomatic relations between the United States and Colombia;

(2) recognizes the critical role that Colombia plays in promoting stability and prosperity in the Western Hemisphere;

(3) recognizes the vital strategic alliance between the United States and Colombia, built on a shared commitment to democracy;

(4) celebrates the contributions made by Colombians and Colombian Americans to the United States;

(5) reaffirms the steadfast support of the people of the United States for the people of Colombia in their pursuit of peace, stability, and prosperity; and

(6) encourages strengthening cooperation with Colombia in areas such as technology, education, energy transition, and nearshoring, as well as in joint efforts toward the protection of democracy in the Western Hemisphere.

SENATE RESOLUTION 630—EXPRESSING THE SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF MAY 1, 2022, THROUGH MAY 7, 2022, AS ''NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK'' TO CELEBRATE THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF SMALL BUSINESSES AND ENTREPRENEURS IN EVERY COMMUNITY IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. KING, Mr. WARNOCK, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. ERNST, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CRAPO, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. REED, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COONS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. PETERS, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. DAINES, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 630

Whereas a ''National Small Business Week'' has been declared by every President since 1963;

Whereas there are more than 32,000,000 small businesses in the United States that support more than 61,000,000 jobs;

Whereas thousands of small business establishments were hard hit by the COVID–19 pandemic and government lockdowns;

Whereas small businesses will continue to play an integral role in rebuilding the economy of the United States; and

Whereas May 1, 2022, through May 7, 2022, would be an appropriate week to celebrate ''National Small Business Week'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and celebrates the entrepreneurial spirit and contributions of small businesses in every community in the United States;

(2) applauds the efforts and achievements of the owners of small businesses and their employees in every community of the United States;

(3) recognizes that, in the face of significant challenges, the owners of small businesses have demonstrated incredible resilience over the past 2 years;

(4) supports the designation of ''National Small Business Week'';

(5) acknowledges the importance of providing access to underserved firms; and

(6) supports efforts to—

(A) hold Federal agencies accountable for fraud, waste, and abuse of taxpayer dollars; and

(B) create an environment that enables small businesses to grow and create jobs.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5030. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 7691, making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the situation in Ukraine for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5031. Ms. CANTWELL (for Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. RISCH)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 456, expressing support for a free, fair, and peaceful December 4, 2021, election in The Gambia.

SA 5032. Ms. CANTWELL (for Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. RISCH)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 456, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5030. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 7691, making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the situation in Ukraine for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 18, strike line 3 and all that follows through page 28, line 11, and insert the following:

SEC. 402.(a) TRANSFER OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Of the unobligated balances of the amounts appropriated under sections 602(a)(1) and 603(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 802(a) and 803(a)) as of the date of enactment of this Act, $21,395,338,500 shall be transferred to the General Fund to carry out this Act.

(2) APPORTIONMENT.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer the amounts specified in paragraph (1) from the unobligated balances of the amounts appropriated under sections 602(a)(1) and 603(a) of such Act in equal proportion to the greatest extent practicable.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) CORONAVIRUS STATE FISCAL RECOVERY FUND.—Section 602(b)(4) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 802(b)(4)) is amended to read as follows:

''(4) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.—The amounts otherwise determined for allocation and payment under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)—

''(A) shall be adjusted by the Secretary on a pro rata basis to the extent necessary to carry out the transfer of funds required under section 402(a) of the Additional Ukraine Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2022; and

''(B) may be adjusted by the Secretary on a pro rata basis to the extent necessary to ensure that all available funds are allocated to States, territories, and Tribal governments in accordance with the requirements specified in each such paragraph (as applicable).''.

(2) CORONAVIRUS LOCAL FISCAL RECOVERY FUND.—Section 603(b)(5) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 803(b)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

''(5) ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY.—The amounts otherwise determined for allocation and payment under paragraphs (1), (2), and (3)—

''(A) shall be adjusted by the Secretary on a pro rata basis to the extent necessary to carry out the transfer of funds required under section 402(a) of the Additional Ukraine Supplemental Appropriations Act, 2022; and

''(B) may be adjusted by the Secretary on a pro rata basis to the extent necessary to ensure that all available funds are distributed to metropolitan cities, counties, and States in accordance with the requirements specified in each paragraph (as applicable) and the certification requirement specified in subsection (d).''.

SA 5031. Ms. CANTWELL (for Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. RISCH))

proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 456, expressing support for a free, fair, and peaceful December 4, 2021, election in The Gambia; as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following: ''That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Gambian people on the successful 2016 and 2021 presidential elections and the April 2022 legislative election;

(2) supports the courageous and necessary work and recommendations of the Truth, Reconciliation, and Reparations Commission to bring accountability, healing, and reconciliation to the nation, and calls on the government to follow through with appropriate actions with regards to justice, accountability, and reparations for victims; and

(3) expresses the support of the American people in The Gambia's continued and noteworthy democratic path forward.

SA 5032. Ms. CANTWELL (for Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. RISCH)) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 456, expressing support for a free, fair, and peaceful December 4, 2021, election in The Gambia; as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas, in 1965, The Gambia became independent from Great Britain;

Whereas, in 1970, The Gambia became a republic following a public referendum, and Dawda Jawara was elected president and subsequently reelected an additional five times;

Whereas, from 1970 to 1994, The Gambia was one of Africa's longest running democracies and home to the continent's human rights body, the African Commission on Human and People's Rights;

Whereas, in 1994, President Jawara was forcibly removed from office in a coup by the Armed Forces Provisional Ruling Council (AFPRC), led by Lieutenant Yahya Jammeh;

Whereas, after two years of direct AFPRC rule that was heavily criticized by the international community, a flawed constitutional reform process occurred and The Gambia scheduled a new presidential election;

Whereas, in the lead up to the September 1996 presidential election, the Jammeh military government outlawed the country's main opposition parties, restricted media freedom, prohibited meetings between rival candidates and foreign diplomats, and used soldiers to attack opposition rallies;

Whereas Jammeh won the 1996 presidential election in a process widely regarded as flawed by international observers;

Whereas President Jammeh won reelection in 2001, 2006, and 2011 in electoral processes marred by political repression, intimidation, and technical flaws;

Whereas Jammeh's presidency saw targeted violence and widespread gross human rights violations, particularly against members of the media, including the murder of editor Deyda Hydara and the disappearance of journalist Ebrima Manneh;

Whereas President Jammeh personally ordered the kidnapping and torture of individuals he accused of ''witchcraft'' and threatened others over their sexual orientation;

Whereas thousands of Gambians fled into exile out of concern for their safety, becoming refugees in Africa at large and elsewhere;

Whereas the Jammeh government's human rights record was widely criticized by regional and international human rights groups, as well as the United States, the European Union, and members of the United States Senate;

Whereas, in December 2016, opposition grand coalition candidate Adama Barrow, who campaigned on the promise of electoral and constitutional reform, won an upset election victory against President Jammeh;

Whereas, immediately after the 2016 election, Jammeh publicly accepted the defeat, but then later rejected the results and refused to depart the presidency;

Whereas Jammeh's refusal to accept defeat was widely condemned, with the African Union refusing to recognize him as president and the Economic Community of West African States deploying an international intervention force to The Gambia;

Whereas, on January 19, 2017, Barrow was sworn in as president at the Gambian Embassy in Senegal;

Whereas, on January 20, 2017, Jammeh and his family departed The Gambia, reportedly stealing more than $1,000,000,000 from state coffers, eventually to appear in Equatorial Guinea, where he remains in political exile with impunity;

Whereas President Barrow initially agreed to limit his term to a three-year transition ending on January 19, 2020, but later stated his intent to serve the full five-year constitutional term;

Whereas the Gambian Truth, Reconciliation, and Reparations Commission (TRRC) was established by an act of the Gambian Parliament to examine abuses committed during the Jammeh era and make recommendations as to whom to hold accountable;

Whereas more than 370 victims and former government officials testified at widely viewed TRRC hearings that documented widespread human rights abuses;

Whereas on November 25, 2021, the TRRC submitted its final report to President Barrow detailing the death of more than 240 people, torture, rape, and disappearances under the Jammeh regime;

Whereas on December 4, 2021, The Gambia held the first post-Jammeh era presidential election, which included six presidential candidates;

Whereas the December 4, 2021 election occurred peacefully, with high voter turnout and under the observation of a significant number of domestic and international monitors;

Whereas, on December 5, 2021, The Gambia's Independent Electoral Commission (IEC) announced the results, showing that President Barrow had won reelection;

Whereas, on December 5, 2021, domestic election observers and other stakeholders released a joint statement noting that ''the elections were conducted generally in an atmosphere of transparency and fairness as observed by domestic and international observers'' and reminded candidates of the Code of Conduct for Peaceful Elections provision to ''accept the results of the election as announced by the Chairperson of the IEC'';

Whereas, on December 5, 2021, former President of Sierra Leone Ernest Bai Koroma, who led an election observation mission from the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), appealed to all the Gambian candidates ''to accept the outcome of the election in good faith'';

Whereas, on December 24, 2021, the Gambia Truth, Reconciliation, and Reparations Commission published its findings that former President Jammeh was responsible for more than 20 years of killings, torture, and rape and recommended that those responsible be prosecuted, saying, ''To forgive and forget with impunity the violations and abuses ... would not only undermine reconciliation but would also constitute a massive and egregious cover-up of the crimes committed.'';

Whereas, on December 28, 2021, the Gambia Supreme Court dismissed a challenge to the election results; and

Whereas, on January 18, 2022, the Independent Electoral Commission announced that National Assembly elections would be held on April 9, 2022: Now, therefore, be it

---

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I have eight requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 11, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct an executive session.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 11, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 11, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 11, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 11, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 11, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct an open hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 11, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 11, 2022, at 4:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Sidney

Beasley, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress.

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

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4190, S. 4191, AND H.R. 7691

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I understand that there are three bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4190) to provide for the independent and objective conduct and supervision of audits and investigations relating to the programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available to Ukraine for military, economic, and humanitarian aid.

A bill (S. 4191) to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds for the establishment or operation of the Disinformation Governance Board in the Department of Homeland Security.

A bill (H.R. 7691) making emergency supplemental appropriations for assistance for the situation in Ukraine for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

Ms. CANTWELL. I now ask for a second reading and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I move to adjourn until 8:26 p.m. today.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:25 p.m. adjourned until Wednesday, May 11, 2022, at 8:26 p.m.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

(Legislative Days of Tuesday, May 10, 2022, and Wednesday, May 11, 2022)

Routine Proceedings, pages S2425–S2463

Measures Introduced: Twelve bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 4180–4191, and S. Res. 629–630. **Pages S2449–50**

Measures Passed:

National Small Business Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 630, expressing the support for the designation of the week of May 1, 2022, through May 7, 2022, as "National Small Business Week" to celebrate the contributions of small businesses and entrepreneurs in every community in the United States. **Page S2455**

United States Alliances: Senate agreed to S. Res. 122, reaffirming the importance of United States alliances and partnerships, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and an amendment to the preamble. **Pages S2455–59**

Paris Peace Agreements with Cambodia: Senate agreed to S. Res. 427, to commemorate the 30-year anniversary of the 1991 Paris Peace Agreements with Cambodia and to call upon all signatories to those Agreements to fulfill their commitments to secure a peaceful, prosperous, democratic, and sovereign Cambodia, after agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S2459–60**

South Sudan: Senate agreed to S. Res. 473, expressing the sense of the Senate on the necessity of maintaining the United Nations arms embargo on South Sudan until conditions for peace, stability, democracy, and development exist. **Page S2460**

Military Coup in Sudan: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 20, condemning the October 25, 2021, military coup in Sudan and standing with the people of Sudan. **Page S2460**

Election in The Gambia: Senate agreed to S. Res. 456, expressing support for a free, fair, and peaceful December 4, 2021, election in The Gambia, after withdrawing the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, and the committee amendment to the preamble, and after taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S2460–62**

Adopted:

Cantwell (for Durbin/Risch) Amendment No. 5031, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S2461**

Cantwell (for Durbin/Risch) Amendment No. 5032, to amend the preamble. **Pages S2461–62**

Measures Considered:

Women's Health Protection Act: By 49 yeas to 51 nays (Vote No. 170), three-fifths of those Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, Senate rejected the motion to close further debate on the motion to proceed to consideration of S. 4132, to protect a person's ability to determine whether to continue or end a pregnancy, and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide abortion services. **Page S2439**

Motion to Discharge Sweeney Nomination: By 51 yeas to 49 nays (Vote No. EX. 167), Senate agreed to the motion to discharge the nomination of Charlotte N. Sweeney, of Colorado, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, from the Committee on the Judiciary. Subsequently, the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 27, relative to Senate procedure in the 117th Congress. **Pages S2425–29**

Motion to Discharge Boyle Nomination—Agreement: Pursuant to S. Res. 27, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation being tied on the question of reporting, Senator Cantwell made the motion to discharge the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation from further consideration of the nomination of Mary T. Boyle, of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission; under the provisions of S. Res. 27, there will be up to 4 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided between the two Leaders, or their designees; with no motions, points of order, or amendments in order. **Page S2445**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the motion to discharge the nomination at approximately 10 a.m., on Thursday, May 12, 2022; and that the vote on the

motion to discharge the nomination occur at 12 noon. **Page S2463**

Lowman Nomination—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Majority Leader, in consultation with the Republican Leader, Senate begin consideration of the nomination of Christopher Joseph Lowman, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense; and that Senate vote on confirmation of the nomination without intervening action or debate. **Page S2445**

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:

By 51 yeas to 50 nays, Vice President voting yea (Vote No. EX. 169), Alvaro M. Bedoya, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of seven years from September 26, 2019. **Pages S2429–39**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 50 nays, Vice President voting yea (Vote No. EX. 168), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S2429**

By 51 yeas to 50 nays, Vice President voting yea (Vote No. EX. 172), Julia Ruth Gordon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. **Pages S2439–43**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 51 yeas to 50 nays, Vice President voting yea (Vote No. EX. 171), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Pages S2439–40**

By 91 yeas 7 nays (Vote No. EX. 173), Philip Nathan Jefferson, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for a term of fourteen years from February 1, 2022. **Pages S2443–44**

6 Coast Guard nominations in the rank of admiral. **Page S2445**

Messages from the House: **Page S2446**

Measures Referred: **Pages S2446, S2455**

Measures Placed on the Calendar: **Page S2446**

Measures Read the First Time: **Pages S2446–47**

Executive Communications: **Pages S2447–49**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S2449**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2450–51**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S2451–52**

Additional Statements:

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2452–53**

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Page S2453**

Privileges of the Floor: **Pages S2453–54**

Record Votes: Seven record votes were taken today. (Total—173) **Pages S2428–29, S2439–40, S2443–44**

Motion to Adjourn: Senate agreed to the motion to adjourn until 8:26 p.m., on Wednesday, May 11, 2022. **Page S2454**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:25 p.m., and reconvened at 8:26 p.m., on the same day, and adjourned at 8:34 p.m., until 10 a.m. on Thursday, May 12, 2022. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2463.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS: INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2023 for the Indian Health Service, after receiving testimony from Elizabeth A. Fowler, Acting Director, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services.

APPROPRIATIONS: AOC, SAA, CBO

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Legislative Branch concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2023 for the Architect of the Capitol, the Senate Sergeant at Arms, and the Congressional Budget Office, after receiving testimony from, J. Brett Blanton, Architect of the Capitol; Karen Gibson, Senate Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate; and Phillip Swagel, Director, Congressional Budget Office.

APPROPRIATIONS: DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies concluded a hearing to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2023 for the Department of Commerce, after receiving testimony from Gina Raimondo, Secretary of Commerce.

GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY AND COVID–19 CRISES

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs concluded a hearing to examine the global food security and COVID–19 crises, focusing on the U.S. response and policy options, after receiving testimony from Atul Gawande, Assistant Administrator for Global

Health, U.S. Agency for International Development; David Beasley, UN World Food Programme, Rome, Italy; Tjada D'Oyen McKenna, Mercy Corps, Washington, D.C.; Akinwumi A. Adesina, African Development Bank, Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire; Tom Frieden, Resolve to Save Lives, New York, New York; and Michael Ryan, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland.

DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST AND FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces concluded a hearing to examine Space Force programs in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2023 and the Future Years Defense Program, after receiving testimony from John F. Plumb, Assistant Secretary for Space Policy, Frank Calvelli, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Space Acquisition and Integration, and General David D. Thompson, USSF, Vice Chief of Space Operations, all of the Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 2427, to require the Federal Communications Commission to conduct a study and submit to Congress a report examining the feasibility of funding the Universal Service Fund through contributions supplied by edge providers, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3053, to amend the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017 to require the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to develop a plan and national guidance document to improve precipitation estimates, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3232, to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety rule for freestanding clothing storage units to protect children from tip-over related death or injury, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3278, to protect children and other consumers against hazards associated with the accidental ingestion of button cell or coin batteries by requiring the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a consumer product safety standard to require child-resistant closures on consumer products that use such batteries, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3290, to establish a National Manufacturing Extension Partnership Supply Chain Database, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3429, to establish an Alaska Salmon Research Task Force, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 3533, to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to improve the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System, with an amendment;

S. 3692, to direct the Federal Communications Commission to evaluate and consider the impact of the telecommunications network equipment supply chain on the deployment of universal service, with an amendment;

S. 4145, to amend section 13 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to provide equitable relief, with an amendment: and

The nomination of Linda L. Fagan, to be Commandant, and promotion lists, both of the Coast Guard.

NATIONAL PARKS LEGISLATION

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks concluded a hearing to examine S. 557, to establish a pilot program for native plant species, S. 1344, to redesignate the Pullman National Monument in the State of Illinois as the Pullman National Historical Park, S. 1718, to amend the Rosie the Riveter/World War II Home Front National Historical Park Establishment Act of 200 to provide for additional areas to be added to the park, S. 1814 and H.R. 3531, bills to authorize the Women Who Worked on the Home Front Foundation to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, S. 2367, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire land in Frederick County, Maryland, for the Historic Preservation Training Center of the National Park Service, S. 2964, to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, S. 3141, to establish the New Philadelphia National Historical Park in the State of Illinois as a unit of the National Park System, S. 3185, to amend the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area Improvement Act to extend the exception to the closure of certain roads within the Recreation Area for local businesses, S. 3240, to waive the application fee for applications for special use permits for veterans' special events at war memorials on land administered by the National Park Service in the District of Columbia and its environs, S. 3307, to modify the boundary of the Wilson's Creek National Battlefield in the State of Missouri, S. 3334, to extend the authority for the establishment of a commemorative work to honor enslaved and free black persons who served in the American Revolution, S. 3338, to revise the boundary of the Ste. Genevieve National Historical Park in

the State of Missouri, S. 3519, to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Butterfield Overland National Historic Trail, S. 3551, to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior to carry out certain activities to enhance recreational opportunities for gateway communities, S. 3667, to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish within the National Park Service the United States African-American Burial Grounds Preservation Program, S. 3685, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the suitability and feasibility of establishing the John P. Parker House in Ripley, Ohio, as a unit of the National Park System, S. 4114, to amend Public Law 99–420 to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal land in the State of Maine for use for affordable workforce housing, S. 4121, to designate the Kol Israel Foundation Holocaust Memorial in Bedford Heights, Ohio, as a national memorial, H.R. 268, to provide for the boundary of the Palo Alto Battlefield National Historic Park to be adjusted, to authorize the donation of land to the United States for addition to that historic park, and H.R. 1931, to provide competitive grants for the promotion of Japanese American confinement education as a means to understand the importance of democratic principles, use and abuse of power, and to raise awareness about the importance of cultural tolerance toward Japanese Americans, after receiving testimony from Michael A. Caldwell, Associate Director, Park Planning, Facilities, and Lands, National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY OVERSIGHT

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine the Council on Environmental Quality, after receiving testimony from Brenda Mallory, Chair, Council on Environmental Quality.

USAID BUDGET

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 2023 for the United States Agency for International Development, after receiving testimony from Samantha Power, Administrator, United States Agency for International Development.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of John Z. Lee, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Durbin, Salvador Mendoza, Jr., of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Murray, Stephen Henley Locher, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of Iowa, who was introduced by Senator Grassley, Nancy L. Maldonado, to be United States Judge for the Northern District of Iowa, who was introduced by Senator Durbin, and Gregory Brian Williams, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware, who was introduced by Senators Carper and Coons, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

VA AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the quality of care in the VA and the private sector, after receiving testimony from Carolyn Clancy, Assistant Under Secretary for Health for Discovery, Education, and Affiliate Networks, Erica Scavella, Assistant Under Secretary for Health for Clinical Services, and Kristine Groves, Executive Director, Office of Quality Management, each of the Veterans Health Administration, and Michael J. Missal, Inspector General, and Julie Kroviak, Deputy Assistant Inspector General, Office of Healthcare Inspections, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs; Jonathan Perlin, The Joint Commission, Oakbrook Terrace, Illinois; and Gregg S. Meyer, Mass General Brigham, Boston, Massachusetts.

CHINA

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee concluded a hearing to examine countering the People's Republic of China's economic and technological plan for dominance, after receiving testimony from Dewey Murdick, Georgetown University Center for Security and Emerging Technology, Beltsville, Maryland; Nazak Nikakhtar, Wiley Rein LLP, Potomac, Maryland; and James Mulvenon, Burke, Virginia.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 17 public bills, H.R. 7715–7731; and 5 resolutions, H. Res. 1103–1107, were introduced. **Pages H4860–61**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H4861–62**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein she appointed Representative DelBene to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H4801**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:19 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H4810**

Whole Number of the House: The Chair announced to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from New York, Mr. Reed, the whole number of the House is 429. **Page H4811**

Committee Elections: The House agreed to H. Res. 1103, electing Members to certain standing committees of the House of Representatives. **Page H4813**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measure: Radiation Exposure Compensation Act of 2022: S. 4119, to reauthorize the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act.

Pages H4813–16

Federal Firefighters Fairness Act: The House passed H.R. 2499, to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that a disability or death of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by any of certain diseases is the result of the performance of such employees duty, by a yea-and-nay vote of 288 yeas to 131 nays, Roll No. 149. **Pages H4816–31**

Pursuant to the Rule, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117–41, modified by the amendment printed in part C of H. Rept. 117–320, shall be considered as adopted, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now printed in the bill. **Pages H4816–28**

Agreed to:

Scott (VA) amendment en bloc No. 1 consisting of the following amendments printed in part D of H. Rept. 117–320: Houlahan (No. 1) that includes a Review of Science of Gynecological Cancers to study the potential risk and connection between fire protection activities and likelihood of developing gynecological cancers; Jackson Lee (No. 2) that adds a study regarding the health and safety impacts on firefighters from circumstances encountered as firefighters; Stanton (No. 5) that requires the Secretary to notify Congress when approving or denying petitions to add diseases to the list; Tlaib (No. 6) that adds an annual reporting requirement on the total number of and demographics of employees with diseases and conditions covered by this Act desegregated by the specific condition or conditions, for the purposes of understanding the scope of the problem; Torres (CA) (No. 7) that the Director of the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health shall conduct a comprehensive study on long-term health effects that Federal wildland firefighters, who are eligible to receive workers compensation, experience after being exposed to fires, smoke, and toxic fumes when in service; and Torres (CA) (No. 8) that directs the Secretary, not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, to evaluate the best available scientific evidence of the risk to an employee in fire protection activities of developing rhabdomyolysis (by a yea-and-nay vote of 224 yeas to 195 nays, Roll No. 146); and

Pages H4822–26, H4828–29

Joyce (OH) amendment (No. 3 printed in part D of H. Rept. 117–320) that adds the Kenneth Meisel Public Servants' Claimant Fairness Act, which amends the Federal Employees Compensation Act (FECA) to establish that claimants who have been asked by the Office of Workers' Compensation Programs to provide additional evidence to support their occupational illness, traumatic injury, or death claim have at least 60 days to provide such evidence (by a yea-and-nay vote of 419 yeas to with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 147). **Pages H4826, H4829**

Rejected:

Keller amendment (No. 4 printed in part D of H. Rept. 117–320) that sought to strike all of the bill text and inserts a provision establishing the Firefighter Special Claims Unit at the Department of Labor to process any claim relating to occupational disease filed by a federal firefighter (by a yea-and-nay vote of 180 yeas to 242 nays, Roll No. 148).

Pages H4826–28, H4829–30

H. Res. 1097, the rule providing for consideration of the bills (H.R. 903), (H.R. 2499), (H.R. 5129), and (H.R. 7691) was agreed to yesterday, May 10th.

Suspensions—Proceedings Resumed: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures. Consideration began Tuesday, May 10th.

Promoting Digital Privacy Technologies Act: H.R. 847, amended, to support research on privacy enhancing technologies and promote responsible data

use, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 401 yeas to 19 nays, Roll No. 150; **Page H4831**

NOAA Weather Radio Modernization Act: H.R. 5324, amended, to provide guidance for and investment in the upgrade and modernization of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio All Hazards network, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 397 yeas to 20 nays, Roll No. 151; **Page H4832**

South Florida Clean Coastal Waters Act: S. 66, to require the Inter-Agency Task Force on Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia to develop a plan for reducing, mitigating, and controlling harmful algal blooms and hypoxia in South Florida, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 412 yeas to 7 nays, Roll No. 152; **Pages H4832–33**

Empowering the U.S. Fire Administration Act: H.R. 7077, amended, to require the United States Fire Administration to conduct on-site investigations of major fires, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 379 yeas to 37 nays, Roll No. 153; **Pages H4833–34**

Providing Research and Estimates of Changes in Precipitation Act: H.R. 1437, amended, to amend the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017 to direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to provide comprehensive and regularly updated Federal precipitation information, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 333 yeas to 81 nays, Roll No. 154; **Pages H4834–35**

United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act: S. 1872, to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the United States Army Rangers Veterans of World War II in recognition of their extraordinary service during World War II, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 418 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 155; **Page H4835**

Fair Hiring in Banking Act: H.R. 5911, amended, to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and the Federal Credit Union Act to expand employment opportunities for those with a previous minor criminal offense, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 329 yeas to 88 nays, Roll No. 156; **Pages H4835–36**

Empowering States to Protect Seniors from Bad Actors Act: H.R. 5914, amended, to amend the Investor Protection and Securities Reform Act of 2010 to provide grants to States for enhanced protection of senior investors and senior policyholders, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 371 yeas to 48 nays, Roll No. 157; **Pages H4836–37**

Small Business Mergers, Acquisitions, Sales, and Brokerage Simplification Act: H.R. 935, amended, to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to exempt from registration brokers performing services in connection with the transfer of ownership of smaller privately held companies, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 419 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 158; **Pages H4837–38**

Russia and Belarus Financial Sanctions Act: H.R. 7066, amended, to require United States financial institutions to ensure entities and persons owned or controlled by the institution comply with financial sanctions on the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus to the same extent as the institution itself, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 418 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 159; **Page H4838**

Ukraine Comprehensive Debt Payment Relief Act: H.R. 7081, amended, to seek immediate bilateral, multilateral, and commercial debt service payment relief for Ukraine, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 362 yeas to 56 nays, Roll No. 160; **Pages H4838–39**

Isolate Russian Government Officials Act of 2022: H.R. 6891, amended, to exclude government officials of the Russian Federation from certain international meetings, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 416 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 161; **Pages H4839–40**

Russia and Belarus SDR Exchange Prohibition Act of 2022: H.R. 6899, amended, to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from engaging in transactions involving the exchange of Special Drawing Rights issued by the International Monetary Fund that are held by the Russian Federation or Belarus, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 417 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 162; **Pages H4840–41**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5302 Galveston Road in Houston, Texas, as the ''Vanessa Guillén Post Office Building'': H.R. 224, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 5302 Galveston Road in Houston, Texas, as the ''Vanessa Guillén Post Office Building'', by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 408 yeas with none voting ''nay'' and one answering ''present'', Roll No. 164; **Pages H4841–42**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 303 East Mississippi Avenue in Elwood, Illinois, as the ''Lawrence M. 'Larry' Walsh Sr. Post Office'': H.R. 700, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 303 East Mississippi Avenue in Elwood, Illinois, as the ''Lawrence M. 'Larry' Walsh Sr. Post Office'', by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 380 yeas to 26 nays and one answering ''present'', Roll No. 165; **Pages H4842–43**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2016 East 1st Street in Los Angeles, California, as the ''Marine Corps

Reserve PVT Jacob Cruz Post Office": H.R. 5900, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2016 East 1st Street in Los Angeles, California, as the "Marine Corps Reserve PVT Jacob Cruz Post Office", by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 401 yeas to 1 nay with one answering "present", Roll No. 166; and **Pages H4843–44**

Designating the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 West Schaumburg Road in Schaumburg, Illinois, as the "Veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan Memorial Post Office Building": H.R. 6386, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 450 West Schaumburg Road in Schaumburg, Illinois, as the "Veterans of Iraq and Afghanistan Memorial Post Office Building", by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 404 yeas with none voting "nay" and one answering "present", Roll No. 167. **Pages H4844–45**

Committee Election: The House agreed to H. Res. 1104, electing a Member to a certain standing committee of the House of Representatives. **Page H4845**

Suspension—Proceedings Resumed: The House failed to agree to suspend the rules and pass the following measure. Consideration began Tuesday, May 10th.

Targeting Resources to Communities in Need Act of 2022: H.R. 6531, amended, to provide an increased allocation of funding under certain programs for assistance in areas of persistent poverty, by a ⅔ yea-and-nay vote of 262 yeas to 156 nays, Roll No. 163. **Page H4841**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Twenty-two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H4828–29, H4829, H4829–30, H4830–31, H4831, H4832, H4832–33, H4833–34, H4834–35, H4835, H4835–36, H4836–37, H4837–38, H4838, H4838–39, H4839–40, H4840–41, H4841, H4842, H4842–43, H4843–44, and H4844–45.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Committee Meetings

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Institutes of Health. Testimony was heard from the following Department of Health and Human Services officials: Diana Bianchi, Director, Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health; Anthony S. Fauci, Director, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health; Gary H. Gibbons, Director, National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, National Institutes of Health; Douglas R. Lowy, Acting Director, National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health; Lawrence A. Tabak, Acting Director, National Institutes of Health; and Nora D. Volkow, Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse, National Institutes of Health.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs held a budget hearing on the U.S. Agency for International Development. Testimony was heard from Samantha Power, Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the Department of Housing and Urban Development. Testimony was heard from Marcia L. Fudge, Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

APPROPRIATIONS—DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense held a budget hearing on the Department of Defense. Testimony was heard from Lloyd J. Austin III, Secretary, Department of Defense; Michael J. McCord, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)/Chief Financial Officer, Department of Defense; and General Mark A. Milley, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Science Foundation. Testimony was heard from Sethuraman Panchanathan, Director, National Science Foundation.

APPROPRIATIONS—U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Homeland Security held a budget hearing on the U.S. Customs and Border Protection. Testimony was

heard from Chris Magnus, Commissioner, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security.

IMPACTS OF VA'S RESEARCH EFFORTS ON VETERANS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies held a hearing entitled ''Impacts of VA's Research Efforts on Veterans''. Testimony was heard from Patricia Hastings, Chief Consultant, Health Outcomes Military Exposures, Department of Veterans Affairs; and Rachel Ramoni, Chief Research and Development Officer, Department of Veterans Affairs.

APPROPRIATIONS—NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies held a budget hearing on the National Nuclear Security Administration and Environmental Management. Testimony was heard from Admiral James Caldwell, Deputy Administrator for Naval Reactors, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy; Jill Hruby, Under Secretary for Nuclear Security and Administrator, National Nuclear Security Administration, Department of Energy; and William White, Senior Advisor, Office of Environmental Management, Department of Energy.

FISCAL YEAR 2023 DEFENSE BUDGET REQUEST FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Committee on Armed Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Fiscal Year 2023 Defense Budget Request from the Department of the Navy''. Testimony was heard from Carlos Del Toro, Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy; Admiral Michael M. Gilday, Chief of Navy Operations, U.S. Navy; and General David H. Berger, Commandant of the Marine Corps, U.S. Marine Corps.

FISCAL YEAR 2023 STRATEGIC FORCES MISSILE DEFENSE AND MISSILE DEFEAT PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic Forces held a hearing entitled ''Fiscal Year 2023 Strategic Forces Missile Defense and Missile Defeat Programs''. Testimony was heard from John Plumb, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Space Policy, Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, Department of Defense; Vice Admiral Jon Hill, Director, Missile Defense Agency, Department of Defense; Lieutenant General John E. Shaw, Deputy Commander, U.S. Space Command, Department of Defense; Lieutenant General Daniel Karbler, Commander, U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command, U.S. Army; and John D. Sawyer, Acting Director, Contracting and National Security Acquisitions, Government Accountability Office.

STANDING UP FOR WORKERS: PREVENTING WAGE THEFT AND RECOVERING STOLEN WAGES

Committee on Education and Labor: Subcommittee on Workforce Protections held a hearing entitled ''Standing Up for Workers: Preventing Wage Theft and Recovering Stolen Wages''. Testimony was heard from Karen Cacace, Labor Bureau Chief, New York State Office of the Attorney General; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Health held a markup on H.R. 7667, the ''Food and Drug Amendments of 2022''; H.R. 7666, the ''Restoring Hope for Mental Health and Well-Being Act of 2022''; H.R. 7233, the ''KIDS CARES Act''; H.R. 623, the ''Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act 2.0''; H.R. 3771, the ''South Asian Heart Health Awareness Act of 2021''; and H.R. 5585, the ''Advanced Research Project Agency-Health Act''. H.R. 7667, H.R. 7233, H.R. 623, and H.R. 3771 were forwarded to the full Committee, as amended. H.R. 7666 and H.R. 5585 were forwarded to the full Committee, without amendment.

A NOTCH ABOVE? EXAMINING THE BOND RATING INDUSTRY

Committee on Financial Services: Subcommittee on Investor Protection and Capital Markets held a hearing entitled ''A Notch Above? Examining the Bond Rating Industry''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IMPROVING THE UNITED STATES' ABILITY TO PREVENT AND STABILIZE CONFLICT: GLOBAL FRAGILITY ACT IMPLEMENTATION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on International Development, International Organizations, and Global Corporate Social Impact held a hearing entitled ''Improving the United States' Ability to Prevent and Stabilize Conflict: Global Fragility Act Implementation''. Testimony was heard from Anne A. Witkowsky, Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Conflict and Stabilization Operations, Department of State; Robert Jenkins, Assistant to the Administrator, Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Stabilization, U.S. Agency for International Development;

and James Saenz, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Counternarcotics and Stabilization Policy, Department of Defense.

ACCOUNTABILITY AND JUSTICE FOR WAR CRIMES COMMITTED IN UKRAINE BY THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Europe, Energy, the Environment, and Cyber held a hearing entitled ''Accountability and Justice for War Crimes Committed in Ukraine by the Russian Federation''. Testimony was heard from Michael R. Carpenter, Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, U.S. Mission to the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, Department of State.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on the Judiciary: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 6943, the ''Public Safety Officer Support Act of 2022''; H.R. 2992, the ''Traumatic Brain Injury and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Law Enforcement Training Act''; H.R. 7647, the ''Supreme Court Ethics, Recusal, and Transparency Act of 2022''; and H.R. 6577, the ''Real Courts, Rule of Law Act of 2022''. H.R. 6943, H.R. 2992, H.R. 7647, and H.R. 6577 were ordered reported, as amended.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands held a hearing on H.R. 279, the ''Roadless Area Conservation Act of 2021''; H.R. 7329, the ''Smith River National Recreation Area Expansion Act''; H.R. 7399, the ''LBL Recreation and Heritage Act''; and H.R. 7665, the ''Mt. Hood and Columbia River Gorge Recreation Enhancement and Conservation Act of 2022''. Testimony was heard from Representatives Gallego, Huffman, Comer, and Blumenauer; Chris French, Deputy Chief, National Forest System, U.S. Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; Richard Lunt, Chairman and Supervisor, District 3, Greenlee County, Arizona; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Oversight and Reform: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 7683, the ''Artificial Intelligence Training for the Acquisition Act''; H.R. 7331, the ''Improving Government for America's Taxpayers Act''; H.R. 7535, the ''Quantum Computing Cybersecurity Preparedness Act''; H.R. 521, the ''First Responder Fair Return for Employees on Their Initial Retirement Earned Act''; H.R. 7674, the ''Ensuring Oversight Access at the Postal Service Act''; H.R. 6104, the ''Building the Next Generation of Federal Employees Act''; H.R. 7686, the ''District of Columbia Code Returning Citizens Coordination Act''; H.R. 7682, the ''Ensuring an Accurate Postal Fleet Electrification Act''; H.R. 228, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2141 Ferry Street in Anderson, California, as the ''Norma Comnick Post Office Building''; H.R. 6404, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 114 North Magnolia Street in Elmwood, Illinois, as the ''Corporal Benjamin Desilets Post Office''; H.R. 7417, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 East Oak Avenue in Seminole, Oklahoma, as the ''Sergeant Bret D. Isenhower Memorial Post Office Building''; H.R. 7514, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 345 South Main Street in Butler, Pennsylvania, as the ''Andrew Gomer Williams Post Office Building''; and H.R. 5976, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 101 West Walnut Street in Watseka, Illinois, as the ''Sgt. Jeremy C. Sherman Post Office Building''. H.R. 7683, H.R. 7331, H.R. 7535, H.R.521, H.R. 7674, H.R. 6104, H.R. 7686, and H.R. 7682 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 5976, H.R. 7514, H.R. 7417, H.R. 6404, and H.R. 228 were ordered reported, without amendment.

SECURING THE DIGITAL COMMONS: OPEN-SOURCE SOFTWARE CYBERSECURITY

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Investigations and Oversight; and Subcommittee on Research and Technology held a joint hearing entitled ''Securing the Digital Commons: Open-Source Software Cybersecurity''. Testimony was heard from Lauren Knausenberger, Chief Information Officer, Department of the Air Force; and public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 7352, the ''PPP and Bank Fraud Enforcement Harmonization Act of 2022''; H.R. 7334, the ''COVID–19 EIDL Fraud Statute of Limitations Act of 2022''; H.R. 7622, the ''Small Business Workforce Pipeline Act of 2022''; H.R. 7664, the ''Supporting Small Business and Career and Technical Education Act of 2022''; H.R. 7670, the ''Women-Owned Small Business Program Transparency Act''; H.R. 5879, the ''Hubzone Price Evaluation Preference Clarification Act of 2021''; and H.R. 7694, the ''Strengthening Subcontracting for Small Businesses Act of 2022''. H.R. 7352, H.R. 7334, H.R. 7622, H.R. 7664, H.R. 7670, H.R. 5879, and H.R. 7694 were ordered reported, without amendment.

BRINGING PROSPERITY TO LEFT-BEHIND COMMUNITIES: USING TARGETED PLACE-BASED DEVELOPMENT TO EXPAND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Select Committee on Economic Disparity and Fairness in Growth: Full Committee held a hearing entitled ''Bringing Prosperity to Left-Behind Communities: Using Targeted Place-based Development to Expand Economic Opportunity''. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D495)*

S. 1226, to designate the United States courthouse located at 1501 North 6th Street in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as the ''Sylvia H. Rambo United States Courthouse''. Signed on May 10, 2022. (Public Law 117–119)

S. 2126, to designate the Federal Office Building located at 308 W. 21st Street in Cheyenne, Wyoming, as the ''Louisa Swain Federal Office Building''. Signed on May 10, 2022. (Public Law 117–120)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 12, 2022

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2023 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 9:30 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine the posture of the Department of the Navy in review of the Defense Authorization Request for fiscal year 2023 and the Future Years Defense Program; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine Medicare for All, focusing on protecting health, saving lives, and saving money, 11 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine U.S. efforts to support Ukraine against Russian aggression, 9:30 a.m., SD–419/VTC.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings to examine pathways to procurement innovation, 10:15 a.m., SD–342.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider S. 3846, to reauthorize the Justice and Mental Health Collaboration Program, and the nominations of Rachelle L. Crowe, to be United States Attorney for the Southern District of Illinois, Jesse A. Laslovich, to be United States Attorney for the District of Montana, and Alexander M.M. Uballez, to be United States Attorney for the District of New Mexico, all of the Department of Justice, 9 a.m., SD–106.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Changing Market Roles: The FTX Proposal and Trends in New Clearinghouse Models'', 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth and Zoom.

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Commerce, 9:30 a.m., Zoom.

Subcommittee on Defense, budget hearing on the National Reconnaissance Office and the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency, 10 a.m., H–405 Capitol. This hearing is closed.

Subcommittee on Financial Services and General Government, budget hearing on the Judiciary, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn and Zoom.

Subcommittee on Homeland Security, budget hearing on the U.S. Coast Guard, 10 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn and Zoom.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled ''Healthy Aging: Maximizing the Independence, Well-being, and Health of Older Adults'', 10 a.m., Zoom.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, hearing entitled ''Army Installations and Quality of Life'', 10:30 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn, and Zoom.

Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on Arts and Humanities, 2 p.m., Zoom.

Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, and Related Agencies, budget hearing on the Department of Energy Science and Energy Programs, 2:30 p.m., 2362–B Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Armed Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Department of the Army Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Request'', 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Subcommittee on Seapower and Projection Forces, hearing entitled ''Air Force Projection Forces Aviation Programs and Capabilities related to the Fiscal Year 2023 Budget Request'', 2 p.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Subcommittee on Cyber, Innovative Technologies, and Information Systems, hearing entitled ''Reviewing Department of Defense Science and Technology Strategy, Policy, and Programs for Fiscal Year 2023: Accelerating the Pace of Innovation'', 4:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled ''Modernizing Hydropower: Licensing and Reforms for a Clean Energy Future'', 10:30 a.m., 2123 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''The Annual Report of the Financial Stability Oversight Council'', 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled ''Forest Conservation in the Fight Against Climate Change'', 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Subcommittee on Asia, the Pacific, Central Asia, and Nonproliferation, hearing entitled ''The Way Forward on U.S. North Korea Policy'', 4 p.m., 2172 Rayburn and Webex.

Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Border Security, Facilitation, and Operations, hearing entitled ''Examining DHS's Efforts to Combat the Opioid Epidemic'', 2:30 p.m., 310 Cannon and Webex.

Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, hearing entitled ''Reforming the Mining Law of 1872'', 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth and Webex.

Subcommittee for Indigenous Peoples of the United States, hearing on H.R. 5444, the ''Truth and Healing Commission on Indian Boarding School Policies Act'', 1 p.m., 1334 Longworth and Webex.

Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife, hearing on H.R. 263, the ''Big Cat Public Safety Act''; H.R. 3081, to make certain irrigation districts eligible for Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program pumping power, and for other purposes; H.R. 5880, to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to modify the enforceability date for certain provisions, and for other purposes; H.R. 6238, the ''SMART Access for Tribes Act''; H.R. H.R. 6369, the ''Sun River Hydropower Authorization Act''; H.R. 7612, the ''Desalination Research Advancement Act''; H.R. 7632, the ''Tribal Access to Clean Water Act''; and H.R. 7633, the ''Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act of 2022'', 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth and Webex.

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing entitled ''Space Situational Awareness: Guiding the Transition to a Civil Capability'', 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Innovation, Entrepreneurship, and Workforce Development, hearing entitled ''Moving Upwards and Onwards: The Workforce and Innovation Needs of the Aviation and Aerospace Industry'', 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, hearing entitled ''Board Member Views on Surface Transportation Board Reauthorization'', 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn and Zoom.

Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Subcommittee on Health, hearing entitled ''Innovative Care Delivery at VA: Partnering to Improve Infrastructure and Operational Efficiency'', 10 a.m., HVC 210 and Zoom.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Subcommittee on Defense Intelligence and Warfighter Support, hearing entitled ''FY23 Military Intelligence Program Budget Hearing'', 10 a.m., HVC–304. This hearing will be closed.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Thursday, May 12

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the motion to discharge the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation from further consideration of the nomination of Mary T. Boyle, of Maryland, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission; and vote on the motion to discharge the nomination at 12 noon.

Senators should expect additional roll call votes.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Thursday, May 12

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Consideration of H.R. 903—Rights for the Transportation Security Administration Workforce Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E479
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E480
Craig, Angie, Minn., E477, E479, E480, E485
Davis, Rodney, Ill., E477, E479, E481, E485
Dingell, Debbie, Mich., E480, E484
Emmer, Tom, Minn., E478
Gosar, Paul A., Ariz., E486
Higgins, Brian, N.Y., E478, E482
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E484
Krishnamoorthi, Raja, Ill., E483
Newhouse, Dan, Wash., E483
Pappas, Chris, N.H., E477, E485
Perlmutter, Ed, Colo., E478, E479, E481, E483, E485
Price, David E., N.C., E477
Schneider, Bradley Scott, Ill., E481
Scott, Robert ''Bobby'', Va., E485
Sherrill, Mikie, N.J., E486
Upton, Fred, Mich., E480
Wasserman Schultz, Debbie, Fla., E483
Wilson, Joe, S.C., E484
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E483
Yarmuth, John A., Ky., E478

Congressional Record

The *Congressional Record* (USPS 087–390). The Periodicals postage is paid at Washington, D.C. The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at *www.govinfo.gov*, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202–512–1800, or 866–512–1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, *contactcenter@gpo.gov*. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197–9000, or phone orders to 866–512–1800 (toll-free), 202–512–1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202–512–2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.