



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2022

No. 26

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who teaches us obedience, show us the right path that we may glorify Your wonderful Name. In times of distress, restore our strength and make us more than victorious because of Your great love, wisdom, and power.

Today, keep our lawmakers true and sincere as they strive to please You in all they think, say, and do.

Inspire them to claim Your great and precious promises. May they embrace Your promise in the 84th Psalm, verse 11, which says, You will not withhold any good thing from those who walk with integrity.

Continue to sustain our Senators with Your faithfulness.

We pray in Your precious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Douglas R. Bush, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, before I get into my remarks, just some brief housekeeping.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR EN BLOC

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I understand that there are three bills at the desk due for a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3600) to improve the cybersecurity of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 3076) to provide stability to and enhance the services of the United States Postal Service, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 6617) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, those are all bills that we hope to move forward, and so that is why I have rule XIV'd them.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

POSTAL REFORM

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, yesterday, by a margin—a large margin—of 342 to 92, Congress took the first steps toward creating the most important upgrade to our post office in decades by passing a bipartisan reform package that has been years in the making.

With an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote in the House, it is my intention for the Senate to quickly take up and pass this bipartisan, bicameral Postal reform bill. We hope to take action here on the floor and pass the bill before we go to the Presidents Day recess.

The post office is, quite simply, one of the most important institutions of American life. Every day, tens of millions of Americans, veterans, small businesses, people living in rural communities, seniors rely on the Postal Service for their medicines and prescriptions, for getting essential goods, for voting, for correspondence, for their livelihoods, and to get close to one another on special occasions like birthdays and anniversaries and things like that.

But, nevertheless, our Postal Service has needed reform for over a decade. Its budgets are severely strained, its delivery services are overwhelmed, and the

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S581

disruptions unleashed by the internet have made it harder for it to meet its obligations to the American people and to its own employees.

Every one of us has heard objections about letters arriving far too late. In many instances, whether they be checks that people depend on for their livelihoods or prescription drugs or whatever, these complaints are growing and growing and growing.

The bipartisan Postal reform bill offers a much needed reset. It will guarantee delivery services continue 6 days a week; it will put the post office on a path back towards solvency; and it will ensure that we take care of our dedicated Postal workers while also saving the post office over \$50 billion.

Let me summarize again. If this legislation is passed, it would ensure continued 6-day delivery service, make deliveries more efficient and timely, and will put the post office on a path to stability.

I want to recognize my colleagues who have made it possible for this legislation to move forward. First, I thank my friend and colleague Senator PETERS, chairman of the Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee, for his leadership in bringing this bill together.

I also want to thank Ranking Member PORTMAN for working across the aisle on this commonsense reform bill.

And I want to thank all my House colleagues who worked assiduously for a long, long time pushing for postal reform. Both the chair and the ranking member of the relevant committees supported the bill on the floor of the House yesterday.

I have always said Democrats will work on a bipartisan basis whenever we can pass commonsense legislation that will improve the lives of the American people.

Last year, bipartisan cooperation helped clear the way for such things as the historic Anti-Asian Hate Crimes bill, a much needed competition bill, and our bipartisan infrastructure package.

This work period alone, we have already made great progress on bipartisan priorities, like ending forced arbitration for sexual harassment and assault. As I have mentioned, we will soon act on the post office.

And I expect both sides will support passage of the short-term CR that will keep the Federal Government open before next week's deadline.

I want to thank the appropriators from both sides of the aisle for working in good faith, and I am optimistic that soon they will arrive at an agreement for an omnibus package, which is far more preferable to the alternative of a yearlong CR.

We are getting very, very close to coming to an agreement on top-line numbers, and as I said, I am more optimistic than I have been in a very long time that we will get an omnibus bill done for government spending for the rest of the year.

So all these priorities—forced arbitration, Postal reform, and government funding—are bipartisan items that I expect the Senate will act on before the recess.

As I have always said from my first day as majority leader, we will work in a bipartisan way whenever we can. We did it in our first year with things like the Anti-Asian hate crimes legislation, the competition bill, and the bipartisan infrastructure package. And these 2 weeks now represent a productive continuation of that commitment.

So on this issue, I am optimistic that very soon we will see the first major reform of America's Postal system in decades. It will be a win for our dedicated Postal workers and for the American people who rely on the post office every single day.

FORCED ARBITRATION

Mr. President, on forced arbitration, before the end of the week, it is my intention to have the Senate take action on one of the most important workplace reforms that we have seen in decades—eliminating forced arbitration for sexual harassment and assault.

Yesterday, I sat down with my Republican colleagues, Senators LINDSEY GRAHAM and JONI ERNST, and we worked out an agreement on a few outstanding issues that will clear the path for the Senate, we believe, to hold a vote very soon on this issue. I want to thank them for their good faith and cooperation. And I especially want to thank my friend and colleague from New York, Senator GILLIBRAND, for being the leader on this important issue for so, so long.

For decades, it has been common practice for employers to tuck arbitration clauses into the fine print of employment contracts. Today, these clauses effectively function as preconditions for getting hired to a new job. Most workers may not even realize what they have signed on to until it is too late, after the fact.

Today, we can no longer ignore that forced arbitration has proven immensely harmful when it comes to sexual harassment and sexual assault. When workers—almost always women—face abuse or harassment at the hands of their employers, forced arbitration immediately limits their options for remedy. The deck is stacked against them from the start, and thus abusers rarely face true accountability. That is awful and must change.

And all of it is going to change very soon. By passing bipartisan legislation to end forced arbitration for sexual harassment and assault, we will ensure that those who face abuse will have the freedom to exercise their basic right to pursue action against harmful employers in court. This is long, long overdue, and I want to commend both sides for working together to getting us close to the finish line. I expect we will hold a vote on this to pass this legislation in the very near future, and the benefits of the legislation will be felt across the country and last for a very, very long time.

Bottom line, ending forced arbitration for sexual harassment and assault is about making our workplaces safer, holding abusive employers accountable, and making sure that every American can exercise their right to seek justice in a court of law.

SENATE BUSINESS

Mr. President, finally, on Senate business, concerning the activity on the floor today, the Senate is going to have another busy workday as we continue confirming Presidential nominations to the administration and onto the Federal bench.

Today, three rollcall votes are scheduled on the nominations of both the head of the U.S. International Development Finance Corp and the President's pick for Assistant Secretary of the Army.

But tonight we are very likely to add additional rollcall votes to complete the confirmation of several pending nominations. These votes will likely take us into the early evening, but they are necessary in order to confirm nominees.

I will add that until this past year, these nominees almost always have been approved through unanimous consent. Unfortunately, a few people on the other side are holding it up and making us vote on each of these, but vote we must.

Once again, though, to move things along, I ask my colleagues to cast their votes quickly tonight, to remain in their seats or near the floor as much as possible, and to be flexible in order to help move things along as quickly as possible on the Senate floor, as we did last week.

We did a good job voting efficiently last week despite the large number of votes. So I ask everyone to continue at that pace tonight as needed.

STOCK TRADING

Mr. President, finally, off the floor, I want to reiterate a brief point I made yesterday regarding stock trading and Members of Congress. I believe this is an important issue that Congress should address, and it is something that has clearly raised interest from both sides of the aisle over the past few weeks.

As I said yesterday, there are a number of Senators with various proposals, and I have asked my Democratic colleagues to come together and come up with a single bill this Chamber can work on. I hope we can pass something. I want to encourage my colleagues on the Democratic side to reach out across the aisle. Some of the proposals—we have a whole bunch—have bipartisan support.

This is something the Senate should address. Hopefully, we can act on it soon, and hopefully it can be done in a bipartisan way, like many of the bills we are looking at this week.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

CRIME

Mr. McCONNELL. While Washington Democrats spent 2021 distracted by their reckless taxing-and-spending spree, violent criminals were preying on the American people. Millions of Americans' neighborhoods descended into chaos and violence around them.

After the nationwide murder rate saw its biggest jump in more than 100 years in 2020, at least 12 major cities set their own alltime homicide records in 2021. Rates of carjackings have doubled, tripled, and even quadrupled in major metro areas.

My hometown of Louisville set a new alltime murder record last year of 188 homicides. Twenty-four of the victims were children. At one point last year, a staggering 65 percent of our homicides were going unsolved. Louisville is now averaging one carjacking every 42 hours. Yesterday, I hosted the FBI special agent in charge of the Louisville field office for a meeting here in the Capitol. We discussed these issues at length.

One survey last year found that Americans believe violent crime is the No. 1 major crisis facing our country. More citizens called violent crime a major crisis than COVID. When Americans were asked about President Biden's handling of law enforcement and criminal justice, the President polls almost 20 points underwater.

The American people know this crime wave is not some spontaneous event. It has been fed and fueled in multiple ways by the Democratic Party's far-left turn. For example, liberal activists and many elected Democrats have spent almost 2 years trying to smear—smear—the entire profession of policing with the actions of a few bad actors.

We know that anti-police culture wars invite more crime. It is a fact. A prominent scholar—who, incidentally, was the youngest African-American professor to ever get tenure at Harvard—has proven that anti-police outcry directly results in more crime, including homicides.

Many jurisdictions have entertained financial attacks on police departments to match the rhetorical attacks. Literally just yesterday, a prominent House Democrat insisted to the press that the far left will not be dropping or diluting their message of “defund the police.”

Meanwhile, our brave men and women in law enforcement are literally—literally—under attack. While too many politicians take aim at our brave police officers in a political sense, violent criminals are taking aim at them in a literal sense. The number of cop killings shot up nearly 60 percent last year to a two-decade high.

In Louisville, Jefferson County Sheriff's Deputy Brandon Shirley was shot and killed last summer. It is believed he was ambushed while wearing his uniform.

The streets of New York City were packed full with heroes a few days ago as fellow officers mourned two of their colleagues who had been shot and killed.

It is not just regular citizens going about their normal days who need this violent crime epidemic to stop; our brave men and women in blue also need very badly for it to stop. But, within the justice system, leftwing activists have insinuated themselves into prosecutorial roles throughout America and are making “soft on crime” actually their official policy.

The State's attorney in Baltimore announced last year she intended to stop prosecuting minor drug and prostitution cases.

New York City's new district attorney said last month he would not pursue charges for marijuana misdemeanors, trespassing, and resisting arrest, among others. After a huge backlash, he tried to walk some of this back.

Chain stores like Walgreens have had to close locations in San Francisco because constant, unpunished theft and shoplifting have become a fact of life in that city.

Another example is almost too sad and ironic for words. In Wisconsin last November, a repeat offender who was out on bond drove his car into a Christmas parade and murdered six people. His victims included an 8-year-old child and a group of grandmothers.

Well, one jurisdiction over in Milwaukee County has one of the most prominent soft-on-crime liberal prosecutors in the entire country. He has spent years waging a national campaign urging prosecutors to actually go easy on repeat criminals like this killer. A few years back, he even admitted soft-on-crime policies would cost innocent lives but said he was willing to make the trade.

Here is what he had to say:

Is there going to be an individual I divert, or I put into [a] treatment program, who's going to go out and kill somebody? You bet. Guaranteed. It's guaranteed to happen. It does not invalidate the overall approach.

These backward, pro-crime attitudes aren't just infecting local DAs' offices; they also seem to be largely defining the Biden Department of Justice. Rachael Rollins is the former Massachusetts DA who spent her last job trying to wipe entire categories of crimes off the enforcement rolls. This earned her a promotion to U.S. attorney from President Biden, which every Senate Democrat supported. There is Vanita Gupta, now an Associate Attorney General, who had previously advocated for sweeping drug decriminalization and expressed her support for efforts to “decrease police budgets.” There is Kristen Clarke, also confirmed by Senate Democrats to work at DOJ, who

echoed calls to “invest less in police.” These are President Biden's picks to top jobs at Main Justice.

I just had to place a hold on the nominee to be U.S. attorney for Minnesota because the person recently acting in that job recommended an unusually soft sentence below the minimum guideline to a convicted fatal arsonist because the arsonist was taking part in a far-left political riot at the time. I will need written assurance the nominee to succeed this person will not continue this jaw-dropping practice and lessen criminals' sentences so long as the political violence they commit happens to be leftwing.

The modern Democratic Party has convinced itself that order—order—is actually oppression and anarchy is actually compassion. This is totally wrong. Tolerating lawlessness and anarchy is not compassionate. It doesn't help vulnerable communities for politicians to passively watch them devolve into literal war zones. The actual residents of these communities know this best of all.

Last summer, even after months of anti-police rhetoric from the left, when a poll asked the residents of Detroit about their concerns, almost five times more people said public safety than police reform. It was even more lopsided among African-American residents. They named public safety eight times more than police reform.

Last summer, NPR interviewed a man who had committed terrible crimes as a young adult, served time, turned his life around, and now works with young men in prison. The reporter asked how he had gotten caught up in criminal violence. Where did his childhood veer off course?

Here was the man's explanation—a direct quote. Here is what he said:

It was my environment. . . . When I go outside every day, as soon as I walk out my front door, I'm entering a war zone . . . from sun-up to sundown, robberies and murders and carjacking and extortion . . . [I] became a product of my environment.

So this man's problem was not an evil justice system that was out to get him; it wasn't that his neighborhood had an excess of law and order; the problem was a lack of—a lack of—law and order.

It is not compassionate to let vulnerable kids grow up in war zones because Democrats feel bad putting violent criminals in prison, where they belong.

Let me say that again. It is not compassionate to let vulnerable kids grow up in war zones because Democrats feel guilty putting violent criminals behind bars, where they belong.

Neither is it compassionate to make innocent, law-abiding citizens across America live in fear because liberal public servants won't do their jobs.

The answer to this crimewave isn't slashing law enforcement budgets, it isn't replacing cops with social workers, and it isn't far-left gun grabbers coming after the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens. Here is the answer: Elected officials need to drop the

soft-on-crime nonsense and give innocent American families the protection they deserve.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE COFFEYVILLE COMMUNITY COLLEGE RED RAVENS MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I rise this morning to recognize and congratulate the Coffeyville Community College Red Ravens men's basketball team on winning the 2021 National Junior College Athletic Association Division 1 men's basketball championship. Kansas has an unparalleled history of college athletes, and I am proud to recognize the Coffeyville Red Ravens' contribution to our State's many accomplishments.

On April 24, 2021, the Coffeyville Red Ravens brought home their first national championship trophy in nearly six decades. As an underdog in the national tournament with a No. 10 ranking, this accomplishment is a result of hard work, determination, and grit. During the championship game, freshman center Blaise Keita had a career high of 27 points, and Tylor Perry scored 18 points. Additionally, Blaise, Tylor, and Love Bettis were named to the All-Tournament team.

The honorable achievements of these players have earned rightful recognition for their commitment to excellence in college athletics. Athletics teach young men and women many valuable skills that serve them throughout their lives.

These lessons and this team's accomplishment were not possible without the leadership of Head Coach Jay Herkelman, who has been an instrumental member of the Red Ravens men's basketball program for nearly three decades. As a coach who has shown dedication to his players and his team, he has earned the title of the Kansas Basketball Coaches Association's "Coach of the Year" five times. Furthermore, congratulations to Coach Herkelman, who is only 1 win away from reaching the remarkable milestone of 700 wins with the Red Ravens.

I am pleased to have introduced a resolution with Congressman LATURNER and Senator MARSHALL on behalf of these dedicated student athletes, coaches, team, and school, and to have had it unanimously pass the U.S. Senate last week.

Thank you to the players, the coaches, and the staff of the Coffeyville Community College Red Ravens men's basketball team for bringing this win home.

Congratulations to all in Southeast Kansas, South Central Kansas, those who are students, those who are faculty, and those who lead this college. We are proud of their success.

The Coffeyville community has much to take pride in this strong program, and I look forward to their continued success.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SUPPLY CHAIN

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, one of the big drivers of our inflation crisis was Democrats' decision to flood the economy with unnecessary government money last March with their \$1.9 trillion spending bill.

Another contributor to the problem has been supply chain bottlenecks. Americans are getting pretty used to long delays in receiving the goods they have ordered, to big holes on grocery store shelves, and to being unable to rely on a store to keep a product in stock consistently.

Since the start of the pandemic, keeping goods in stock has been a challenge, but, as with the larger inflation crisis, the White House has seemed largely uninterested in addressing the problem. "The tragedy of the treadmill that's delayed"—that was a quote of the White House Press Secretary, joking in October, a typically tone-deaf comment from an administration often oblivious to the difficulties facing ordinary Americans.

In fact, supply chain issues are not a minor inconvenience; they are a real problem. It is not easy for an already overstretched mom or dad to have to run around town trying to find essential items—items they could previously rely on one store, at least, to have in stock. Businesses are struggling to maintain their profit margins and meet the demands of their customers, particularly small businesses, which have fewer resources to work around supply chain problems. Of course, supply chain problems are helping to fuel the price hikes Americans have been facing on everything from food and clothing to furniture, to used cars and trucks.

These are facts that seem lost on the administration, which has largely ignored supply chain issues and the inflation crisis in favor of focusing on pet projects: a massive tax-and-spending spree and election legislation that it thinks will boost Democrat chances in the fall.

On top of this, the administration has taken more than one action that is making or seems likely to make our supply chain problems even worse.

Earlier this week, for example, the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration implemented its entry-level driver training rule, which substantially expands training requirements for drivers seeking to obtain a com-

mercial driver's license. The new rule is likely to make it significantly more challenging for trucking companies to train new drivers, particularly for smaller trucking companies, which may struggle to afford the enhanced training costs.

The trucking industry has been hit hard by the supply chain crisis, with drivers working longer hours with fewer resources to keep goods moving across the country. They have been heroes. This makes it a very bad time to impose new burdens on truckers and tie up trucking companies with additional redtape.

The administration should have delayed the implementation of this rule until the worst of the supply chain crisis eases. Unfortunately, the administration decided to push ahead anyway, and now truckdrivers and trucking companies will face additional challenges, which will likely exacerbate supply chain problems.

The Canada-U.S. cross-border truck-driver vaccine mandate is another administration action that has created new pressures on a trucking industry already stretched thin thanks to the supply chain crisis. I am a strong supporter of vaccines, but mandating vaccines for cross-border truckdrivers has only served to worsen supply chain bottlenecks. You just need to look at the current situation in Canada to see the evidence of that. Truckdrivers do not pose a high risk of COVID transmission since they spend most of their workday alone. This mandate's main legacy looks likely to be increasing the supply chain problems we are facing.

Then, of course, there is the administration's hostile attitude toward conventional energy production. The administration might not like it, but the fact of the matter is that our economy will continue to rely on conventional energy like gasoline for a while yet. Discouraging conventional energy production, as the administration has done, is doing nothing but worsening our inflation and supply chain crisis and driving up energy bills for American families.

Energy prices have a substantial effect on prices in the store and on the availability of goods. The higher energy prices are, the more expensive it will be to produce and transport goods. The more it costs to produce and transport goods, the higher the final price of the goods is likely to be.

The administration's hostility to traditional energy production has helped drive energy prices up, which is aggravating, making worse, our supply chain and inflation crises.

Instead of imposing unhelpful new regulations, it would be nice to see the administration turn its focus to meaningful measures to address the supply chain crisis, like those in the bipartisan legislation I introduced last week with Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR.

For some time now, I have heard reports of ocean carriers refusing to

transport certain goods—often American agricultural products, which impacts my State of South Dakota—in favor of more lucrative cargoes. Our legislation is designed to address this problem and create a more level playing field for American producers.

Our bill gives the Federal Maritime Commission greater authority to respond to discriminatory ocean carrier practices, and it provides the FMC with tools to more quickly resolve detention and demurrage disputes.

This legislation will bring greater efficiency and transparency to a process that leaves many shippers frustrated—especially small businesses—and bring long-term, positive changes to the maritime supply chain, which I hope will benefit exporters, importers, and consumers alike.

These are the kinds of measures the White House should be focusing on, measures that open up the supply chain instead of weighing it down with government mandates and regulations.

Given the administration's general lack of concern with the supply chain and inflation crises facing the American people, I don't have a lot of hope that the White House is going to do much to address either of these problems, but I will continue to work with my colleagues in Congress from both parties wherever possible to advance measures that will ease our supply chain problems and help to get back to a situation where goods move smoothly around our country and around the world.

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 RETA JO LEWIS

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the nomination of Reta Jo Lewis to serve as the President and Chair of the Ex-Im Bank of the United States. It is my understanding that we are likely to have a vote later today on her confirmation, and I want to address this.

And let me start by underscoring why, frankly, I don't think we should have an Ex-Im Bank, and let me explain why. First of all, let's start with the Ex-Im's claim about how it does business. The Ex-Im Bank maintains that, when it provides financing for these transactions that it engages in, it only takes risks that private lenders are either unable or unwilling to take.

Now, we ought to stop ourselves right there and say: Well, wait a minute. If the private sector is not willing to take these risks, why should we force taxpayers to take these risks—because the Ex-Im Bank is, of course, backed by American taxpayers. So that is question No. 1.

But it actually gets worse than that. The Ex-Im Bank also insists that it only makes safe bets; it only engages in very low-risk, safe transactions. But, of course, it is impossible to do both, right? Ex-Im can't only take transactions so risky that no one else will do them but at the same time only do safe transactions. That is an obvious contradiction, and that is a contradiction that is at the heart of Ex-Im's business model.

So how do they do business? The reason they do business is they systematically underprice the risk. That is why Ex-Im gets the transaction instead of the private sector. That is why borrowers go to Ex-Im instead of any number of private financial institutions that are happy to offer the deal but only under terms that generate an adequate return on the risk.

This is why, for instance, the largest, most successful, most profitable banks in America go to Ex-Im for loan guarantees—because Ex-Im's terms are too good to be true, at least too good to be true in the private sector.

Let me just give a very recent example of just how egregious this is. In 2021, the Ex-Im Bank financed a deal in which they guaranteed an \$82 million loan made by JPMorgan, the bank, to Qantas, the Australian airline, for the purpose of buying jet engines from General Electric. Now, let's think about this. We have JPMorgan, the largest bank in America—extremely profitable, enormously successful, all the capital in the world. We have Qantas, which is one of the most successful and profitable airlines in the world. They are the largest airline in Australia. And, of course, General Electric is one of the largest industrial companies in the world.

Can anybody actually, with a straight face, suggest that any of these companies can't borrow money privately? Seriously? All three of them access the capital markets every day. They have access to all the financing in the world. Yet taxpayers guaranteed this transaction because it was available. They don't need any subsidy from American taxpayers, none whatsoever. Yet this is what Ex-Im does.

Now, one of the claims that we hear from Ex-Im and from some supporters of Ex-Im is that Ex-Im plays an essential role; without them, we just wouldn't have the exports that we have; we depend on Ex-Im to export products.

Well, the problem with that argument is the vast, overwhelming majority of American exports are done without Ex-Im. Now, we went back and looked at the annual export data from 2007 through 2020. In that period of time, the highest percentage of U.S. exports that were financed with Ex-Im financing happened to be in 2012. Do you know what that percentage was? It was 2.3 percent. That is the value of the exports that were financed by Ex-Im Bank.

And that was, by the way, when Ex-Im had everything going for it. It was

fully operational. It had a quorum on the Board. It had not reached its lending limit. So it was doing business without constraints. Yet it does this little, tiny sliver of American exports.

The fact is, we are the second biggest exporting economy in the world behind China. The United States is No. 2 in total exports of goods. We are No. 1 in the world in terms of value added, and we do it almost entirely without Ex-Im financing—at least 97.7 percent in Ex-Im's best year. So the argument that somehow American exporters need Ex-Im to survive is patently false.

It gets worse, though. Now Ex-Im wants to expand into domestic financing. Ex-Im has been tasked by the Biden administration with developing a new domestic financing program to expand the reach of the Bank. The proposed domestic financing program would support creating or expanding domestic manufacturing businesses and infrastructure projects as long as there is the expectation that some arbitrary portion of the goods will ultimately be exported.

Can you imagine? So now the Ex-Im Bank is going to provide domestic financing. Gee, if only we had banks in America. If only we had capital markets in America so that we could provide financing for these transactions. No, we need the Ex-Im Bank to do it. We need taxpayers to go into the domestic banking business, on top of everything else.

It is unbelievable. This isn't just mission creep. This is like mission sprint. Of course, it completely subverts the congressional intent. The intent was to match financing that is provided for exports around the world. This has nothing to do with that. There is no reason in the world that Ex-Im should be providing domestic financing—none. We live in the most developed capital markets of the world. We have a huge, enormously successful banking system. There is absolutely no need for this. And the only way they will get business is to, once again, underprice the risk so that taxpayers do not get properly compensated for the risks that they take.

Now, let me get to the specifics of our nominee. I am concerned that Ms. Lewis is not going to protect the U.S. taxpayers from this inherently risky construct. For one example, the Biden administration has suggested doubling Ex-Im's statutory default cap from 2 percent to 4 percent. So what does this mean? So under current statute, Ex-Im has got a limit of how much of its balance sheet can be in default. It is 2 percent.

Well, lately, the default rate has been creeping up. In fact, it has tripled, and it is very close to 2 percent. So the obvious solution is to do something about the credit quality of the balance sheet, but that is not the Biden administration's solution. They just want to double the permissible amount of losses. Well, I have no reason to believe that Ms. Lewis would object to that at all.

In fact, I suspect she would embrace that.

I am also concerned about the background she brings to this job. Ms. Lewis does have some experience in international policy, but she does not have the financial background that should be a prerequisite for serving as the President of a big bank. And without such a background, she is going to inevitably rely heavily on Ex-Im's staff. As I said, I am very concerned that she is going to support this domestic financing program of the administration.

So for these reasons and others, I am urging my colleagues to vote against the confirmation of Ms. Lewis as President of the Ex-Im Bank.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator MURRAY and I be allowed to complete our remarks before the scheduled rollcall votes.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3604

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, for the past 2 years, our Nation's kids have suffered. They have suffered socially, academically, and psychologically at the hands of Democratic politicians, the Biden administration, and their political bosses in the teachers unions.

Although kids are at the lowest risk of hospitalization and death from the Wuhan coronavirus, they have endured and they continue to endure some of the most excessive, extreme, and suffocating COVID restrictions of any population in our country. This treatment has been nothing short of cruel. The politicians and the neurotic public health obsessives who enforce these policies should all hang their heads in shame.

There are few things in a kid's life, outside of family and church, that are more important to them than their school. For them, open and happy schools are precious. But for teachers union bosses like Randi Weingarten, they are just useful hostages.

For the better part of a year, teachers unions shut down our schools while they shook down politicians for more funding and benefits that they promised would allow them to reopen safely. Yet they kept schools closed. They kept kids masked.

Desperate parents watched their socially isolated kids fall behind while they engaged in Zoom schools, but the unions still dragged their feet.

When schools finally reopened, our kids faced insane coronavirus protocols. They weren't allowed to sit with friends at lunch. They weren't allowed to play at recess. They had to eat outside on freezing-cold days. And every moment of every day at every school, they were forced to wear a mask.

Confused and hyper kids naturally often rebelled, and they have been reprimanded and they have been punished

for simply trying to play, trying to make friends, trying to breathe a little easier.

Some parents may think that masks work for their kids, and that is fine. If they want to, they can put their kids in a mask. They should be able to choose. But under Democratic-forced masking policies, parents have no choice at all. Tragically, but predictably—not just predictably—predicted—these absurd policies have had severe psychological effects on our kids. Suicide and mental health problems have skyrocketed in the past 2 years. Grades have plummeted, while depression has surged. And as is so often the case, those with the least have suffered the most.

But when parents dared to complain on behalf of their kids, they were condemned by teachers union bosses and by Democratic politicians as anti-science and extremists. They were investigated when Attorney General Merrick Garland sicced the Feds on parents who were simply going to school boards to protest these stupid policies. The Secretary of Education threatened to withdraw Federal funding from States and schools who did not have mask mandates.

Thankfully, the tide has begun to turn. Sometimes I hear the phrase “the science changed.” The science hasn't changed. What has changed is that there is an election coming and Democrats have seen the polling on this question. Now they are running scared, and they want to pretend that they didn't force your kid to wear a mask for 2 years.

You see it in States that are run entirely by Democrats: California, New Jersey, New York, the President's own Delaware. Just yesterday, across the river in Virginia, the State senate, to include many Democrats, voted not just to allow parents a choice but to prohibit mask mandates by local schools.

Yet, in many places, forced masking remains. Kids as young as 2, 3, 4 are still being forced to wear hot, restrictive, and ineffective masks for hours on end. Yes, ineffective because almost all those kids are wearing cloth masks, which don't even work. And that is not me speaking; that is the CDC speaking. These masks don't even work. Yet the kids are forced to wear them all day long.

I can tell you that most Democratic politicians don't think they work either. How do we know that? Look at the candidate for Governor in Georgia, Stacey Abrams—or maybe I should say the Governor of Georgia, since she still refuses to concede the 2018 election and many of my Democratic colleagues have endorsed her view that she is somehow the shadow Governor of Georgia. Just last week, photos emerged of her sitting in classrooms with masked kids grinning ear to ear, the only person not wearing a mask in the classroom.

Also, Gavin Newsom, the Governor of California, was yucking it up at SoFi

Stadium when the Rams played the 49ers, taking pictures—without a mask—with Magic Johnson and a bunch of other celebrities, while he enforced one of the most onerous mask mandates in the country.

What about Eric Garcetti, whose nomination to be the Ambassador to India is in front of the Senate right now, who said that pictures of him without a mask on are fine because he was holding his breath—I guess like Bill Clinton, who didn't inhale.

Barack Obama, pictures recently emerged of him standing outside—outside—on the beach, without a mask, while all the peons who are building his multimillion-dollar beach compound were forced to wear a mask in front of him.

And I will let you in on something. The same goes for Democratic Senators. I was in a hearing this week. It was in a small, closed room. Not a single Democratic Senator wore a mask in that hearing in that room. The catch is, the TV cameras weren't on, so there wouldn't be video of them sitting in that closed room without a mask on.

But masks in school have become symbols of control and fear. They are not instruments of public health. It is past time for the mask mandates to end and for parents across this country to have a choice. That is why I am asking the Senate to pass my legislation today to require schools that receive Federal funding to give parents a simple choice on whether their kids should wear a mask.

If my Democratic colleagues will join me, we can get this done now, today. That is why I urge them to support this bill. And I ask, as if in legislative session, unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 3604, which is at the desk; further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have said before that we all want to make sure our schools can stay safely open for in-person learning. But based on this legislation, it is not clear that is true for all of my Republican colleagues.

Look, this is straightforward. If you want education decisions to happen at the local level, you do not tie the hands of State and local officials when they are trying to keep their students and educators safe. And if you want schools to be able to stay safely open and bring some stability and certainty back to our classrooms, you don't cut schools off from the resources they need just because you think you know better than the parents and local officials about how this pandemic is progressing in their community or how they should use tools like masks.

I am a former preschool teacher, parent advocate, and school board member. But let's be honest, you don't need classroom experience to see that right now the very last thing we should be doing is denying schools the tools and resources to help kids learn safely. The data is clear. We have real work to do to help our students make up for an incredibly tough 2 years.

Now, Democrats actually passed legislation—the American Rescue Plan—which invests specifically in helping our students recover academically and mentally. The proposal from the Senator from Arkansas would put our students' recovery and safe in-person learning in jeopardy. It would take those important public health decisions, which should be based on local conditions, away from those communities and slash funding for students and schools right when they need us the most.

Now is not the time to pull the rug out from under students in schools. Parents, educators, and, most of all, kids have been through enough. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I would simply reply to the remarks of the Senator from Washington, she asserted that I or others who oppose these mask mandates think that we know better. That is the whole point, though. It is not that we think we know better; I think that you, as a parent, know better. You know what is best for your child—not some Democratic politician, not some liberal superintendent, not some neurotic public health obsessive.

And, apparently, the Democrats have no problem using these Federal funds when it suits their neurotic policies. After all, the Department of Education last year threatened Federal funding for States and schools that did not permit mask mandates. The whole point of this exercise is this: the Democrats who think they know better than parents to make the choices for the parents' kids.

I am disappointed today that my Democratic colleagues want to continue to see kids forced to wear masks in schools across America, but, trust me, change is coming one way or another. It will be because Democratic politicians, like Gavin Newsom, run for the hills or because the American people repudiate them all in November.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Scott A. Nathan, of Massachusetts, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Development Finance Corporation.

VOTE ON NATHAN NOMINATION

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

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 24, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 43 Ex.]

YEAS—72

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

NAYS—24

Blackburn	Hoeven	Moran
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Paul
Braun	Inhofe	Rubio
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Daines	Lee	Shelby
Ernst	Lummis	Tuberville
Fischer	Marshall	Wicker

NOT VOTING—4

Barrasso	Luján
Hawley	Rounds

The nomination was confirmed.

(Mr. CASEY assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. HEINRICH assumed the Chair.)

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The 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 nomi-

nation of Executive Calendar No. 498, Douglas R. Bush, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army.

Charles E. Schumer, Jack Reed, Sheldon Whitehouse, Richard Blumenthal, Catherine Cortez Masto, Richard J. Durbin, Jacky Rosen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Mark Kelly, Benjamin L. Cardin, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, Angus S. King, Jr., Patrick J. Leahy, Martin Heinrich, Tim Kaine, Gary C. Peters, Chris Van Hollen.

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 Douglas R. Bush, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, 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.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 95, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 44 Ex.]

YEAS—95

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

NAYS—2

Hawley	Scott (FL)
--------	------------

NOT VOTING—3

Barrasso	Luján	Rounds
----------	-------	--------

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 95, the nays are 2.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon disposition of the Bush nomination, the Senate vote on confirmation of the Coffey nomination.

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

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here again today to discuss the scheme by big Republican donor interests to capture and control our Supreme Court. Today, I am going to put a little spotlight on ongoing scheme operations.

As we all know, Justice Stephen Breyer will retire at the end of this Supreme Court term. As the Biden administration selects a nominee, the scheme is shifting gears to attack her even before she has been named.

A dark money front group called the Judicial Crisis Network has already announced a multimillion-dollar ad blitz against Justice Breyer's unnamed replacement, and its first ad is already up. The ad's premise is that leftwing dark money is poised to capture our Supreme Court. I am not making that up. Think of a squid. When a squid senses danger, it squirts a jet of ink into the water. The squid ink creates confusion and distracts predators, and the squid sneaks off. This new ad from the Judicial Crisis Network is squid ink.

Let's start with just a quick review of the facts. Rightwing donor interests captured our Supreme Court under Donald Trump. They did it with dark money. They used the front group Judicial Crisis Network to launder off identities of big rightwing contributors. The deidentified contributions funded political campaign ads against Merrick Garland and for Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett. Those are the facts. The road onto the Supreme Court for those three Justices was paved with dark money.

By the way, the checks were big. Four of the checks to Judicial Crisis Network were for \$15 million or more. That is a big check. Because we don't know who those donors are or who that donor is—it could all be one donor—we don't know what business they had before the Court or why it was so worth it to them or him to spend \$60 million to influence the makeup of the Court.

This new Judicial Crisis Network ad—the squid ink ad—is designed to confuse those rather conspicuous facts. They can hide who funded them, but they can't hide what they did; so, squid ink—distraction, misdirection. Their accusations of dark money corruption are a projection of the very scheme they themselves hatched and executed. As I have discussed previously in these speeches, this is a classic propaganda technique: You accuse your adversary of what you yourself have been doing.

Yes, it is maddening to have a phony front group use dark money to capture and corrupt our Supreme Court and turn it into the Court that dark money built. It is devilish, Vladimir Putin-style propaganda for that phony front group to then accuse others of exactly what it did—a false mirror of its own behavior.

By the way, that Judicial Crisis Network ad accusing a not-yet-chosen Su-

preme Court nominee of being a dark money stooge? Paid for with dark money. You can't make this stuff up.

Let's look at the Judicial Crisis Network. Start with the fact that "Judicial Crisis Network" does not exist. It is, legally speaking, a fiction. Who knew, right—an entity selling fiction that is itself a fiction. "Judicial Crisis Network" is actually a "fictitious name"—that is a term under Virginia incorporation law—a fictitious name, one of several filed by an organization, a completely different organization, called the Concord Fund.

It gets even more tangled, as dark money schemes tend to be—they are a lot like a covert operation—so let's keep digging.

The Judicial Crisis Network actually used to exist. It was once the 501(c)(4) twin of a 501(c)(3) called the Judicial Education Project. That is the state of the art these days for dark money political mischief, a twinned 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4). Tax records list the same address for both entities—conveniently an address which happens to be just right down the hall, on the same floor, in the same building, as the Federalist Society.

This twinned organization trick allows donors to shift money in and out of different shady operations with zero disclosure, and it even gives donors a tax deduction to the 501(c)(3). You could pierce that corporate veil pretty easily.

All this schemery hides the donors behind the operation. It fools members of the press who don't bother to figure it out, and it helps dark money operatives like Leonard Leo, the central organizer of the scheme—the operative for the big dark money donors—to hide their hands and shuffle money secretly around.

Leonard Leo, you will recall, ran the donor turnstile at the Federalist Society that picked Justices Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett. Then, at the tail end of the Trump administration, with no more Supreme Court appointments likely, Leo scuttled off to a new venture: CRC Advisors.

CRC Advisors was designed, as Axios reported, to "funnel big money and expertise across the conservative movement."

As an aside, CRC Advisors has an affiliate called CRC Strategies, which, among other things, brought us the infamous swift boat campaign against John Kerry—classy bunch.

Along with the inception of CRC Advisors, Judicial Crisis Network was quietly renamed the "Concord Fund," and the Judicial Education Project was quietly renamed the "85 Fund."

These became twin 501(c)(4) and 501(c)(3) political mischief operations. Concord, as a 501(c)(4), would handle attack ads and PR. The 85 Fund, the 501(c)(3), would help mask Concord's operations and donors and provide tax deductibility.

So that was the original setup, the renaming. Then these newly named

groups loaded up with all these fictitious names. They filed under Virginia law for permission to operate under fictitious names, and these are the fictitious names they registered to use.

First, Concord took its old name—its old name—and reregistered it as this new fictitious name. And so did 85 Fund, taking its old name, Judicial Education Project, and registering it as a fictitious name. Go figure why that was necessary.

Then they stood up new voter suppression projects under other fictitious names: Honest Elections Project Action and Honest Elections Project. Those two front groups—fictitious name front groups—are part of the dark money armada, along with Heritage Action and others, through which big rightwing donors orchestrated the anti-voting laws that have spread like a virus through Republican State legislatures. That didn't just happen. That was done. And as a Heritage Action employee admitted in a leaked video, they did it, quietly, through sentinels.

Concord also added another fictitious name, Free to Learn Action, and 85 Fund created the twin Free to Learn. These fronts are presumably to whip up the rightwing about so-called critical race theory when the big donors want.

Gobs of money pours into this propaganda machine. The 85 Fund's last tax filing shows \$65 million in revenues, including one \$48.5 million donation from a single, anonymous donor. If it is the same single, anonymous donor that contributed the over \$15 million contributions to the Judicial Crisis Network before, that would put one donor over \$100 million into this Court-capture scheme—and all that money for an organization with only one employee who draws a salary of over \$100,000 per year.

So no surprise, then, that the 85 Fund channels lots of money back to the CRC mother ship. Its last tax filing shows over \$12 million paid to Leo's CRC Advisors for so-called consulting/advertising services, and it distributed over \$34 million to other unnamed groups, presumably in other areas of the scheme, in a big dark money shuffle.

We are still waiting for Concord Fund records for the most recent tax year, but the previous year's filing proves the Axios reporting is spot on. Concord's top independent contractor is CRC Advisors, paid over \$4.2 million for consulting services. It is out of this pea-and-shell game switcheroo that the dark money Judicial Crisis Network ad emerges.

I have noticed recently—in fact, as recently as our last Judiciary Committee markup—that Republicans are currently reverting, often, to the same dark money line of attack as the Judicial Crisis Network. As we watch Republican Senators attack Democrat dark money, let's remember a few things. First, Republicans created, protected, and defended—and defend to this day—dark money. Republicans

block our efforts to get rid of dark money.

Republicans came first to the dark money game with billions of dark money dollars. Then, when we began to play by their rules—the rules they made, the rules they defend—they complained. I guess they hope that we will unilaterally disarm so they can pound us with dark money just as they did for years after their Republican Justices in Citizens United let the big money flow.

Well, unilateral disarmament isn't going to happen, but that is not the only reason for the squid ink. The falsehood of this ad serves to damn us all in the eyes of the public. The right-wing scheme reckons that Americans, frustrated and cynical about a slimy, dark money battle purportedly involving both sides, will tune out and turn away from what Justice Sotomayor has called the "stench" of partisanship emerging at the Supreme Court.

All this misdirection—squid ink—can then distract from their captured Court's record for the big scheme's donors. The "Roberts Five" have a pattern now, a pattern of 80–80—partisan 5-to-4 decisions, all benefiting easily identified Republican donor interests—an 80-to-0 record. It is a heck of a pattern.

And now they have a new rightwing, dark money supermajority to amp it up even further. It is no wonder polling shows that Americans believe the six-Justice Republican majority is motivated mainly by politics and that the Court's approval rating just hit an all-time low.

So a little distraction is in order. Cue the squid ink. Meanwhile, the Senate minority leader is reportedly urging his caucus to keep a low profile on Biden's nominee. I get it. When you have got your burglars inside merrily ransacking a house, the last thing you want is a noisy ruckus out on the front lawn. One liberal Justice exchanged for another isn't worth a fuss when the loot is being shoveled out the window to your gang.

If there was any honest concern about dark money on the Republican side, there is a really, really easy way to show it: support legislation to clean it up; put an end to it.

I have a bill, the DISCLOSE Act. It will end dark money in our politics and in our judiciary. Every single Senate Democrat has voted in favor of this DISCLOSE Act. Even the liberal groups that Judicial Crisis Network complains about are backing that bill.

So, my Republican friends, support it, pass the law, end the slimy, political, dark money era we now live in. They could do that, but I will make you a bet that they won't. Dark money power is too important a weapon for rightwing donors to abandon.

So, instead, Republicans in this Chamber filibuster that legislation—filibuster it—and dark money continues to corrupt our politics.

Brace yourselves, folks. Squid ink will flow in the weeks and months

ahead. For the dark money forces squirting out the squid ink, the aim is defense, defense of their mighty prize: the Court that dark money built and that dances to their dark money tune.

To be continued.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I commend my colleague for talking about dark money. I was so curious this week when I saw—I think it was—a New York Times article about the amount of dark money that came from the Democratic side of the aisle this year far outpacing anything that Republicans had spent. So I hope he is going to be successful in dealing with some of his supporters on that side of the aisle.

CRIME AND BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, what I want to focus on today is a meeting that I had the opportunity to have last week with the Tennessee Association of Chiefs of Police and yesterday with Tennessee sheriffs who had come up.

And one of the things that they talked about repeatedly in these meetings is the recent crime spike. This is something on everybody's mind, and for good reason. The majority of America's 40 most populous cities saw an increase in homicides last year—40 most populous, increase, homicides. More officers were intentionally killed on the job than in any other year since the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.

This is why morale is low.

Shoplifting is surging, and the thieves are getting creative. Instead of stuffing merchandise in their clothing and smuggling it out the door, gangs of thieves are executing smash-and-grab raids. We are also seeing a spike in drug use. Overdose deaths were up 30 percent in 2020.

This is not trivial; it is not frivolous; it is not a laughing matter; and it is something you cannot just overlook. It is life.

And I am sorry to say that Tennessee hasn't escaped this terrible trend. In 2021, the homicide spike in Memphis set a new record. We lost more than 3,000 Tennesseans to drug overdoses in 2020.

Law enforcement officers take this personally because they see how quickly crime can destroy a community. Are they worried? Yes. Do they have reason to be worried? Absolutely. As I said, morale is low. Recruiting is hard.

But here is what struck me about my conversation with the police chiefs and the sheriffs. They don't only consider the local effects. They really see the big picture and the issue writ large for what it truly is.

You won't be surprised to know that the lack of security along our southern border came up more than once in these conversations. The chiefs, the officers see the ripple effects of the Biden administration's absolutely demoralizing failure to enforce the law.

On his first day in the White House, President Biden endorsed lawlessness

when he made it harder for Border Patrol to secure the country. That stroke of a pen caused absolute chaos on our southern border.

Border Patrol detained more than 1.7 million migrants between January and September of 2021, and 1.1 million of those people were single adults. They were not families.

Those 1.7 million were just the ones we were able to catch. We will never know how many hundreds of thousands of "got-aways" made it into the interior of the country, nor do we know what they were bringing in with them that they were trying to evade the Border Patrol.

People and drugs are flowing across the border. Just last week, I came here to the floor and told the story of the Border Patrol's \$7 million week. Between January 21 and January 28, 1 week, they seized 47 pounds of meth, 3,800 pounds of marijuana, and almost 20 pounds of cocaine—1 week.

Hopefully, those drug mules are behind bars, but, remember, those are just the drug mules we caught. We do not know what the "got-aways" were bringing in with them or how many drug mules there were or how many hundreds of women they were trafficking in for sex trafficking, for human trafficking, for gangs, for labor crews. We don't know.

My Democratic colleagues continue to spin the border crisis as a purely humanitarian issue, but what we are seeing along our southern border is lawbreaking. In many cases, it is dangerous criminal behavior. And the Biden administration is ignoring every bit of it. Don't believe what you see. Don't believe the Border Patrol. Don't believe the people who are down there running videos. Oh, no. Everything is fine. Just listen to them.

But do you know who does not believe this? Our law enforcement officers. They don't believe what this administration is saying because they see something different. Every town is a border town, every State is a border State because of that open southern border.

Our law enforcement officers can't ignore this. They can't ignore the ripple effects because they live it every single day. They put on the belt, the badge. They go out, and they do their job. They see how the Democrats' desire to ignore lawless behavior when it benefits their narrative has created a perfect storm of violence, of fear, and has empowered criminals—not quite the message you want to send if you believe in the rule of law.

Just yesterday, I had to send a letter to Health and Human Services demanding to know why taxpayer dollars are funding fresh crack pipes for drug addicts. That is right. A HHS spokesman has confirmed that the Agency is pushing a grant program that would fund so-called smoking kits with pipes for users to smoke crystal meth, crack cocaine, and "any illicit substances"—government-funded drug paraphernalia.

Every once in a while, you think you have heard it all. Meanwhile, the border sits wide open, crime is on the rise, and we are asking police departments to do more with less.

A recent survey showed that between April 2020 and April 2021, police force retirements were up 45 percent, and resignations were up 18 percent compared to the previous year. There is no coincidence there.

It is time for the administration to decide whose side they are on. Are they on the side of the American people? Are they on the side of law enforcement? Are they on the side of criminals and monsters who really are responsible for this terrible crime spike?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, when the Biden administration ordered the evacuation of families of U.S. diplomats from Ukraine last month due to the increased threats of Russian military action and crime, a Ukrainian official clapped back: "Quite frankly these Americans are safer in Kyiv than they are in [Los Angeles] . . . or any other crime-ridden city in the U.S."

Yes, that is what a Ukrainian official said. The comment really struck a nerve because it may not be so far from the truth. In fact, an L.A. Police Department detective says the out-of-control crime in the city is "so violent, we're telling people 'don't visit,' because we don't think we can keep you safe right now." The city was surrendered to criminals by the L.A. district attorney on his first day on the job in 2020 when he banned bail and prohibited prosecuting even the most serious crimes, like murder and rape, to the fullest extent of the law.

The consequences of giving "get out of jail free" cards to criminals shouldn't surprise anyone. Flash mobs of thieves breaking into local businesses are giving new meaning to "door busters" as they ransack city stores like bargain shoppers on Black Friday.

Looters are robbing trains like it is the Wild West, making off with millions of dollars' worth of merchandise, including pistols and shotguns. A Union Pacific Railroad official says that even when apprehended, criminals boast that they will face no serious charges, and within hours, they are let back out on the streets.

But most troubling, over the past 2 years, Los Angeles has experienced a shocking 94-percent increase in homicides. The L.A. sheriff says it is probably one of the biggest jumps ever, and he lays the blame on the woke policies of both the district attorney and the county board.

These senseless acts of violence aren't confined to liberal Los Angeles, and neither is the revolving-prison-door approach that is allowing career criminals to roam our streets. The U.S. murder rate hit its highest point in a quarter of a century last year. More

and more felons are being released across the country as a result of permissive policies being pushed by progressive politicians and lenient district attorneys who view punishment as the real crime.

Democrats in New York, for example, recently pushed through a State law requiring the release of suspects arrested for stalking, arson, robbery, and other misdemeanors without bail. They require the release without bail. And despite the dramatic increases in crime in New York City, a Democrat district attorney released a list of crimes—I am serious about this, folks—released a list of crimes on his first day in office that would no longer be prosecuted, including resisting arrest. The DA claims longer sentences don't deter crime or result in greater community safety.

But a former New York City police commissioner points out the obvious—that when you say you are not going to prosecute certain crimes, you are sending a strong message to criminals. And it is the wrong message to criminals. He notes that since the penalty was taken away, stealing a car has become a game. As a result, vehicle theft is driving up the city's crime rate, and the New York Post reported just last week that the Big Apple is becoming a live action version of the game Grand Theft Auto.

But the wave of crime that has been unleashed is far more deadly than just stolen property. New York City's murder rate spiked an astounding 47 percent last year, and the killing spree is continuing into 2022. The latest victims include a teenager who was working at Burger King and two young police officers.

Refusing to keep dangerous, repeat criminals with a history of violence behind bars allows anyone, at any time, to become the victim of an entirely preventable crime.

For example, the low bail set by a Wisconsin District Attorney's Office last November resulted in the release of a violent criminal with a very long list of charges going back 15 years, including running over a woman with a Ford Escape. Within days of being released, he drove that same SUV into a crowded Christmas parade, injuring more than 60 people and killing 6, including a 5-year-old child and several members of the Dancing Grannies, who were entertaining the crowds at that Christmas parade. In a split second, the joy of the season was turned into a gruesome crime scene because a violent, repeat offender was set free. The Democrat district attorney has since admitted the release was "a mistake."

Folks, we cannot afford any more of these mistakes by public officials who are putting their personal political agenda ahead of protecting our public.

If letting criminals out of jail without bail isn't bad enough, progressive politicians are even—get this—providing perks for perpetrators. The Biden administration, for instance, is allowing illegal immigrants to use ar-

rest warrants as alternate forms of ID at airports to clear security checkpoints and board airplanes—arrest warrants. Seriously, folks.

Some liberal cities, like New York and San Francisco, have cash for criminals, programs that actually pay prior offenders in the hopes that they won't shoot anyone. Great plan. That is right—the same gang calling to defund the police wants to fund felons.

A California cash for criminals program may have allowed some individuals to get away with murder. As long as the participants pledge to improve, they are still paid. Even when caught with a gun or, worse, suspected of murder, they get paid.

Folks, it is one thing to give first-time, nonviolent offenders a second chance, but rewarding career criminals by letting them loose and paying them an allowance is itself criminal.

Democrats' approach to criminal justice can be summed up as "take no prisoners" literally.

Instead of admitting their approach has backfired, liberals keep looking for excuses, and they play the blame game. To address the rise in carjackings in Chicago, for example, progressive politicians proposed banning the video game Grand Theft Auto. Perhaps the real problem is making crime all fun and games, with no real-world penalties and only rewards, just like the video game.

A retired police officer who was carjacked in his own driveway south of the city says the carjackers know that even if they are caught, "they are going to get right back out." That is because the area's State attorney promised to reduce the prison population, and by golly, she is keeping that promise by dismissing tens of thousands of criminal cases. As a result, about 100 people charged with murder in Cook County have been let out on the city streets.

The Chicago police superintendent is even warning that the Cook County court is "making us all less safe by releasing violent offenders." The horrifying numbers speak for themselves.

Chicago had more murders last year than any other city in the United States with nearly 800 homicides. That is more people than in the small community I grew up near—800 homicides.

Shootings in the city are up a shocking 63 percent since 2019. One of the fatal victims was a 7-year-old girl who was gunned down at a McDonald's by a gang member who was allowed out of prison despite being charged with other crimes. The suspects in another recent shootout, which left one dead and two others wounded, were released without charges.

Public officials charged with enforcing the law who signal that it is OK to commit crime by reducing or eliminating penalties are engaging in criminal negligence. It is time to put an end to prosecutors being partners in crime.

I took the first step towards making our streets safer by introducing legislation to increase the penalties for some

violent offenders and child predators, including life imprisonment for repeat offenders.

Folks, progressive prosecutors need to stop playing politics and start doing their job, which is enforcing the law. Criminal penalties are not just suggestions; they are put in place to protect the public. Parents shouldn't have to worry about the safety of their children, and no one should feel unsafe, especially in their own neighborhood.

Let's get serious about crime so that the only people in America who are afraid to walk the streets are the criminals.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I have two words for you today: "crack pipes"—crack pipes, not crackpots.

Many of us went to bed last night, others waking up this morning, and heads are exploding across this Nation as we learn that this administration is giving crack pipes to crackheads. I think when the history books are written about this President and 2020 through 2024, that will be the picture right next to the President's name—a picture of crack pipes being given out by this administration.

I want to come back to that in a second, though.

I have a picture of my dad today and our dog Rennie. My dad and our family—my mom, an older brother, younger sister—moved off the family farm when I was 5. My dad was a proud, proud police officer. I remember the day in kindergarten when my dad and our family dog Rennie came to visit and what a proud moment it was for me. In 3 years, my dad was head of the fire department, and 2 years after that, he became the chief of police. My dad was the chief of police in El Dorado, KS, for some 25 years.

My dad represented law in the community. He represented right from wrong, and he applied that law equally. There was never a gray area for my dad. I remember having dinner at my grandma's house one Sunday evening and the phone ringing. We didn't have pagers. We didn't have cell phones.

All I remember, my dad was saying: Stand down.

My grandma looked at us and said: You guys better hug your dad goodbye. I said: Grandma, what do you mean? She said: He may not come back.

It was a familiar story of a domestic violence, of a drunk husband with his wife on the front porch. There was always a 12-gauge shotgun. It was never a 16-gauge or a 20; it was always a 12-gauge shotgun. My dad was the person who would go and disarm that person. It happened way too often.

But I just tell that story as we reminisce because we know how important law enforcement officers are to all of us.

I remember, you know, you sit around and you listen while you are making homemade ice cream, and peo-

ple asked my dad questions about crime. I think of those crack pipes and my dad always saying that drugs and crime go hand in hand like peanut butter and jelly—the more drug abuse there is, the more crimes there were in the community.

I remember somebody asking him why would the police officers be so strict about petty crimes. Maybe it was a little vandalism. Maybe it was a broken window. Maybe it was graffiti. I remember my dad talking about, you have to set an example, that if you allow people to vandalize, if you allow people to do graffiti, if you allow people to break windows, it is just a cascade of bigger crimes.

I finished up some townhalls this past weekend—15 townhalls in the past 2 weeks—and what Americans are concerned about are inflation and crime. This is what Americans—Kansans—are telling me that they are seeing every night on their television sets. They are seeing 2 million people—maybe 6 million people—cross our border illegally, and they see this administration reward them with an all-expenses-paid vacation trip to any city in America.

America has seen riots and vandalism on television, and this administration and this party applaud them. Every night, we see looting and shoplifting, but this administration says: Don't prosecute.

Last year, America saw 5 tons of fentanyl cross the border illegally, cross our southern border—five tons. Think of five big semitrucks loaded with a ton—that is 2,000 pounds—of fentanyl. I remind everybody that 1 teaspoon of fentanyl can kill 2,000 to 3,000 Americans.

We are seeing our law enforcement officers being told to turn their backs on violent crimes, to not chase the bad guys. America sees this White House and their party turn their backs on law enforcement officers.

Again, I go back to my dad. I remember it was probably around 2014, and my dad and I were fishing, as we often do together, probably crappie fishing on a farm pond in the Flint Hills of Kansas, my favorite place to be. My dad said to me: You know, Son, I don't think this President has the back of our law enforcement officers any more.

As I visit with those law enforcement officers every time I am back—and I appreciate them coming to my townhalls and having my back—I can tell you, the law enforcement officers across this country do not feel like they are being supported by this White House.

As I think about an America of today versus growing up, I do think there has been a decay in our culture, and this "defund the police" movement from the radical left made that culture even weaker. We have members of this squad wanting to close Federal prisons. They encourage open borders. They want illegals to use arrest warrants to get through the TSA. Of course, they want criminals to get off the hook. There is this culture of lawlessness.

Again, I go back to my generation of "If it feels good, do it." I remember that saying for the first time from some song, I believe, from the early 1970s, "If it feels good, do it," and that is the way this country is acting right now. What is the result? We see crowds chanting "Pigs in a blanket, fry 'em [up] like bacon."

"Pigs in a blanket, fry 'em [up] like bacon."

The next time one of those houses is burning down that one of those people lives in, I wonder who they are going to call. If they are stranded in a motor vehicle accident, who is going to be the first one on the scene? Again, I go back to thinking about my dad and him carrying out one of my classmates in second grade from a fire. Unfortunately, my classmate didn't make it.

Three hundred forty-six law enforcement officers were shot in 2021. Seventy-three were intentional. Twenty-four were shot last month—a 40-percent increase. Ambush-style attacks increased 115 percent. We have never seen a crime wave like this across our Nation—not since the early 1990s, anyway. The United States recently saw the fastest increase in murder rates ever recorded. Violent crimes spiked. Fourteen major, Democratic-run cities are setting alltime highs for homicide records. The numbers continue to go up.

As I think about advice for this administration, I know if they had the will, they could fix this problem. I know exactly what my dad would tell them. He would say: Treat criminals like criminals. Treat police officers, law enforcement officers, like heroes. Tell them thanks. Reward them. Respect them.

It is time to re-fund the police, folks. It is time to secure the border. Let's hold criminals accountable.

It was a rare day, but I do remember my dad talking at the supper table about someone they worked so hard to convict, and a judge or DA let them off easy. We need to prosecute the smallest of crimes.

We need an Attorney General. Where is our Attorney General? Where is he? In the middle of this crime spree, where is our Attorney General? He needs to be tough on crime instead of labeling parents as "domestic terrorists."

Simply, America, it is time to get back to our values—the same values my dad raised us on. It is time to, like my dad did, apply the law equally.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, last week, a member of the Biden administration was confused—very confused—why FOX News is talking all the time about crime. That person is the Press Secretary to President Biden, Ms. Psaki. She said Americans care more about what is happening in their daily lives than what the news says about crime.

How much more out of touch could the Biden administration be? Crime is happening in Americans' daily lives all across America. Thousands more people a year are being murdered.

Violent crime has increased for 2 years, and there is no sign of it slowing down.

The administration's plan to fix the violent crime spike is merely another partisan gun control plan. That is what they think about, doing something about crime: control the guns of people who abide by the law.

They won't seriously reduce violent crime. If you do that, it focuses on issues that make up a tiny fraction of violent crimes or maybe it doesn't contribute to the problem at all.

For example, the administration wants to crack down on ghost guns, but ghost guns are involved in only a fraction of 1 percent of the crimes—particularly of the murders.

The Biden administration also wants to focus on the so-called "Iron Pipeline," and that is blaming red States for guns in crime-ridden blue States. But on that issue, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms, their data shows that guns used in blue-city crimes usually come from that very same blue State.

Finally, the Biden administration wants to focus on lawful gun sellers, but we have a Department of Justice study finding most crimes are committed with stolen guns from the black market.

So I worry about the Department of Justice could use efforts to reduce violent crime as a pretext to harass lawful gun dealers and owners. Gun sales have increased nationwide because Americans don't feel safe anymore. They feel the police are not proactively policing, so they get a gun to protect themselves.

Honest people who don't break the law want to feel safe, and that makes them feel safe. I don't blame them for taking protection of their life and property into their hands.

I related recently about the increases in crime that have nothing to do with guns, and yet all we hear from this administration is about controlling guns. But what does that have to do—gun control is not going to stop criminals from pushing people in front of subway trains. Gun control won't stop flash mobs from stealing goods from stores. It isn't going to stop the thieves from looting train yards, and you see evidence of this all the time on television—almost daily—people going into stores with bags, filling it up, and just think in San Francisco some prosecutor said if you steal less than \$950, you won't be prosecuted.

So you wonder why people commit crime. If you aren't going to pay a penalty for it, why not do it? So the Biden administration is wasting precious resources and taxpayer dollars on partisan pet projects of gun control.

The Biden administration has ordered the Department of Justice to

look like it is doing something without really doing anything at all.

You know what Americans actually need to reduce violent crime? They need police forces empowered to do their jobs with the right resources and protections.

Now, we hear the Biden administration just last week in New York saying it supports police. The President himself was up there. But a leaked Executive order shows it wants to take away their nonlethal, lifesaving tools, and make it more difficult for police to get grants for funding.

Americans also need responsible bail policies—these policies that, if they were responsible, wouldn't let dangerous criminals back out onto the streets to kill people.

They need prosecutors who will actually do their job to keep violent criminals away from the vulnerable. The Biden administration has a chance to make a real difference in reducing violent crime. It is a shame that they are wasting their time and resources on a misleading message.

When you see the prosecutors in Los Angeles and San Francisco listing a whole bunch of crimes that they are not going to prosecute, it just invites lawbreaking. We need to stop this "defund the police" crusade. We need to step up prosecution. We need to eliminate progressive prosecutors. We need to make sure that people don't get bail if they are repeat criminals or a threat to society.

In the final analysis, taxpayers are paying for public safety, but in some places in the United States, they aren't getting their money's worth for public safety they pay for. Government is set up to maintain public safety, and that is what we are all about with this War on Crime, protecting the taxpayers, protecting every citizen taxpayer or not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, oftentimes when we talk rising crime, we talk about statistics. For example, last year in Milwaukee, there were 194 murders.

As I prepared to give remarks yesterday, I got the stat that there were 26 murders already this year. That is an 86-percent increase. Unfortunately, last night there were two more murders, and now it is up to 28.

Seventy-three law enforcement officers were intentionally killed in the line of duty last year. That is the highest it has been since 1995.

We had three police officers shot in a 2-week period at the end of January. Those are just some of the statistics, and I am sure you have heard a lot more on the floor here today. But one thing I don't think we talk about enough are the victims.

I heard President Biden's Press Secretary, Jen Psaki, last week. I guess she was monitoring different TV stations, and she remarked that one com-

mentator was talking about soft-on-crime consequences, and she giggled and said what does that even mean?

Well, I will talk about what it means. An excellent article in the *Just the News* a couple days ago had some heartbreaking examples of those consequences.

Last week, we held an event about the open border, about the catch-and-release policies of this administration, record levels of people coming into this country illegally and what that represents from a standpoint of national security and homeland security and crime.

In Alabama's Chilton County, two illegal immigrants, ages 27 and 28, have been charged in the murders of three adults found shot and burned in an SUV.

In another recent case, a Florida father who believed he was taking in a 16-year-old migrant minor from Honduras, a Good Samaritan, was killed by that migrant who turned out to be much older and involved in crime.

In Florida, a 5-year-old girl riding in her mother's car was crushed to death when an illegal immigrant from Honduras crashed into the car. The driver admitted he got into the car after drinking six cans of 32-ounce beers.

In Harris County, TX, an illegal immigrant from El Salvador is charged with exiting his vehicle during a routine traffic stop and fatally shooting the sheriff's deputy in the face.

Those are just a few examples of the consequences of soft-on-crime policies. Those are crimes that were committed by illegal immigrants that take advantage of the catch-and-release policies on the border.

But we are not only just experiencing catch-and-release on the southern border, we also have catch-and-release in our criminal justice system—these no-bail, low-bail policies promoted by generally Democrat district attorneys in cities governed for decades by Democrats.

We had a tragedy in Waukesha, WI. It never should have happened. This was during the Waukesha Christmas parade, when children lined up on the street, on the curb, waiting to see Santa Claus—instead they saw a slaughter. Six innocent people lost their lives. Sixty-two people were injured—their lives forever altered.

And it didn't have to happen because the murderer had been let out on a thousand-dollar bail after having run over the mother of his child with that same SUV. That is the result—that crime, those 6 innocent victims, those 62 innocent victims who were injured, their family members, their loved ones are the consequences of soft-on-crime policies of Democratic governance.

So as horrific as those 6 murders were, as horrific as the 62 injuries were, what I can't get out of my mind are those little children sitting on the curb waiting to see Santa and instead witnessing the slaughter. How do they ever recover from that? Is that something that Jen Psaki ever thinks

about? Is that something that President Biden ever thinks about?

As Jen giggles about the consequences, these are serious consequences. We need to get tough on crime. We need to put violent criminals in jail and leave them in jail so they don't create more victims.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I think Senator BLUNT from Missouri is going to ask for recognition, and I do not object to that. But I was scheduled for earlier, and I would like to ask unanimous consent that when the upcoming rollcall is completed, I be the first Senator recognized.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Sorry, after the second rollcall, that I be the first Senator.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes before the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, there are really few jobs in the country as difficult, as dangerous, and as demanding as the sacrifice of being a law enforcement officer. I would suggest the one job that may possibly be harder—and certainly in my view is as hard—is to be the family member of a law enforcement officer, wondering all during that working shift what might be happening to the person you care so much about.

You know the challenges to these officers and their families—the challenges they face today are intensified as local departments struggle with the staffing shortages caused by record high departures and difficulty filling the open positions they have got.

The Eastern Missouri Police Academy had around half as many recruits join in 2021 as they had in 2020. In my hometown of Springfield, MO, they have 40 vacancies right now they are trying to fill in the department.

In January, the Columbia, MO, Police Department had around 20 vacancies in a force that its maximum size would be 187 or so people.

According to the St. Louis Post Dispatch in September, officer departures in St. Louis City and St. Louis County spiked in 2021 and were at a pace to be up to 60 percent higher in each of those departments than they had been in the average year.

In the police force here, I was with Chief Manger yesterday, and he pointed out that retirements and resignations were 50 percent higher than they have been in recent years in 2021.

The new chief of police at the St. Louis County Police Force said: My biggest priority is hiring and finding people who will do these jobs.

These staff shortages are unfortunate, but they are in so many ways predictable of a movement that villainized enforcement for, I think, political gain in many cases. Officers have been demoralized by the “defund the police” crusade. They have been discouraged by prosecutors who put dangerous criminals back on the street or even put out a list of crimes that people will not be prosecuted for.

That is well beyond the standard of belief that most people would have had, actually, until they heard it, my guess would be, that, no, these are crimes that we are just not going to prosecute people for.

Police saw themselves, in many cases, forced out of the force because of a vaccine mandate they didn't agree with, often going to smaller forces that had less than 100 people.

All this is happening, really, against a backdrop of a crime wave that is harming communities of all sizes all across the country.

When I talk to police chiefs, I hear concerns that a lot of good candidates are deciding maybe law enforcement won't be the career that they want to have. When I talk to the sworn officers that I see here every day and I see at home, I hear many of them feel they just simply have a job where they face danger but they don't get enough support that they need to do the job that they need to do.

Police work has always been dangerous. We have always lost officers. They have always been courageous in their willingness to stand up, but last year was the deadliest year ever for law enforcement officers. Four hundred fifty-eight officers died in the line of duty in 2021, 128 of them from gunshot wounds or fatalities from traffic.

You don't have to travel very far away from here, just down Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capitol to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, to understand what it means to lose officers and what it means to lose them in protection of the country. The marble walls there bear the names of thousands of officers who have been killed in the line of duty. Each corner of that memorial shows a lion protecting its cubs.

We have always seen law enforcement as our protectors, not as those we should somehow fear. It eats away at our society to say that we appreciate law enforcement but we really don't want to do what is necessary to support law enforcement.

I think there is no data that says one or more tweets that say “defund the police” leads to two crimes or two muggings, but it simply makes common sense that when police departments are understaffed and undertrained, it increases the risk of violent crime on the officers themselves and the communities they serve.

As the cochair of the Senate Law Enforcement Caucus, one of my priorities has been to ensure that law enforcement officers have the support and re-

sources they need to do the job they are asked to do and do it as safely and effectively as they possibly can.

We certainly all can and I think would agree—I certainly would—that there really should be zero tolerance for police misconduct. Taking the oath to support and defend and then somehow not conducting yourself in the right way, if you cross that line, you ought to be held accountable.

We need to view people on the line as people who are there to defend us, to serve us. We need to make this a profession that people want to be part of, and if they are willing to be part of it, we have provided them everything they need to be safely doing the hard work that they are asked to do.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON BUSH NOMINATION

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bush nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 45 Ex.]

YEAS—93

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

NAYS—2

Hawley Scott (FL)

NOT VOTING—5

Barrasso Rounds Tillis
Luján Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of John Patrick Coffey, of New York, to be General Counsel of the Department of the Navy.

VOTE ON COFFEY NOMINATION

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

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays, please.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

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

The result was announced—yeas 79, nays 17, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 46 Ex.]

YEAS—79

Baldwin	Hassan	Risch
Bennet	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rubio
Booker	Hoeven	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kelly	Shaheen
Capito	Kennedy	Shelby
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Klobuchar	Sinema
Casey	Leahy	Smith
Cassidy	Lee	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Sullivan
Coons	Markey	Tester
Cornyn	McConnell	Thune
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Tillis
Cramer	Merkley	Toomey
Crapo	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Durbin	Murray	Warrick
Ernst	Ossoff	Warren
Feinstein	Padilla	Whitehouse
Fischer	Paul	Wicker
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Graham	Portman	Young
Grassley	Reed	

NAYS—17

Blackburn	Hagerty	Marshall
Boozman	Hawley	Moran
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Lankford	Tuberville
Daines	Lummis	

NOT VOTING—4

Barrasso Rounds
Luján Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The Senator from Texas.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, folks in Texas and across the country are looking to their elected officials for sound leadership. Family budgets are being clobbered by the worst inflation in 40 years. From gas stations to grocery stores and everywhere in between, people are spending significantly more money on their basic expenses. Inflation has outpaced wage growth, giving the average worker a pay cut. That is what inflation does. It erodes and undermines your standard of living by charging more for basic goods and services.

Families aren't just stressing about their finances; they are also worried about their safety. The shocking surge in violent crime that began in 2020 hasn't just continued. In many places, it has accelerated, and last year several major cities had their deadliest year on record.

With the safety and well-being of their families at the forefront, our constituents want to know what is being done to address these problems. They are pretty basic.

What types of solutions do their representatives have in the Senate and the House? What actions are the White House contemplating and how long will it be before they can experience some relief? Unfortunately, when the voters gave Democrats the leadership of the White House and both Houses of Congress, the responsibility has largely been up to them to provide that leadership when it comes to the agenda.

Unfortunately, the real problems that my constituents in Texas are experiencing, like inflation and crime, those were the last things for our leaders here in Washington to consider. Forget real problems and real families; Democrats' governing strategy was dictated by partisan ambitions.

Our colleagues tried to give the Internal Revenue Service the unprecedented authority and manpower to snoop on the finances of virtually every single American. Now, we are accustomed to the fact that the IRS knows how much you make; that is how you calculate your taxes. But our Democratic colleagues went so far as to inquire for every family: How much money do you spend and what do you spend it on? That sort of invasion of privacy is unprecedented.

Then our colleagues on the other side of the aisle tried to get involved in the childcare business and dictate what sort of childcare and where you would be able to get that childcare and how much it would cost. Basically, saying to those who are motivated to help support families when it comes to childcare, that if you are a faith-based organization, you are not going to qualify. And because of the huge influx of money that the Democrats were planning to put into childcare, excluding a huge segment of the childcare providers was going to result in scarce supply and run up the price, further exacerbating inflation.

Then we saw when it comes to the wealthy—our Democratic colleagues like to be the party of the average working person and complain about Big Business and millionaires and billionaires. But what do they do when it comes to tax proposals? They propose to give millionaires and billionaires a tax cut by eliminating the cap on deductibility of State and local taxes in high-tax jurisdictions like New York and California. Who would have to pick up the responsibility or deficit? Well, you guessed it; it would be the middle class.

Then we saw our colleagues on the left use the last year to attempt a Federal takeover of State-run elections. Some even proposed to blow up the rules of the Senate and eliminate the filibuster, the one thing that forces us to do what doesn't come naturally, which is to work together and build bipartisan consensus.

There were proposals from the majority leader himself and others saying we are going to blow up the Senate because we cannot get our way, and the main reason we can't get our way is because we are unwilling to work with the other side of the aisle. Thank goodness two of our colleagues, the Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Arizona, tapped the brakes, and we have not yet found ourselves in that situation.

So every one of these examples I mentioned has been tried and failed in this last year. But there is, of course, what economists call opportunity costs. We can't take back the last year that we wasted on these partisan efforts. A lot of the damage has been done. Invaluable time has been wasted on partisan legislation that was sure to go nowhere, while the most basic responsibilities of governing had been tossed aside.

Last year, our Democratic colleagues nearly dropped a debt bomb on our economy. We had to spend a lot of money during the COVID pandemic. And during the last year of the Trump administration, we did that on a bipartisan basis. But even after the imminent need for that help was subsiding, our colleagues decided to spend another \$2 trillion in the first months of the Biden administration. Only 10 percent of that was COVID-19 related and

less than 1 percent had to do with people getting access to therapeutics and vaccine.

Our colleagues allowed the National Defense Authorization Act to sit on the shelf, to linger on the calendar for months, leaving it until the very last minute. And then we find ourselves just 9 days away from a shutdown of the Federal Government. Our colleagues in the majority have yet to pass a single appropriations bill on a regular basis. And unless Congress takes action here in the next week and a half, the American people can add a government shutdown to the list of crises that we are facing.

Unfortunately, this is a familiar story. We found ourselves in this position on more than one occasion over the last several months. Congress's deadline to pass funding bills doesn't just pop up out of nowhere. It hits at the same time every year, September 30. Back in September, it was clear that a yearlong funding bill was nowhere in sight, and so our colleagues in the majority kicked the can down the road for 2 months. Rather than use that time to try to pass annual appropriations bills, they wasted week after week on unserious, partisan bills.

By the time the new deadline rolled around, nothing had changed, and so our colleagues had to punt again, setting up a new deadline of February 18. And based on the way things look right now, it doesn't appear that we are any closer to an annual funding agreement than we were last September or last December. There is some rumor of a top-line funding level agreement but no real progress on the underlying substance of these appropriations bills.

So you can't help but wonder, how has it taken so long to accomplish so little? Our colleagues are steering the ship of state, both Chambers of Congress, and the White House, and still we can't seem to come up with a way to do the basic function of governing, which is to fund the government. We managed to avoid government shutdowns, to be sure, but that is a pretty low bar to clear.

The Democratic majority has introduced yet another short-term funding bill that would carry us through March 11. I sincerely hope that progress can be made before then. I am just not sure how long the conversation should continue when we know what the job is that remains to be done and what the sticking points are.

But that is where we are. Our colleagues haven't just punted critical responsibilities. In some cases, they have ignored them completely.

In 2021, for the first time on record, there were more than 2 million people who attempted to enter the United States without a visa, a passport, or legal immigration papers—2 million people—and those are just the ones that the Border Patrol encountered. It doesn't count the so-called “got-aways,” which is what the Border Patrol calls the drug smugglers and other

criminals who come across the border at the same time.

Two million people is larger than the population of a dozen individual States. That is how many new people have come into the United States during a pandemic, without being vaccinated, without proof of a negative COVID test, and at a time when people are concerned about their jobs.

The Biden administration has allowed this crisis to grow and grow and grow without any substantial action. As a matter of fact, the Secretary of Homeland Security and other members of the President's Cabinet have actually made it worse. Border Patrol will tell you there are two main things that they look for when it comes to illegal immigration. They look for the push factors, which are things like violence and poverty in some of the states and places people are coming from. We all get that. We understand those being the push factors, but they also talk about the pull factors, which puts a big sign out that you are free to come to the United States without any real consequence. You don't need to get in line. You don't need to comply with our immigration laws. You can just come as fast as you can get here.

One of the biggest pull factors is the misguided guidance from the Secretary of Homeland Security himself. I call it nonenforcement guidance. Basically, Secretary Mayorkas has said Border Patrol will not detain anyone whose only offense is entering the country illegally.

That sends a big welcome sign to anybody who wants to come to the United States without going through our legal immigration system. And the transnational criminal organizations that benefit from this financially make millions and millions—including billions—of dollars by smuggling people and drugs into the United States.

And while an open border's message may appeal to some elements on the left, it is creating serious burdens for law enforcement in border communities.

Over the last year, I have spent a lot of time listening to my constituents and the professionals in the Border Patrol about the many challenges that this crisis has created. Border Patrol agents are pulling double duty as childcare providers because our laws incentivize unaccompanied minors to come to the United States.

Now, nobody actually believes they get here on their own, but once they are here, under our current laws, they have to be placed with the State, with a sponsor, and told to show up for a hearing—for your asylum hearing—months, maybe years, in the future. And nobody is surprised when as many as half of those individuals don't show up for their asylum hearing—same thing for the adults in the family units.

But while you may think that this is primarily a problem for border States like Texas and Arizona, California and

New Mexico, and others, it actually extends throughout the country. One of our colleagues from Montana tells me that his sheriff in one of his major cities said that one of the biggest problems they have is methamphetamine that is smuggled across the U.S.-Mexico border.

You can't get much farther north, and you can't get much farther away from the southwestern border than the State of Montana, but that is what the ripple effect of this uncontrolled illegal immigration, along with the drugs being smuggled across the border—those are the consequences of those failures by the administration.

Leaders in my State have constantly sought for the administration to take some action. This is a Federal responsibility, not a State responsibility. They have asked for more staff, better resources, and better policies to put an end to some of these pull factors.

But the Biden administration has done nothing to make it better. I would argue that they have actually made it worse with policies like the non-enforcement policy that Secretary Mayorkas issued months ago.

Senator SINEMA—a Senator from another border State and a Democrat—and I offered the Bipartisan Border Solutions Act, along with a Democrat and a Republican House Member, with the idea that if maybe we came up with a bipartisan, bicameral proposal, the Biden administration would say: Well, why don't we start there? Why don't we start the discussions there?

Well, the Biden administration refused to take any action, and the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee here in the Senate has refused to even hold a hearing on that bill.

Now, our Democratic colleagues may control all levers of government, but, for sure, that is a far cry from actually governing. Our colleagues can't seem to accomplish the bare minimum, let alone craft policies that address the needs of families.

Our colleagues seem to think that these partisan victories are the only way they can prove to voters that they know how to govern, but they got it backward, and they don't have much to show for it. The reality is, our colleagues' burning focus on partisan legislation has kept them from achieving much of anything at all.

Our colleagues have been so distracted by their own partisan ambitions that they have allowed the Senate to skate from crisis to crisis without meaningful action.

I can only hope that our colleagues will recognize that what they have been doing is not working and engage in some sort of midcourse correction in the coming months.

The truth is, our country deserves a government that works for the American people, not for just one political party or for any constituency within that political party, like the progressive left.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from New Hampshire.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I would ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of the MacBride nomination until 6 p.m. and that at 6 p.m. the Senate vote on confirmation of the Baker and Lewis nominations.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Neil Harvey MacBride, of Virginia, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. For the information of the Senate, we expect to line up to three additional votes this evening. Therefore, Senators should expect a series of up to five rollcall votes beginning at 6 p.m. Senators are asked to vote from their desks after the first vote so we can move these along and not spend all night here.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am actually on the floor to speak to a different issue, even though I think expediting votes is an important one, and I support that.

But I am really here to highlight the negative consequences for our country of continuing to fund our government through continuing resolutions.

One of the most basic constitutional duties of Congress is the appropriations process. The Nation relies on this body to provide Federal funds for programs that support national defense, small businesses, our border defenses, conservation of public lands, food assistance for low-income families, and so much, much more.

And as a long-serving Member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, I am extremely disappointed that Congress is about to pass yet another CR that is going to take us to March 11, nearly 5 months past the start of the fiscal year.

Now, on a positive note, I understand that there is a tentative agreement on top-line funding, so that we should have budget numbers for an omnibus that would fund the remainder of the fiscal year. And that is good news. But the fundamental problem remains; long-term CRs create uncertainty and inefficiencies inside and outside of the Federal Government.

CRs prevent Agencies from issuing new grants or expanding programs. They curtail hiring and recruitment. And moreover, those who rely on government programs and Federal resources—and that could be either SNAP recipients or defense contractors, but everyone is forced into a budgetary limbo.

And simply put, when Congress refuses to act, people can't do their jobs,

and this is especially true for our military men and women who are serving.

From Russia's efforts to undermine democracies in Europe to China's rapidly expanding sphere of influence, to the unpredictable threat of rogue actors like North Korea and Iran, the threats we face today are varied and numerous. And nothing hinders our national security more than funding our national priorities in piecemeal fashion.

Make no mistake, as we are engaged in this crisis right now in Europe, where Russia is on the borders of Ukraine, threatening to invade, we can bet that Vladimir Putin is watching our Congress to see if we can actually get an agreement to get a budget funded for the rest of this year.

Recently, several of my colleagues from the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense and the Armed Services Committee met with Marine Corps Commandant General Berger to discuss the challenges that are facing the Marines. The message from General Berger was clear: If we continue to fund our government through CRs, it will erode our military readiness, and it will cut training time and impede the maintenance processes we rely on to keep our soldiers safe.

The impact of continued CRs on our military would be wide-ranging, and the negative effects would continue to ripple for years. And we had this experience since I have been here. In 2012 and 2013, when we had the budget cliff, we saw what happened to our military. We saw readiness of our men and women in uniform erode.

Thousands of pilot flight hours would be lost. Critical exercises within our national allies would be canceled. Our overall global presence diminished at a time in which our adversaries are seeking to outcompete us in multiple theaters.

Aircraft like the brandnew KC-46 tankers that we are so proud to have stationed at Pease Air National Guard Base in New Hampshire, they are such a point of pride. They are an invaluable strategic national asset, but they would spend more time on the ground rather than flying the missions that they were designed for.

And submarines, the backbone of our nuclear deterrence and technological overmatch against our adversaries and, by the way, the ships that China is most concerned about, are an instantly recognizable symbol of American military might and the values of our country, they would be sidelined due to maintenance disruptions.

That would have significant impact not just for our readiness but also for places like the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, which has as its responsibility the maintenance and repair of our attack submarines.

So what kind of a signal does it send to adversaries like Russia, as they continue amassing troops on the Ukrainian border and threaten the stability of Europe, when we can't get a budget?

Long-term efforts to recruit and retain the best and brightest to serve in our military would be undone as bonus and incentive pays are cut and overall end-strength numbers decrease by thousands.

Military families would be forced to bear the burden of greater financial uncertainty on top of the many sacrifices that they already make for our country. We would be left with a smaller, less capable force that is demoralized from pay cuts and forced to shoulder greater risks for their safety.

Now, in addition to the harm to our servicemembers and military families, we would also be undermining the critical modernization efforts that we need to keep pace at a time when competitors like China are experiencing technological breakthroughs.

Just 8 months ago, I am sure we all remember that China tested an advanced hypersonic missile that was launched into space before reentering the atmosphere and nearly hitting its target.

This test should serve as a wake-up call about the urgent threat that China's military breakthroughs pose. And if the U.S. research and development efforts are slowed down due to the constraints of operating under a continuing resolution, we will not be able to drive the innovation needed to keep pace with China, let alone regain a convincing advantage.

And make no mistake, Putin isn't the only one watching to see if we can get a budget agreement in this Congress. Xi is also watching from China.

The development of our next-generation fighter to ensure we maintain air superiority in the air will be slowed.

Our efforts to defend against cyber attacks that could cripple critical infrastructure or expose national security secrets would be hamstrung.

Simply put, for all the might and selfless service of our service men and women, we would be asking them to defend us while tying their hands behind their backs simply because we in Congress can't find the courage of compromise.

I would say to my colleague Senator CORNYN from Texas, who talked about the narrow focus of Democrats—who are in the majority in this body right now, very slim majority—worrying only about our own parochial interests, that this is an opportunity for us to work together. Let's work across the aisle and see if we can't find some agreement on budget that will get this done not just for the remaining months of this fiscal year but next year and the next year and the next year.

China doesn't just compete with us on military technology; China and our other economic competitors are pouring resources into scientific and technological innovation. And if we want to sustain our global prosperity, global leadership, and national security, we cannot afford to be caught flatfooted.

That is why last week the House of Representatives passed the America

COMPETES Act, which is a companion to the Senate-passed U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, which passed the Senate months ago with a very strong bipartisan vote.

These bills will soon be in conference, and, if passed, they will bolster innovation and international trade, but the investments to meet the authorizations that are contained in these bills can't be made under a continuing resolution.

I chair the Commerce, Justice, and Science and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, the CJS Subcommittee. Our bipartisan CJS bill included a \$1 billion increase for the National Science Foundation to keep pace with scientific discoveries that can power the economy in fields like artificial intelligence, quantum computing, microelectronics, and advanced communications.

Under a CR, we would forfeit the chance to fund 2,300 additional research and education grants that will support 27,500 more scientists, technicians, teachers, and students compared to fiscal year 2021.

That means a lot of innovative research projects, and therefore potentially new discoveries, technology, and industries would never get started. It also would diminish our ability to train the next generation of innovators.

It isn't just the National Science Foundation; under a CR, NASA wouldn't have the needed increases that will help us return humans to the Moon—the high ground that China is also eyeing. We will lose out on the opportunity to provide the Department of Commerce additional funding to build next-generation climate and weather satellites, help small- and medium-sized manufacturers, enforce export and trade laws, and invest in economic development.

Furthermore, a CR would delay implementation of the bipartisan infrastructure bill.

Last year, along with nine of our colleagues, we drafted the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, which is bipartisan legislation to make historic investments in our Nation's infrastructure. The legislation provides \$550 billion in new Federal investment to respond to the needs of the country, from rebuilding crumbling roads and bridges to providing clean drinking water and addressing harmful contaminants, to expanding broadband coverage to even the most rural parts of our country. The Senate passed that infrastructure bill by an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote of 69 to 30.

When President Biden signed the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act into law, it became the single biggest infrastructure investment in U.S. history. It is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for us to invest in this country. But if we continue with CRs, the implementation of this bipartisan infrastructure law could be delayed.

In addition, as a result of its flat obligation limitations, a CR would pre-

vent State departments of transportation from accessing higher amounts of formula funding provided by the highway trust fund.

The CR would also prohibit new starts for new formula programs authorized by the bipartisan infrastructure law, including the fiscal year 2022 portion of the carbon reduction program that supports emission-reducing transportation projects and the PROTECT formula funding to States to support transportation infrastructure resiliency.

Now, in addition to slowing meaningful infrastructure investments, a CR also fails to address urgent needs in our communities.

Americans want to be safe from international threats to our national and economic security, but more important, they want to be safe in their communities. Yet, in 2020, murders rose by 30 percent.

The Senate Commerce-Justice-Science bill includes significant funding to help local police departments fight crime and put officers on the street. It also includes a new Community Violence Intervention Initiative to implement strategies to reduce homicides and gun violence. But with a CR, we wouldn't have funding for this promising strategy.

We would also lose the chance to provide historic levels of funding for the Office on Violence Against Women. Today, it is particularly important because a bipartisan group of Senators will introduce a reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act. But without a CJS appropriations bill, we can't provide additional funding for the Sexual Assault Services Program, which is a formula grant released to States, Tribes, and other coalitions in order to provide support services like medical services, counseling, and crisis intervention for victims of sexual assault, and we cannot start new programs like Restorative Justice, a growing area in criminal justice to repair and address the harm experienced by victims.

Continuing to rely on last year's funding levels and last year's programs undermines our chances to improve our military readiness, to invest in our economy, and to address emerging challenges.

This week, instead of enacting funding bills for the fiscal year that began on October 1, 2021, Congress will instead extend the deadline again, passing another CR through March 11. Now, don't get me wrong, I am glad we are continuing to keep the government open, and I understand that Senate leadership—Chairman LEAHY and Vice Chairman SHELBY, along with their House counterparts—has reached a tentative agreement on total spending levels to allow us to use the next month to finish our work and enact a remaining year appropriations bill, but it is way past time to have made that happen. The American people deserve no less, and we need to do better next year.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Florida.

HONORING THE MEMORIES OF THE VICTIMS OF THE SENSELESS ATTACK AT MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL ON FEBRUARY 14, 2018

Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, it is hard to forget the 14th of February in the year 2018, when I was actually here in the U.S. Senate when news reports began to emerge that there had been a shooting at a school in South Florida, where I live.

I was at the time—or I am still now, but at the time, all four of my kids were in school in South Florida, and as a parent, the first thing that flashes in your mind is, Where? Which schools was it?

Fortunately, we were blessed by God's grace that it was not any of the schools that my children were in, but, sadly, there were other Floridians on that day who were impacted in ways that I think will clearly forever change their lives, but I think it has also impacted the Nation.

It is now well known what happened on that terrible day, a day of complete horror that shocked the Nation, and today, we stop and remember those who lost their lives on that day and those whose bravery saved lives on that day.

We have learned much since that day about the things that went wrong with law enforcement, with the FBI, with local authorities, and with the school district, and that work continues. The monster who committed this act is now facing the justice of the Florida court system and will soon be sentenced.

But I wanted to spend the brief time we have to talk about it here today focusing on what has happened since that day and, in particular, the extraordinary work of some of the parents of those children who lost their lives on that tragic day, because they have turned their pain into activism in ways that have had concrete and meaningful impact.

One in particular is Max Schachter and his family, who, as they dove into this, realized that there was no place where school districts could go and learn about the best practices for how to safeguard a school or any facility, for that matter. Everyone was off doing their own thing, being pitched contracts and ideas by different companies that said: We can add this, and we can give you that. But there didn't seem to be a single place where you could go and learn the best practices to ensure the safety of our students.

That began to change because of his work. He lost a son, Alex, on that day, but from that pain, he has become a national leader on the issue of a Federal clearinghouse, which now exists.

The previous administration, the Trump administration, took executive action on it. Today, there exists a

clearinghouse that I hope we can put into statute through the Luke and Alex School Safety Act to make it permanent. It has become a resource where schools across the country are now able to, on an ongoing, real-time basis, see whether what they have in place is the highest standard and the most effective. Every time there are improvements, it is updated. It has had a meaningful impact. There are schools across this country that had vulnerabilities they didn't recognize. Those vulnerabilities aren't just about physical hardening of buildings and so forth; it is about identifying and getting ahead of these problems.

Sadly, what we learned from many of these tragedies is that, well before that day, there are clear signs that something is about to happen.

I think one of the things that most struck me is that multiple families told me that as soon as the news came out that this had happened, everyone knew who it was. Without even having heard the name, everyone knew who did it because the signs had been there and they had been missed.

The ability of school districts to now recognize that and get ahead of it is just one of the many innovations that are now in place because of the work of Max and his family in honor of their son Alex and of all those who suffered greatly on that day.

So I think it is important not just to obviously remember the extraordinary pain and horrific events of that moment but also to remember how these brave American families have since that day taken their pain and turned it into action and that today, across this country, many of our schools are better positioned to prevent this from ever happening to anyone else because of what they have done with this tragedy.

I wanted to take this moment today to commemorate and recognize their hard work and the work they and other families are doing not simply to raise awareness but to spur real, concrete action that makes a meaningful difference.

I now want to turn it over to my colleague from Florida, who was Governor on that terrible day and dealt with this all firsthand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. SHAHEEN). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, almost 4 years ago, on February 14, 2018, the world witnessed a senseless attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, FL.

I am proud to join my colleague Senator RUBIO to introduce this resolution which honors the 17 victims of the tragic shooting: Alyssa Alhadeff, Scott Beigel, Martin Duque Anguiano, Nicholas Dworet, Aaron Feis, Jaime Guttenberg, Chris Hixon, Luke Hoyer, Cara Loughran, Gina Montalto, Joaquin Oliver, Alaina Petty, Meadow Pollack, Helena Ramsay, Alex Schachter, Carmen Schentrup, and Peter Wang.

I often think of these innocent lives who were lost way too early. They were

sons, daughters, parents, and partners. Some were educators, athletes, musicians; many of them, just kids with a life full of promise ahead of them. My heart breaks knowing that they will never get to pursue their dreams and that their families will always have a piece of their heart missing.

Since that horrific day, I have worked closely with many of the victims' families to ensure no family has to experience that again.

While I was Governor, we passed the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School Public Safety Act to make sure our State does everything possible to ensure this does not happen again.

Now as a U.S. Senator, I am fighting for improvements on the Federal level, including the Luke and Alex School Safety Act, named after Luke Hoyer and Alex Schachter, which builds on our work to keep schools safe.

I am also working with my colleagues to pass the bipartisan EAGLES Act, which improves school safety for our students and teachers and provides more resources to law enforcement to prevent future tragedies from happening.

While, unfortunately, we cannot bring back the lives lost on that tragic day nearly 4 years ago, I will always work to honor them and do everything in my power to protect our students and educators and ensure they have a safe environment to learn and succeed.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 508, which is at the desk.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 508) honoring the memories of the victims of the senseless attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14, 2018.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 508) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

FLOOR VOTES

Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, I want to start by thanking my friend

from the great State of New Hampshire for signing on to a letter I just want to briefly describe and send the letter to the desk.

I send a letter to the desk which has been signed by seven Members of this body, and we expect several more to be added over the next day, if not this evening.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is pretty simple. I was thinking that my mom is one of the few people who probably watches C-SPAN a lot when her son is on the floor. We have so many instances where we have 90 or so Members standing on the floor, looking at a door to the left or the right or the rear, wondering where that last Senator is who is holding the vote open.

So, Mom, when I am on the floor and looking that way, it is because we have a Member who may be coming to vote or maybe not.

What we have here is a situation where any one Member is able to hold the vote open. Out of respect for that Member—technically, the vote could be called after the time is called, but it is not out of respect for our Members.

So what I have simply done is circulate with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and say: How about this as a proposition: If you are the last Member to vote and your vote will not change the outcome, then instruct the desk and the Presiding Officer to simply call the vote.

We had nearly 80 Members already agree that is a reasonable proposition, and every one of those Members has an opportunity on an exception basis to say: No, this vote is important to me; you have to hold it open.

They could be caught in traffic. They could be coming from the airport—any number of valid reasons.

There was a vote on this this afternoon, and the reason I missed that vote was I am a ranking member of a subcommittee, and the witnesses were just about to testify. I could have held the vote open or I could have been rude to the witnesses and left when they prepared the testimony. I felt like it was more important to hear their testimony. That vote, by the way, passed by a huge margin. That is an example where I am perfectly happy to show respect to my colleagues, not hold the vote open, and move on.

Tonight, we are going to have several votes stacked up, and invariably, we may have someone come in—I don't think it is malicious, but they are unintentionally holding up the proceedings of this body. I think if we simply have them, their scheduler, their chief of staff, or anyone in their office simply say "The boss has to vote on this bill," then they could call the cloakroom, and the vote could be held open, which is a tradition here.

I want to thank Senator SHAHEEN, the Presiding Officer. I want to thank the 77 people who have signed on to this letter just to show that we want to do the work of the people, we want to do it in a timely manner, and we want

to show the utmost respect to the Members and to the staff who are also held up for sometimes no good reason.

So this is a good step forward. It is a baby step. It is not a sea change. But I think we can change the behavior of the Senate by being mindful of how our actions can affect the proceedings on the floor and every one of our calendars.

So, again, Madam President, I send that letter to the desk. I have shared a copy of the letter with both cloakrooms. I will be sending a letter to Senator SCHUMER, who I understand will gladly accept it.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, DC, February 2, 2022.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER SCHUMER AND MINORITY LEADER MCCONNELL: As you know, despite our collective efforts to encourage Members to vote on the Senate floor in a timely manner, votes are often left open well beyond the allotted time, frustrating a majority of Members from both sides of the aisle. Often, the outcome of the vote is not in doubt.

With this in mind and in order to expedite floor votes, we are instructing the Presiding Officer to close any vote in which: (a) one of the signatories below is the last remaining vote; and (b) the Member's vote would not change the outcome. However, on any particular vote, if a signatory requests that the vote be held open, they may do so by providing notice to their Cloakroom.

Sincerely,

Thom Tillis, Angus S. King, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Roy Blunt, Shelley Moore Capito, Patrick J. Leahy, Kyrsten Sinema, Jon Tester, Ron Johnson, Amy Klobuchar, Jon Ossoff, John Barrasso, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Rick Scott.

Mark R. Warner, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Rob Portman, Mike Rounds, James Lankford, Joni Ernst, Cynthia M. Lummis, Mike Crapo, Bill Hagerty, Richard Burr, Dan Sullivan, Debbie Stabenow, Roger Marshall, Jerry Moran, James E. Risch.

Tommy Tuberville, Tim Kaine, Lisa Murkowski, John W. Hickenlooper, Richard J. Durbin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Ben Sasse, Benjamin Cardin, Tammy Duckworth, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Roger F. Wicker.

Todd Young, John Boozman, Chris Van Hollen, Michael F. Bennet, Martin Heinrich, Robert Menendez, Richard Blumenthal, Brian Schatz, Patrick J. Toomey, Lindsey Graham, Steve Daines, John Hoeven, Gary C. Peters, Jeff Merkley.

Rand Paul, Bernard Sanders, James M. Inhofe, Alex Padilla, Christopher Murphy, Tina Smith, Cynthia Hyde-Smith, Mike Braun, Jeanne Shaheen, Deb Fischer, John Kennedy, Marco Rubio.

Mitt Romney, Joe Manchin, III, Sherrod Brown, Bill Cassidy, John Cornyn, John Thune, Mark Kelly, Cory A. Booker, Kevin Cramer.

Mr. TILLIS. Thank you, Madam President. I look forward to seeing it work in action.

I yield the floor.

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

TRIBUTE TO ANTHONY FAUCI

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, our history books are filled with the names of great men and women who devoted their lives to others. One who may not be as recognizable as others is Norman Borlaug. He was an American biologist. He successfully developed a strain of wheat that grew more quickly and was disease-resistant. His work to feed the hungry has been credited with saving a billion lives worldwide.

Madame Marie Curie was a Polish chemist who is remembered for her discovery of radium and polonium and her huge contribution toward finding a treatment for cancer.

Of course, there are all the scientists throughout history who developed lifesaving vaccines: Edward Jenner, smallpox vaccine; Louis Pasteur, rabies; Albert Calmette, TB; Leila Denmark, whooping cough; Jonas Salk, polio. I might add Albert Sabin, too, because I was a kid and remember he came up with the oral version, which meant we didn't have to get a shot. Kids remember that.

These men and women will be remembered for improving and saving lives with their breakthroughs in medicine, agriculture, and science.

I want to nominate another person to be remembered in that same light. His name is Anthony Fauci. Born in 1940, Tony Fauci, the grandson of Italian immigrants, grew up a Yankees fan in Brooklyn. He was the captain of his high school basketball team. He worked construction jobs over breaks in the summer from school.

He ultimately decided he wanted to pursue a career in medicine. Thank goodness he did. In 1972, Anthony Fauci accepted a senior researcher position at the National Institutes of Allergy and Infectious Diseases at the National Institutes of Health, and for the past 38 years, Dr. Fauci has been the leader of that Institute. He has advised seven Presidents of both political parties. He has guided our Nation and the world through countless public health crises—SARS, avian influenza, swine flu, Zika, Ebola.

Aside from his work against COVID-19, he is best known for his work on HIV/AIDS. Anthony Fauci's tireless efforts on HIV/AIDS, both domestically and worldwide, through the creation of PEPFAR, the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, is the main reason why HIV/AIDS is no longer a death sentence.

Some of us can remember when HIV/AIDS was first discovered. I can recall coming to vote in the House and somebody stopping me on the sidewalk and saying: Did you hear Magic Johnson has AIDS? I can remember hearings in the House Budget Committee as a young Congressman when we thought

it was a death sentence that we were all going to face eventually. There was ultimate panic in the air, but thank goodness there were talented people like Tony Fauci with the nerves of steel needed to confront that.

Harold Varmus, a former NIH Director, once said:

PEPFAR has turned around declining life expectancies in many countries and likely saved some countries—even an entire continent—from economic ruin.

Larry Kramer, a prominent and well-known AIDS activist who recently passed away, called Dr. Fauci “the only true and great hero” among government officials of the AIDS crisis.

For his work on HIV/AIDS, Dr. Fauci was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom in 2008—our Nation's highest civilian honor—from then-President George W. Bush, who called Dr. Fauci “my hero.”

Dr. Fauci has devoted his career and his life to improving public health. He has saved countless lives here and around the world. These days, he is working 18 hours a day, 7 days a week, shuttling from the NIH to the White House and back home.

He is a classic example of American excellence, a brilliant scientific mind. Yet, despite all this, despite all that I have told you about this man, some Members of today's Republican Party have chosen to make him a political target. They think attacking Dr. Fauci will cause us to forget the real history of COVID-19.

You see, the Republican Party has consistently failed the American people when it has come to COVID—from President Trump's refusing to take it seriously, to the discouragement of mask-wearing and vaccines, to promoting horse tranquilizers and bleach and bizarre theories as a cure. They have too little courage to face their communities and to do the hard work of governing during this public health crisis, so they have invented a political target, a convenient target, on which to focus their blame.

Instead of addressing this public health crisis head on, they are trying to deflect and distract from it in attacking Dr. Tony Fauci. They are, without evidence, suggesting the false narrative that Dr. Fauci secretly and purposely funded illicit research that caused this virus. They are even criticizing his government salary, for goodness' sakes.

He accrued that salary, I might remind them, over four decades of public service, as though he wouldn't make twice or three times that amount in the private sector today. They are questioning his financials and ties to the drug industry, even though he has made every requested document available, and no malfeasance or conflicts have been found.

So why do they do this? Why are they determined to run this man down? Why would they attack this public servant who is working around the clock to keep us safe?

It is because it is much easier to malign a person than it is to do the hard work of enacting policies to tackle this virus and keep America healthy. Their distractions have sunk so low that they are using these attacks to raise money for their political campaigns.

We have Republican candidates, from Ohio to Florida, who are running ads entitled, “Fire Fauci,” who are promising to subpoena him and reduce his salary to zero if it is within their power, who are selling “Freedom over Fauci Flip-Flops,” which comes from none other than the Governor of Florida. A few of my Senate Republican colleagues have loaded up their websites with anti-Fauci fervor, conveniently located next to a “donate here” option.

We have FOX News’ anchors and podcast comedians giving air time to anti-vaxxers who are hoping to get their 15 minutes of fame by leveling baseless claims against Dr. Fauci, baseless claims that have resulted in death threats and harassment against Dr. Fauci, his wife, and his children.

Let me ask you this: What have Dr. Fauci’s most vocal critics done to advance the cause of public health?

Nothing. They have done nothing. Worse than that, their lies about Dr. Fauci and about COVID are creating a toxic political environment that is literally killing people, as 900,000 Americans have now died from COVID. Some of these deaths could have been prevented with vaccinations.

Americans who are unvaccinated—listen to this; the Presiding Officer knows it—are 97 times more likely to die from COVID than their vaccinated and boosted counterparts—97 times more likely to die. Yet, instead of spending their time encouraging vaccinations and promoting other proven, legitimate public health measures that would end this pandemic, many in the Republican Party want to get their 5 or 10 minutes of Sun on FOX TV, and they spend their time attacking Dr. Fauci.

These attacks are a shameful fraud, and for what—to fundraise? to win another guest appearance on FOX?

Working in politics, you get used to a lot of things—grandstanding, demagoguery, hypocrisy—but what some of my Republican colleagues are doing to Dr. Fauci is the lowest form of political life. They are lying about someone who has devoted his life to saving people—saving AIDS patients, containing and eradicating Ebola, preventing the spread of Zika and the avian flu. He is someone who has worked harder than anyone to end this COVID pandemic.

David Relman, a microbiologist who has advised the U.S. Government for years on biological threats, said this of Dr. Fauci:

Nobody is a more tireless champion of the truth and the facts . . . I am not entirely sure what we would do without him.

Dr. Fauci’s name is—and deserves to be—listed alongside our world’s greatest scientific minds. History will reserve another place for those who lied

about him for their own gain—inciting hatred, prolonging this pandemic, and contributing to needless pain and suffering.

America is blessed to have the talent, dedication, and compassion of Anthony Fauci in the midst of this deadly pandemic.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from The Washington Post, entitled, “Anthony Fauci is up against more than a virus,” after these remarks.

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

[Jan. 27, 2022]

ANTHONY FAUCI IS UP AGAINST MORE THAN A VIRUS

(By Dan Zak and Roxanne Roberts)

Two years into the pandemic, the threats and vitriol have not stopped. And the many Americans who still trust him are exhausted.

The doctor opens the front door. Never mind introductions. “I know who you are. Do you think these guys would let you get this close to me, if we didn’t know who you are?” Across the street is a security agent in Nikes, a badge on his belt. He’s not the only one watching.

“I mean, isn’t it amazing?” the doctor says. “Here I am, with cameras around my house.”

The house is modest for Washington: stucco and brick, cozy and cramped. No obvious tokens of celebrity or esteem. Icicles on the dormant hot tub out back. Bottles of red wine and olive oil on the kitchen counter.

“It’s messy because, as you know, in covid times, nobody comes over. So nobody cares.”

People are coming by outside, though. They are snapping photos. Two years into the pandemic Anthony Fauci remains the face of America’s covid response, and on this cold Saturday in January thousands of marchers are descending on the capital to rally against vaccine mandates. Are some of them staking out his home?

The security agents “usually leave at a certain time,” the doctor says. “But tonight they’re going to sleep in our guest room.”

Year 3 of covid times. Nearly 900,000 Americans are dead. An average of 2,000 (mostly unvaccinated) Americans are dying every day now, even though there is a simple measure to limit such suffering—made possible in large part by the Vaccine Research Center founded under Fauci. And yet many Americans would rather take their chances with a virus than a vaccine, because there’s more than just a virus going around. There’s something else in the air. Symptoms include rage, delusion, opportunism and extreme behavior—like comparing Fauci to Nazi doctor Josef Mengele (as Lara Logan did on Fox News in November), or setting out for Washington with an AR-15 and a kill list of “evil” targets that included Fauci (as a California man did last month).

“Surrealistic,” the doctor says.

He has not had a day off since the beginning. “I would say I’m in a state of chronic exhaustion.” He quickly adds: “But it’s not exhaustion that’s interfering with my function.” He is a precise man whose tour in the information war has made him extra-vigilant about his words. “I can just see, you know, Laura Ingraham: ‘He’s exhausted! Get rid of him!’”

Fauci has been a doctor and public servant for more than 50 years. He’s been the country’s top expert on infectious diseases under seven U.S. presidents. George H.W. Bush once called him his personal hero. Under

George W. Bush, Fauci became an architect of an AIDS-relief program that has, according to the U.S. government, saved 21 million lives around the world.

He knows how a virus works. He knows how Washington works. He thought he knew how people worked, too—even ones who called him a murderer, as AIDS activists did decades ago because they felt left for dead by a neglectful government. Back then the angry people were motivated by truth and science. Fauci had something to learn from them, and they had something to learn from him. The shared mission was pursuing facts and saving lives. Fear and uncertainty could be eased by data and collaboration. Combatants, however scared or passionate, shared a reality.

Now?

“There is no truth,” Fauci says, for effect. “There is no fact.” People believe hydroxychloroquine works because an Internet charlatan claims it does. People believe the 2020 election was stolen because a former president says so. People believe that Fauci killed millions of people for the good of his stock portfolio because it’s implied by TV pundits, Internet trolls and even elected leaders. Fauci is unnerved by “the almost incomprehensible culture of lies” that has spread among the populace, infected major organs of the government, manifested as ghastly threats against him and his family. His office staff, normally focused on communicating science to the public, has been conscripted into skirmishes over conspiracy theories and misinformation.

“It is very, very upending to live through this,” Fauci says, seated at his kitchen table in the midwinter light. He pauses. “I’m trying to get the right word for it.” He is examining himself now, at 81, in the shadow of the past two years. “It has shaken me a bit.”

The way he can comprehend the situation is in the context of the Jan. 6, 2021, siege of the Capitol. There it was, on live TV, an experiment as clear as day: The abandonment of truth has seismic consequences.

Something has been replicating in the American mind. It is not microbial. It cannot be detected by nasal swab. To treat an affliction, you must first identify it. But you can’t slide a whole country into an MRI machine.

“There’s no diagnosis for this,” Fauci says. “I don’t know what is going on.”

A virus is a terrifying force that hijacks civilization. A bureaucracy, intricate yet imperfect, is what we have to take back control. For better and worse, Fauci became the personification of both. He has been sainted and satanized over the past two years, since he first fact-checked President Donald Trump. His inbox is a cascade of hosannas and go-to-hells. His days often start at 5 a.m. His nights are fitful. What more could he have done today? What fresh horror awaits tomorrow? He is fighting for a best-case scenario, urging preparation for the worst, and fretting that nothing will ever be good enough.

“I do worry about him,” says Francis Collins, until recently the director of the National Institutes of Health. “He’s incredibly frustrated” by the attacks “because it’s a distraction. But there is no part of Tony Fauci that’s ready to give up on a problem just because it’s hard.”

“Being two years into this, and being at the tip of the spear—it takes a certain person to be able to persevere through that,” says Michael T. Osterholm, director of the Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy at the University of Minnesota. “It’s almost like asking someone to run a marathon every day of their life.”

“He’s always had complete bipartisan support, up until covid,” says AIDS activist

Peter Staley, who once picketed NIH and is now a dear friend of Fauci's. "It's flat-Earth time. Nothing makes sense. This is a guy who tries to let science dictate what he says and does. Now they're turning what is a pristine record into something evil. They lie, and repeat the lie 100 times until people think it's true."

Staley calls Fauci multiple times a week to check in, ask him how he's doing, discuss the covid response and the resistance to it.

"What do I tell him?" Staley says. "What kind of advice do I give him to win that war? It's very frustrating. It's almost unwinnable."

Look at Fauci's Jan. 11 appearance before the Senate Health Committee. Sen. Richard Burr (R-N.C.) chided Fauci and other officials for spreading "skepticism and mass confusion" with mixed messaging on covid guidelines. A harsh but fair criticism. Then two senators—who each happen to have medical degrees—got personal.

"You are the lead architect for the response from the government, and now 800,000 people have died," said Sen. Rand Paul (R-Ky.).

Fauci scolded Paul that such an "irresponsible" statement "kindles the crazies." "I have threats upon my life, harassments of my family," Fauci said, suggesting that the California man targeted him because he "thinks that maybe I'm killing people."

For years, Fauci had joked that his personal philosophy comes from "The Godfather": "It's not personal; it's strictly business." The business is science. Science helped him cure vasculitis. Science helped him and others transform HIV from a death sentence to a condition managed by a pill.

What he was facing now felt like it had nothing to do with science.

Later in the hearing, Sen. Roger Marshall (R-Kan.) displayed a giant prop paycheck depicting Fauci's \$400,000-plus salary. Marshall accused Fauci and "Big Tech" of hiding his financial investments, which created an "appearance that maybe some shenanigans are going on."

Fauci, bewildered and incensed, replied that his assets, which he had disclosed for decades, were available to the public. (While this statement was technically true, his disclosures were not just a Google search away; after the hearing, Marshall's office requested and received the documents from NIH, then declared that Fauci "lied" about the ease of their availability.)

When Marshall finished his questioning, Fauci let his frustration get the better of him. "What a moron," he muttered to himself, not intending it for the microphone.

What was going on here? Senators were "trying to troll Fauci, and they're trying to bring him down to their level," says Matthew Sheffield, a former conservative activist who now runs a political commentary website called Flux.community. "They know if they can get him to call people a moron, or engage in pettiness the way that they engage in pettiness constantly—if he does it even once, then it's a victory for them."

Paul disputes this characterization and claims that Fauci deserves "some culpability" for the pandemic because a grant from his agency funded research in a lab in Wuhan, the Chinese city where the novel coronavirus was first detected. (The exact origins of the virus remain unknown. Scientific consensus points to an animal-to-human transfer, but the debate is ongoing.)

Marshall's office did not have comment on Sheffield's theory. After the hearing, the senator's campaign website did start selling \$29 T-shirts, featuring the doctor's likeness, to commemorate the moment: "Send Fauci a message by getting your own 'MORON' t-shirt!"

The way in which the United States funds and manages science provides a solid foundation for skepticism and conspiracy, says University of Pennsylvania professor Kathleen Hall Jamieson, who studies science communication and misinformation.

Yes, scientific recommendations change based on available data, a truth that can be exploited to make responsible leaders appear inconsistent or incompetent.

Yes, Fauci has a high salary by government standards, has been in the same unelected position for 38 years and oversees a budget of \$6 billion that flows into grants; those are truths on which a distrusting person could build a theory about corruption, unaccountable elites and a nefarious flow of money from this or that institution to this or that lab.

Yes, the virus seems unaccountable to our best efforts and fueled by our worst instincts. Yes, the ways it has ended and up-ended people's lives have been undeserved, tragic, crazy-making. These are scary truths that you can neutralize with a fantasy about how a single human villain is to blame.

The attacks and misinformation seem to be having an effect. Confidence in Fauci is softening, according to polling conducted since April by the Annenberg Public Policy Center. After holding steady last summer and autumn, the percentage of Americans who are confident that Fauci provides trustworthy information about COVID-19 is down six points since April, from 71 to 65 percent.

"For the first time in my lifetime—and I am an elderly woman—the voice that speaks on behalf of the best available knowledge in science has weathered sustained attack," says Jamieson, director of the policy center. "Confidence [in Fauci] remains high despite that attack, but the erosion is worrisome."

With Trump long gone from the White House and public exhaustion with precautions surging alongside the omicron variant, Fauci may now be more useful to the pundits who need a villain than those who need a hero. "Fauci must go," the editors of the conservative National Review demanded this month. "I'm over COVID," talk-show host Bill Maher told Deadline before his show last week. His guest, author Bari Weiss, echoed the frustration of millions: We were told "you get the vaccine and you get back to normal. And we haven't gotten back to normal."

"The stalwart Fauci was the wise Oracle of Delphi to then-President Donald Trump's babbling brook about household bleach as an injectable, anti-viral agent," Washington Post columnist Kathleen Parker wrote this week.

"Maybe it's my imagination," she continued, "but Fauci appears less confident of late, perhaps weary of his own voice and exhausted by two years of on-camera appearances."

Sen. Marshall exaggerated this erosion during the Jan. 11 hearing. "You've lost your reputation," he told Fauci, adding: "The American people don't trust the words coming out of your mouth."

"That's a real distortion of the reality," Fauci answered.

Marshall replied with a truth from the world outside of medical science: "Perception is reality."

Fauci is not naive. He gets that a third of the country won't hear him. He still understands Washington enough to see how it is deteriorating in new and disturbing ways, as fringe thinking spreads to the central organs. As Peter Staley puts it: "Because one party has turned so anti-science, Tony's power is no longer stable."

Yet Fauci still thinks he is an effective messenger. And he still hasn't totally given up on the people who are making his life

miserable. After the exchange with Marshall, and a news cycle dominated by "moron" instead of "omicron," Fauci told his own incredulous staff: Maybe the senator has a point. Maybe my financial investments, though disclosed and available, should be much easier to see.

As for the citizens who wish him harm, he can't help but search for some signal, some symptom, that could help him understand.

"I'm always looking for the good in people, that kernel of something that's positive," Fauci says. "And it's tough to imagine that that many people are bad people. And, I mean, it's just—has something been smoldering in their lives? Something that's sociologically evasive to me?"

He wonders: Does their resentment indicate an underlying issue that needs—for lack of a better term—healing?

"Maybe it's pain that they're feeling, that's driving it?" he says, as if bedside with a patient. "And we're focusing on the aberrancy of their actions, but we really are not fully appreciating that maybe they're suffering. And they're rebelling against a failing of society, maybe, to address some of their needs. Maybe we need, as a nation, to address the fundamental issues that are getting, you know, tens of millions of people to feel a certain way."

On Sunday, in front of the Lincoln Memorial, thousands of people rallied against vaccine mandates. Fauci's name was scrawled on many signs. The rhetoric was familiar. "Dr. Fauci is the new Jeff Menzies from World War II," said a Long Island construction worker named Gio Nicolson, who described Fauci as both "puppet" and "dictator." A 57-year-old woman named Robin Field drove three hours from Yorktown, Va., to hold up a homemade sign that depicted Fauci's decapitated head in a noose, under the words "HANG EM HIGH."

Fauci is guilty of treason, according to Field. She's done her own research, she says, and it's clear that his recommendations have both "killed people" and made him money.

The violence of her sign, though—where is that coming from? At a primal level, it seems to convey pain or fear.

"Of co—" Field starts, then stops. "Well . . ."

How would she put it? "I feel so bad that so many people have lost their lives. That hurts, because we all have loved ones that have touched our hearts and passed away."

Almost no one alive has experienced this kind of sudden mass death, this level of widespread illness, this freezing and fracturing of all life. It hurts. For much of the 1980s, every single one of Fauci's AIDS patients died. Ugly deaths that he was powerless to prevent. He had to suppress the pain and bury the emotion to get through each day. When he recalls that era, his eyes water and his throat constricts. His self-diagnosis is a quick aside ("post-traumatic stress") as he bridges the past and the present. In the middle of a cataclysm, it's hard to see the end. But it does end.

"As a society, when we get out of this, you know, we're going to look up and say, 'Oh, my goodness, what we've been through,'" he says. "We've had an outbreak where we've lost close to 900,000 people in the last two years. That's going to have a long-lasting effect."

In the early '70s, when he was chief resident in a Manhattan hospital, Fauci remembers glancing out over the East River in the middle of the night. "Saying, you know, I'm tired, but I can't stop until at least this patient is stabilized." When he was the main attending physician at NIH during the AIDS crisis, he wouldn't leave the ward until he addressed every patient need. Now he views

the entire country as his patient—a patient afflicted by both a virus and an undiagnosed condition that hampers its ability to fight it.

He could spare himself further pain and exhaustion and allow America to see another doctor. He could tag out.

"That's not my character," he says. "I don't do that."

The patient, you see, is not stabilized yet.

Fauci stares out the kitchen window into his small backyard. Right now he sees a crossroads for America. The best-case scenario: increased vaccination, more immunity, antiviral drugs, a virus under control. If we work together. The worst: a new variant, as transmissible as omicron but more deadly, exacerbated by that comorbidity—the deterioration of our minds and politics.

"It's like it's 2 o'clock in the morning, and I'm looking out the window at the East River," Fauci says, "and I got a patient who's bleeding, and another patient has a myocardial infarction, and another patient who has septicemia—"

The sense memory prompts a sort of pep talk for the present.

"There's no time to be exhausted, folks. You got a job to do."

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

TITLE IX

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, in my 40 years as a coach and mentor, I have witnessed the immeasurable value that sports plays in the lives of young adults.

The lessons learned on the field contribute to an athlete's success off the field. For example, there is the value of discipline and hard work, how to deal with success and failure, how to be a leader, and the importance of putting the interests of the team ahead of the individual's. But many of these lessons are only realized when there is a fair and level playing field, and that is why title IX protections have been so transformational for women's and girls' sports.

I began my career as a high school coach, coaching boys' basketball and football, as well as girls' basketball. This was just a few years after Congress expanded title IX, ushering in a new era of opportunities for women and girls in sports.

Title IX provided women and girls the long-denied platform that had always been afforded to men and boys. It ensured female athletes had the same access to funding, facilities, and athletic scholarships. Before title IX, female athletics received less than 2 percent of the college athletic budgets, and athletic scholarships for women were virtually nonexistent. Since it was enacted, I have witnessed firsthand how the expanded provisions in title IX have changed the game for female athletes at every level.

Today, 43 percent of high school girls participate in competitive sports.

Since the 1970s, when I first started coaching, female participation at the college level has risen by more than 600 percent. Additionally, America's female athletes are routinely the best-performing on the world stage in both team and individual sports.

In the 2016 Olympics, we saw the largest number of U.S. female Olympians in history. It is clear we have made important strides. Yet, recently, the adoption of policies for transgender athletes has negatively impacted the rights, privacy, safety, and achievements of women and girls in sports. That is why we need to continue to fight to uphold and preserve title IX protections in women's and girls' sports.

This is a cause I have championed in my role on the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee. When then-nominee for Under Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education, James Kvaal, testified before the committee, I pressed on the administration's commitment to upholding title IX and protecting the rights of women. As expected, he failed to articulate how title IX would be protected under the Biden administration.

In March of last year, when Senate Democrats were pushing through their so-called COVID relief package, I led the charge here on this floor to prohibit education institutions from receiving Federal stimulus money if they failed to uphold title IX. Not surprisingly, it was rejected.

But this is not just a debate we are having here in Congress; we are seeing it all across the country. To appease the demands of the left, sports organizations—from grade school to professional leagues—are focusing on the concept of being inclusive at the expense of being fair, but by including biological males in women's athletics, fairness is not possible. I can't believe we are even talking about this.

Just last week, I heard from female Olympic gold medalists who reiterated this, and study after study continues to confirm what we already know: Male and female bodies have inherent biological differences that no amount of testosterone suppression can level. Male bodies have larger hearts, bigger bone structure, leaner muscles, and expanded lung capacity.

One study concludes: "On average, males have 40–50 percent greater upper limb strength, 20–40 percent greater lower limb strength, and an average of 12 pounds more skeletal muscle mass than age-matched females at any given body weight."

The latest study published by clinical researchers in Europe finds that "current evidence shows the biological advantage is only minimally reduced when testosterone is suppressed as per current sporting guidelines for transgender athletes."

You can't make a level playing field. It is unquestionably the truth that biological males have a physiological advantage over females, and sports asso-

ciations across the world are starting, finally, to pay attention.

In 2019, USA Powerlifting prohibited transgender women from competing in female powerlifting. In 2020, World Rugby became the first international sports governing body to ban transgender women in global competitions. Just last September, the UK Sports Councils—the national funding bodies for sports across the United Kingdom—issued a report concluding that allowing transgender athletes to compete in women's sports does not allow for a balanced and even playing field—prohibited. These organizations are doing the research and making recommendations in the best interests of their athletes while also maintaining fairness in sports.

But then there is the NCAA, better known as the National Collegiate Athletic Association. After a transgender collegiate swimmer began shattering—and I am talking about shattering—records in swimming just in the last few weeks, the public outcry was so loud that the NCAA said: Well, we will review this policy.

The NCAA met, and the board voted in support of a sport-by-sport policy that they say "preserve opportunity for transgender student-athletes while balancing fairness, inclusion and safety for all who compete."

In effect, this means they will defer the policy to individual national governing bodies and kick the can down the road. These governing bodies, in turn, generally adhere to the standards of the International Olympic Committee, which permits transgender athletes to compete in women's sports.

The Independent Women's Law Center and Independent Women's Forum both have condemned the NCAA for adopting this approach. The NCAA had the perfect opportunity to stand up for women and girls in sports, and they blew it.

The NCAA's lack of true action is disappointing and invites more questions than it provides answers. By punting the responsibility, the NCAA leaves the door open for continued erosion of title IX protections at the expense of women's athletics and continues to chip away at the great unifier that Americans know and love. We need to do better for women athletes all across this country.

So let me be clear. The question here is not should we be inclusive and supportive of all athletes; it is how. There is no pregame speech you can give a woman or a girl who feels like they aren't competing on a fair playing field. No pep talk can touch title IX's 37 words that changed everything for women's sports over 50 years ago. It rightfully afforded women and girls the same athletic opportunities that their male counterparts have always had, and we should continue to fight for all the young girls and the future of this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

SUPREME COURT NOMINATION

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution provides that the President “shall nominate, and by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, shall appoint . . . judges of the Supreme Court.”

One of the most important constitutional responsibilities I have as a Senator is to provide advice and consent on a President’s Supreme Court nominee. A new Justice is someone who could serve for a generation or more and have a profound impact on the lives of all Americans for decades to come.

Recently, Supreme Court Justice Stephen Breyer announced that he would step down once the Senate confirms his successor. In his remarks, while reflecting on what he learned during his nearly three decades on the High Court, he said:

This is a complicated country. There are more than 330 million people, and my mother used to say it’s every race, it’s every religion—and she would emphasize this—and it’s every point of view possible.

Justice Breyer has built a reputation and cemented a legacy as a champion of civil rights and fought to protect American consumers and our very democratic system of government from the attempts to undermine our campaign finance system and weaken the sacred franchise of the right to vote. His thoughtful scholarship on the importance of safeguarding human rights and respecting international law will continue to influence democratic governments around the world for years to come.

When I think about a successor to Justice Breyer, I want to see someone who can serve as a strong and thoughtful presence on a Court that is tasked with some of the most complicated legal problems and questions in our Nation. Each new Justice is someone who could serve for a generation or more and have a profound impact on the lives of all Americans for decades to come.

The Supreme Court will make decisions on a broad range of issues, such as voting rights, healthcare, women’s reproductive freedoms, equal rights for women, climate change policy, gun safety, campaign finance, civil rights issues, and so much more. A nominee should represent the values of our Constitution in such a way that allows us to expand, not restrict, the civil rights of all Americans and keep powerful special interests and corporations in check.

The U.S. Constitution is not a perfect document, but its authors designed a system of government around the rule of law and protection from abuses of power. Abuses could come from special interests or the government itself. Our Constitution created the Supreme Court of the United States as the protector of our constitutional rights.

A Justice should have a healthy respect for the separation of powers and

checks and balances in our constitutional system. A nominee should strive to safeguard the independence of the judiciary and protect the prerogatives of each branch of government, including Congress and its duly-enacted laws. A strong nominee must be respectful of the diversity of the American experience and live up to his or her constitutional oath to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States, as well as their judicial oath to “administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich.”

Thus far, 115 Justices have served in our Nation’s history, including Baltimore’s own Thurgood Marshall, who was the first Black Supreme Court Justice. It is long past time to improve diversity on our Nation’s Court, which promises “equal justice under the law” to all those who enter its hollowed chambers. The Supreme Court and its Justices should look more like the America it serves in both its demographic and professional diversity.

Madam President, I know you are aware that of the 115 Justices who have served throughout the history of the United States on the Supreme Court, 108 of those 115 are White males. We need greater diversity in our courts, and we need greater diversity on the Supreme Court of the United States.

In Maryland, for years, I have worked diligently when vacancies arise to recommend highly qualified lawyers to the President who will better diversify our Federal bench. Our Federal district court in Maryland consists of 10 active district court judges who sit in Baltimore and Greenbelt. I am proud that our court reflects the breadth and depth of the demographic and professional diversity in Maryland, including the first Black woman to serve as a Federal judge in Maryland and the first Asian-American Federal judge in Maryland.

Half of the active district judges in our State are now women. I chuckle when I recall the late Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg’s comment on how many women should be on the Supreme Court, as she was only the second female Justice in the Court’s history. This is her quote:

When I’m sometimes asked ‘When will there be enough [women on the Supreme Court]?’ and I say ‘When there are nine,’ people are shocked. But there’d been nine men, and nobody’s [even] raised a question about that.

Our Federal judges in Maryland come from a wide variety of legal backgrounds, including having served as prosecutors, public defenders, private law firm attorneys, and judges in other courts. Maryland now has its first Black U.S. attorney in our State’s history, whom I was pleased, along with Senator VAN HOLLEN, to recommend to President Biden and who was unanimously confirmed by the Senate.

I believe that a more diverse court and justice system inspires the confidence of Marylanders who seek their

day in court and want to be treated fairly, with dignity and respect.

I am confident that the Senate, under the leadership of Majority Leader SCHUMER and Judiciary Chair DURBIN, will conduct a fair hearing, vetting, and confirmation process for President Biden’s eventual pick to replace Justice Breyer.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Senate over the coming months to give full and fair consideration to President Biden’s nominee to replace Justice Breyer in order to fill the upcoming vacancy on the Supreme Court. I am hopeful the American people will be proud of the process that unfolds in the Senate as they watch and learn more about the Constitution and the three branches of government that interact in this unique process to select the next Justice who will dispense justice on the highest Court in our land.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

HOUSING

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, before last year, the committee I chair and one of the committees on which the Presiding Officer sits—the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee—was far too much about Wall Street and far too little about issues that matter to people’s lives.

We have changed that. Instead of always listening to the biggest banks and their corporate lobbyists, we listen to workers and we listen to their families from all kinds of communities all over the country.

Last year, we held the committee’s first-ever worker listening session where, as hard as it was for all of us, no Senator asked questions. We just heard from witnesses. We heard from workers—about a half-dozen workers—who just told us their story.

We know that workers power our economy. We heard from workers from all kinds of backgrounds, working all kinds of jobs. Some worked for banks, others worked for large tech companies, and some for other corporations. They talked about wage theft. They talked about being laid off during a pandemic with no severance pay. They talked about the danger in their workplaces. They talked about how, in some cases, their companies busted their unions.

Their stories make it clear that the real harm the Wall Street business model does is to workers’ lives.

Yesterday, we held our second listening session, this time with renters from around the country whose homes are owned by deep-pocketed investors like corporate landlords and private equity funds.

One of those renters—some lived in the Presiding Officer's home State, I believe in North Minneapolis—told her story. It is an increasing problem in every region, from big cities to rural towns. Deep-pocketed investors come into a community they have no connection to, and they buy up homes; they raise rents; they cut services; and they don't deliver on their promises to their tenants.

These out-of-town and sometimes out-of-country investors are raising rents often by as much as 50 percent, issuing eviction notices, and leaving toxic mold and pest infestations to grow worse, all to pad their bottom line.

We heard from renters in apartment buildings and single-family homes and manufactured housing. We heard from renters in Las Vegas, NV; Great Falls, MT; and Hyattsville, MD—all sharing those stories.

One renter was told, when she asked why her rent suddenly increased by hundreds of dollars a month, "We have to please the investors." Think about that. "We have to please the investors."

Renters in Nevada, in Maryland, in Texas, and in California had their homes repeatedly flooded with wastewater, lived with rodent infestations, and went long periods without working showers or hot water.

Listen to Juan Cuellar from Maryland. He said:

The ceiling in the hallways is falling in. The wood floor is buckling. We don't have heat. There are cockroaches and mice. The air conditioning units don't work. There is a lot of mold. The refrigerator doesn't work. They don't want to fix anything, including the stove and the refrigerator and the heater.

They don't even have heat. These investors claim they are just running a business. OK. The business is supposed to be providing a decent place to live—that is part of the deal—in exchange for collecting people's hard-earned money in rent each month. If your building is full of mold and mice and doesn't have working heat or doesn't have a working stove, you are not holding up your end of the deal. You are not running a real business; you are running a scam. Families pay a very high price for it.

Rachel Jones is a working mother in North Minneapolis. She said her persistent complaints about her home's leaking sewage and dangerous garage went unanswered. The city itself was forced to step in because of code violations. This single mother said the company that owns her home bought it as "essentially a money-grabbing tool. That's all they are doing."

Ms. Nguyen, who lives in Brooklyn, talked about the firm that bought her building, Greenbrook. She said:

They and their business model do not care if I or my neighbors become homeless—in fact, their business model makes that possibility [much more] likely.

Cindy Newman, from Great Falls, MT, talked about her manufactured

home community. She worked hard to buy her home, but she rents the land it sits on. That is how manufactured homes work, how mobile home parks work. She rents the land it sits on. She said they used to have "a fair land owner who kept our community safe and affordable," until the private equity firm Havenpark Capital took over.

I would just add that Senator SANDERS just walked in, and Senator SANDERS and I have talked about when these private equity firms come in and buy mobile home parks and the damage that so often does.

She said her new owners in Montana have "cut back on all amenities and strip value out of our communities. They are brutal, absentee landlords." Her line, her quote.

The group raised rents and added fees for water and sewer and trash removal. Ms. Newman said this company bought a number of these homes—Havenpark—all over Montana and Iowa and other places around the country.

She said it amounted to about an 86-percent increase—her words—for the dirt that her home sits on. But they just can't pick up and move. Moving her home to a different community would cost \$10,000 or \$20,000.

Just picture these mobile home parks. These mobile homes they buy—maybe \$30-, \$40-, \$50,000 in some cases—they set them and then they build around them, and they aren't really mobile at that point. It costs, as this woman said, \$10- to \$20,000 to move them.

Most of her neighbors are seniors. They are on fixed incomes.

She continues:

It's hard to believe we could lose our homes and our life savings to such uncaring, greedy people.

Remember, they moved into these places 5 years, 10 years, 20 years ago. A family owned it. The family rented the land out for \$200 or \$300 a month. Then a private equity firm came in and doubled their rent. I mean, think about what that does, just upending the lives of people who are not all that affluent. They are kind of living paycheck to paycheck or Social Security check to Social Security check anyway.

As apartments and houses and manufactured home communities that people can afford become harder and harder to find, families are left with an impossible choice: pay money they don't have for a home that may put their kids at risk or gamble and look for a new place to live with a fear they will end up with no place to sleep.

That is what these seven renters, who represent millions of renters across the country—that is what they told us yesterday. These renters and homeowners shared their stories. They have shone a light on this problem.

Tomorrow in our hearing—we will hold a hearing in our committee looking at how we ended up here, how this exploitive business model has exploded around the country. For Wall Street investors, rent increases are distilled

down as returns to shareholders. Code violations and eviction violations are just the cost of doing business. But for Mr. Cuellar and Ms. Jones and Ms. Newman and millions of Americans, these are their homes. These are their neighborhoods. It is up to us to look out for them, not to look out for private equity firms' bottom lines.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3615

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, let us be as clear as we can be, and that is, there is significant discontent throughout our country today, from Vermont to California and in all 50 States. The American people are worried about COVID. We are all worried about COVID. We are all tired of COVID. But the American people are worried about much more. They are worried about inflation, the price of food and gas, and other products going up. They are worried about climate change and whether or not the planet they will be leaving to their kids and grandchildren will be healthy and habitable. They are worried about a middle class whose real, inflation-accounted-for wages have not risen in almost 50 years, have been stagnant, and the reality that today, half of our workforce is living paycheck to paycheck.

The American people are worried about the massive level of income and wealth inequality which we are experiencing in which, during this pandemic alone, just the last few years, the billionaire class saw an increase in their wealth by some \$2 trillion while at the same time, thousands of workers died as they went to their jobs. They didn't have a choice about it; they went to work, and they died.

The American people are worried that their kids are not getting the quality childcare that they need or that the family can afford. They are worried about the outrageous levels of student debt that their kids acquired because they chose to get a higher education.

Above all else, the American people, in my view, are outraged that in the midst of all of these crises and more, their elected officials are simply not responding.

In my view, now is the time to tell the American people that we in Congress do understand their pain, that we do know what they are going through, and that we are prepared to stand up for the working families of this country and take on the greed of powerful special interests who wield so much influence over the economic and political life of our Nation.

Today, Senator KLOBUCHAR and I are going to focus on one—just one—of the many issues that this Congress must address. The American people want action, and that is what we have to give them. We have to respond to the crises.

Today, we are going to be talking about prescription drugs. For decades, literally decades—20, 30, 40 years—

Members of both political parties have come to the floor of the Senate, come to the floor of the House, and they have bemoaned the high cost of prescription drugs in this country. They promised the American people they would lower those outrageous prices. Republicans have come to the floor, Democrats have come to the floor, and speech after speech has been made. And not only speeches—Members of both political parties put 30-second ads on television when they ran for office: Hey, vote for me. I am going to lower the cost of prescription drugs.

For decades now, Members of Congress have been talking about lowering the cost of prescription drugs, and for decades, they have failed to deliver. Talk, talk, talk—nothing happens. The cost of prescription drugs goes up.

Congress has failed to deliver under Democratic leadership. It has failed to deliver under Republican leadership. It failed to deliver under Democratic Presidents and failed to deliver under Republican Presidents. We have failed to deliver because of the greed of the pharmaceutical industry, which today is likely the most powerful corporate interest in America and is certainly the dominant political force here in Washington, DC.

So I ask my fellow Americans today: Do you want to know why you are paying the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs? Simple question. Why is it that we are paying in some cases 10 times more for the same exact prescription drugs that are sold in Canada or in Europe?

Do you want to know why one out of four Americans—this is really quite crazy, that in the midst of a dysfunctional healthcare system, we have one out of four Americans who cannot afford to fill the prescriptions that their doctor writes. Think about that for one-half a second. People are sick. They go to the doctor. The doctor writes out a prescription. People can't afford to fill it. They end up in the emergency room. They end up in the hospital. They get sicker because they simply cannot afford the outrageous cost of medicine.

Do you know why millions of diabetic Americans actually ration their insulin? I have talked to diabetics and parents of diabetics. Their kids get sick because they cannot afford the cost of insulin. Obviously, diabetes today is a terrible, terrible illness impacting many millions of Americans.

Let me tell you why we pay the highest prices in the world, why people in America die because they can't afford prescription drugs. The answer has everything to do with the corrupt political system in which over the past 20 years the pharmaceutical industry has spent over \$4.5 billion—not million; \$4.5 billion—on lobbying and hundreds of millions of dollars on campaign contributions. Yes, you heard that correctly—\$4.5 billion over 20 years on lobbying and God knows how many hundreds of millions of dollars on cam-

paign contributions. These are campaign contributions that go to Republicans. These are campaign contributions that go to Democrats. And I am talking about many hundreds of Members of the House and Senate who receive funding from the pharmaceutical industry.

Further, the pharmaceutical industry has over the years mounted an unprecedented lobbying effort in Washington, here in the Nation's Capital, and in States all over the country. I hope everybody hears this because this is what power is about. This is why you pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs.

Last year alone, the pharmaceutical industry hired more than 1,700 well-paid lobbyists to come to Capitol Hill to protect their interests, including the former congressional leaders of both major political parties. Got that? Seventeen hundred well-paid lobbyists protecting the interests of the pharmaceutical industry—get out your calculator because what that amounts to is three pharmaceutical industry lobbyists for every Member of Congress. There are 435 Members in the House and 100 in the Senate and 1,700 well-paid lobbyists making sure that you pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs.

What is the result of all of that lobbying and all of those campaign contributions? Well, I think the American people know it every time they walk into a drugstore. The pharmaceutical industry, uniquely in the entire world, is able to raise their prices anytime they want, to any level they want.

How many people out there walked into a drugstore, refilled their prescription, and the pharmacist said: Well, I am sorry to tell you the cost of your medicine has gone up 20 percent.

Why? Because they can. They can do anything they want. If they want to double prices, triple prices, there is no law stopping them. That is what you get when you spend billions of dollars on lobbyists and campaign contributions. You get what you pay for, and they have gotten what they paid for.

Not only do we pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs, but the result of that is that the pharmaceutical industry, year after year, makes huge profits. Eight of the largest drug companies in America in 2020 made nearly \$50 billion in profits, while the CEOs of those pharmaceutical companies took home over \$350 million in total compensation. Eight companies; \$350 million in compensation for the CEOs of those companies; \$50 billion in profits in the last year we have information.

Let's be very clear. The overriding motivation of the pharmaceutical industry is greed. Their overriding goal is to make as much money as they can by squeezing as much as they can get from the sick, from the elderly, and from the desperate.

I could give you many, many examples of the outrageous greed of the

pharmaceutical industry, and I am not even going to talk about the opiate crisis, which has killed hundreds of thousands of Americans. I am not even going to go there today.

Let me just mention, a couple of years ago, the former CEO of a drug company called Gilead became a billionaire by charging \$1,000 for the hepatitis drug Sovaldi. He became a billionaire. Interestingly enough, that drug was developed by taxpayer dollars through the Veterans' Administration. While they charge \$1,000 a treatment here in the United States, it turns out that it costs \$1 to manufacture and can be purchased in India for all of \$4—\$1,000 here; \$4 there.

In 2016, the chairman of Mylan received a \$164 million compensation package after his company jacked up the price of EpiPen—you all remember EpiPen—by 550 percent over a 9-year period.

All over this country, the American people are asking a simple question: How many people in our country need to die? How many people need to get unnecessarily sicker before Congress is prepared to take on the greed and power of the pharmaceutical industry?

Enough is enough. A lifesaving prescription drug does not mean anything if you cannot afford that drug. We have great drugs out there. What does it mean if you can't afford that drug or if you are going to go bankrupt because you have to buy it for a family member?

We cannot allow the pharmaceutical industry to charge the American people, by far, the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs. And that is why I have introduced today, along with Senator KLOBUCHAR, legislation that would cut the cost of prescription drugs under Medicare in half—not by 10 percent, not 30 percent—cut the cost of prescription drugs under Medicare in half. It would do that by making sure that Medicare pays the same low prices for prescription drugs as the Veterans' Administration does.

Why is it that the VA pays so much less for prescription drugs than Medicare? The answer is pretty simple. While the VA has been able to negotiate with the pharmaceutical industry for the past 30 years, Congress banned Medicare by law from doing anything to lower prescription drug prices. And the result is that, according to the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office, Medicare pays twice as much for the exact same prescription drugs as the VA.

All right. You talk about dysfunctionality. You talk about crazy. You have two branches of government. VA pays X, Medicare pays 2X. How in God's name does that make sense to anybody other than the pharmaceutical industry? This is totally absurd. And if the VA can negotiate with the drug companies, so can Medicare.

By the way, for all of the great deficit hawks here staying up nights worrying about the deficit, let me tell you,

if we do that, we will save Medicare some \$900 billion over the next decade. I would like to see where the deficit hawks are on this issue—\$900 billion, 10 years. That is real money.

The VA, obviously, is not the only Agency that negotiates for lower drug prices. That is something that takes place in every other major country on Earth. There is no rational reason for the pharmaceutical industry to charge the American people \$98.70 for a standard unit of insulin that can be purchased in the UK for just \$7.52, and on and on it goes.

The American people are being played for suckers. They have bought the U.S. Congress, and it is time now for Congress to stand up to these people.

With that, I would mention that what we are talking about—what Senator KLOBUCHAR and I are talking about is not some radical far-left idea. I get that. I don't know if Senator KLOBUCHAR gets that, but it is not some radical, far-left idea; it is a fairly popular idea.

According to an October 2021 poll by the Kaiser Family Foundation, 83 percent of the American people want Medicare to negotiate with the pharmaceutical industry to lower the cost of prescription drugs, and poll after poll shows the same thing. Maybe, just maybe—ready for a radical idea, Madam President? Maybe, just maybe, instead of doing the work of the lobbyists and the pharmaceutical industry, we might just want to represent the American people.

I yield the floor.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I think you know Senator SANDERS and I debated a number of issues before, but from the beginning, we have been strongly united on one thing, and that is bringing down costs for the American people. And that is, as he just said, not one bit radical.

We have joined together to introduce the Cutting Medicare Prescription Drug Prices in Half Act because that is what we should be doing. America pays more. The people of this country pay more for their prescription drugs than any other country in the world. How can that be, as Senator SANDERS has noted, when it is our country, our taxpayers who are investing in all this research? How can we come up short when it comes to what our people are paying for drugs?

The examples: In the past 5 years, the cost of Lyrica—a drug that you see advertised on TV, millions of dollars in ads—a drug that treats nerve pain or Symbicort, an asthma medication, increased almost 50 percent. What is the result of these kinds of increases? Nearly 20 percent of older adults have reported not taking their medicines as prescribed because of the cost.

Last month alone, drug companies hiked the price of 742 drugs in America. What do we do? We sit. We sit; we talk about it; and we are not taking action.

That is why Senator SANDERS and I are putting our bill in today. We would

love to spend the week debating it. We would like to move to this bill so we can get this done. We know that prescription drug prices in the United States are more than 250-percent higher than other industrialized nations.

What is our simple solution? The VA, the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, that we empower with the lives of our veterans and their healthcare—they negotiate the prices of the drugs they purchase and dispense for our Nation's veterans. One report found that the VA price is often half as much as what Medicare pays. Why? It is simple. The VA negotiates for prices; Medicare doesn't.

I kind of think—and Senator SANDERS and I know this well—that 46 million seniors in America could get a pretty good deal if you allow the government to negotiate on their behalf, a good deal for the taxpayers of this country, for people who care about deficits, for people who care about the bottom-line budget, and a good deal for customers.

Guess what. It wouldn't just help seniors because that is such a large block of customers in this country that it would bring down the drug costs for everyone.

The stories in my State—people like Claire from St. Paul. When the cost of the prescription drug she relied on to manage her rheumatoid arthritis jumped from \$60 a month to \$1,400 per month, she could no longer afford it. In her words, her arthritis became so bad that she could barely handle a fork and a knife or the young man who is the manager of a restaurant, a full-time job. When he aged off his parents' insurance, what happened to him? You know this story, Madam President. He started to ration his insulin. He had severe diabetes, and he died. His mother has made her life about getting better drug prices.

Senator SANDERS and I believe you start with the biggest buying block. You start with seniors. You get that negotiation going, and it will make a big difference.

For people who believe in free markets and negotiation and competition, I don't know how you can say no to this proposal. It is time to allow this to be debated to move forward with this bill. Let's get it on the floor and call it up for a vote.

Thank you, Senator SANDERS.

Mr. SANDERS. Senator KLOBUCHAR said it all. I know we are spending the week dealing with Assistant Secretaries or something or another—and that is all terribly important—but the American people want us to start acting on their needs.

At the top of the list, as Senator KLOBUCHAR just said—and what she said about folks in Minnesota is exactly the same everywhere. You hear the same stories in Vermont. People die and get sick because they can't afford prescription drugs.

I say to my Republican friend, the time is now to have that debate. You

want to vote against this bill? Hey, that is your right. You go home and explain it to the people. That is what democracy is. Some of us still believe in democracy, by the way.

Madam President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined today by the majority leader, following consultation of the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 3615, which was introduced earlier today; that there be 2 hours for debate, equally divided; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill without intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Madam President, our Nation's seniors deserve meaningful solutions that increase prescription drug access and affordability.

This bill, unfortunately, would double down on the deepest flaws in our current healthcare system and usher in a host of new problems from fewer treatments to more bureaucracy. And, yes, it is almost certain under this legislation we would see launch prices for new drugs actually increase. The solution is not to go and double down on a failed socialist theory of price-fixing and work to make our market better.

Even setting aside the overwhelming implementation challenges and technical issues that this legislation would present from the outset, the provisions included would do far more harm than good, particularly for the very older Americans they are intended to help.

I would note from the outset there is talk about wanting to have process and a vote. This legislation was just introduced today. It just got a bill number today. There has been no vetting of this legislation in the committee, which is the regular order of this Senate. There has been no public analysis. There has been no public review. There has not been any hearing on this legislation. There has been not any negotiation on this legislation.

I heard numbers thrown out here about what a savings this would be. CBO has not scored this legislation, and there are serious flaws with it.

Under this proposal, we would see a staggering decline in the game-changing research and development that our universities, medical centers, and entrepreneurs conduct every day, as vital investments in the cures of the future would decline.

As countless studies of price control mandates like the one before us today have concluded, these policies would slash new drug discoveries in the years to come, jeopardizing some of the highest risk projects, in particular.

Potential treatments targeted at conditions affecting seniors at high

rates, like certain cancers, would likely suffer the greatest impact, as Medicare would become increasingly stagnant and unable to meet the evolving needs of rapidly aging populations.

After coming in under budget with satisfaction rates soaring and premiums remaining remarkably stable, Medicare Part D would lose the market-driven structure that has made it such a success story for so many seniors. Instead, we would move closer to a government-run healthcare system—which is the ideal and the goal—where bureaucratic price controls like these would become the norm.

The vast majority of Americans, in my opinion, still reject the notion of a government-run healthcare system and price controls in place of a free market.

Meanwhile, our frontline healthcare providers have weathered a truly unprecedented 2 years of pandemic, and they would face a sweeping, immediate, and drastic payment cut as this legislation aims to advance immediate payment reductions under Medicare Part B with direct implications for doctors and other healthcare professionals across all settings.

In the face of widespread provider burnout, retirements, closures, and consolidation, these cuts risk accelerating trends that already jeopardize access to healthcare for far too many Americans from all walks of life, particularly in rural and underserved communities.

The VA, which has been referenced here, for its part, would inevitably see higher healthcare costs as any discounts or other price concessions that lower drug costs for our Nation's veterans would disappear.

Previous payment systems along these lines that have been suggested in the past have resulted in a host of unintended consequences, from higher launch prices to withheld rebates and discounts.

Our veterans do not stand to gain from being tied to this unvetted and failed new proposal.

As we confront unprecedented challenges at home and abroad, we must look to consensus-driven solutions that meet Americans' everyday needs, including prescription drug access and affordability. We can agree on that.

Members across the political spectrum have developed bipartisan drug pricing policies that could make a meaningful difference for workers and families. I have introduced legislation which is waiting in the committee for a vetting rather than coming to the floor here to try to get it brought to the floor without even going through Senate regular order.

My legislation is called the Lower Cost, More Cures Act. Here is just a quick summary of what it contains: a hard cap on annual out-of-pocket spending for all seniors under Medicare Part B, with an installment-based monthly payment option; reforming of Medicare Part B benefits to reduce sen-

iors' cost-sharing burdens and incentivize plans to negotiate the best possible deal for enrollees; increasing Part D plan choices; increasing options; and reducing prices.

My bill does have an out-of-pocket monthly insulin cap at \$35. That, you might remember, is the insulin cap that President Trump put into place. That is the kind of approach we need to follow.

It also includes establishing a chief pharmaceutical negotiator to combat foreign freeloading and ensuring the best trade deals that achieve American success in dealing with these price discrepancies that are driven by terrible behavior from our counterparts in other parts of the global economy; strengthening our consumer-oriented oversight through our cost-comparison tools and price transparency measures and robust reporting requirements in the drug supply chain; facilitating value-based arrangements where private and public sector payers can pay based on patient outcomes, driving better results for patients; and restructuring payments for drugs administered in the doctor's office or hospital outpatient department to encourage physicians to deliver cost-effective treatment options where appropriate clinically.

My point is, there are a lot of solutions that can work within the consistent free market and private sector solutions that we have solved here and are working on to make them better.

We have an opportunity to lower prescription drug costs without threatening access to therapies or cures or the future handling of giving an advantage, frankly, to our global rivals like the Chinese. With a bipartisan and bicameral effort undertaken through regular order, we could make a major impact on these issues. This legislation, unfortunately, does no such thing. It is thoroughly unvetted, showing no signs of technical assistance or practical feasibility. It has not, as I said, received a CBO score or even an informal analysis or a committee hearing. It did not advance through regular process in the Senate.

I see that our time is running out, and so I will end my comments at this point but just ask my colleagues to let us engage in regular order in the Finance Committee in the Senate and work these issues through. There are a lot of ideas on the table. Let's work them through rather than try to cram through one side's idea on the very day the bill was introduced in the Senate. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The objection is heard.

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I say to my friend from Idaho, we have been going through regular order dealing with prescription drugs for 40 years. It hasn't quite worked.

Your bill has gone nowhere. My bill has gone nowhere. If you have got objections to what Senator KLOBUCHAR

and I are doing, let's debate them on the floor of the Senate.

We have heard all the talking points from you that the pharmaceutical industry wrote—I got that. They spend a lot of money writing these talking points. Let's have that debate right here. The bill that Senator KLOBUCHAR and I are proposing is supported by over 80 percent of the American people and, I dare say, a vast majority of the people of Idaho. You want to oppose it. Go for it.

Let's have the damn debate right here on the floor, and if it takes 1 week, great. If it takes 2 weeks, great. You will agree with me that this is an issue that the American people care about so I would hope that you would reconsider. Let's bring it to the floor. Offer your amendments. Let's have the debate.

NOMINATION OF LEONARD PHILIP STARK

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week, the Senate will vote to confirm Judge Leonard Stark to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

Judge Stark is an exceptional and experienced jurist. For the past 14 years, he has served the District of Delaware—first, as a magistrate judge and, since 2010, as a district court judge.

He has presided over 6,000 civil and criminal cases, including 2,400 patent matters and 63 patent trials.

This experience will be of particular importance on the Federal Circuit for two reasons. First, unlike the 12 other courts of appeals, the Federal Circuit has a specialized jurisdiction; it hears all of the Nation's patent appeals. Second, Judge Stark would replace the only active judge on the court who has previously served as a trial judge. This makes his extensive background as a trial judge especially valuable.

Judge Stark brings with him considerable experience serving on Federal appeals panels. He has sat, by designation, on the Third and Federal Circuits, where he heard 54 appeals and authored 11 unanimous opinions. Before joining the bench, Judge Stark served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney for the District of Delaware for 4 years. He worked as a litigation associate at an international law firm. And he clerked on the Third Circuit.

Judge Stark earned his bachelor of arts, bachelor of science, and master of arts simultaneously at the University of Delaware. He was awarded the prestigious Rhodes Scholarship and received a doctorate in philosophy from the University of Oxford. He also holds a J.D. from Yale Law School. With such impressive credentials, it is clear why the American Bar Association rated Judge Stark unanimously as "Well Qualified" to sit on the Federal Circuit.

His expertise in adjudicating patents combined with his experience hearing appeals will be an asset to the Federal Circuit and to our industrious, inventive Nation. I will be voting for Judge Stark's confirmation, and I urge my colleagues to join me.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alexandra Baker, of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of Defense.

VOTE ON BAKER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Baker 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 75, nays 21, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 47 Ex.]

YEAS—75

Baldwin	Hassan	Portman
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Risch
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Hoeven	Sanders
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Burr	Inhofe	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Capito	Kelly	Shaheen
Cardin	Kennedy	Shelby
Carper	King	Sinema
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Leahy	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Sullivan
Cornyn	Manchin	Tester
Cortez Masto	Markey	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	Menendez	Van Hollen
Daines	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wicker
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Grassley	Peters	Young

NAYS—21

Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Johnson	Rubio
Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Marshall	Toomey
Fischer	Moran	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—4

Barrasso	Luján
Ernst	Rounds

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, for the information of Members, we are going to have four more votes tonight. I urge Members to sit in their seats so

we can get these done quickly, like we did last week.

I ask unanimous consent that the votes be 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Reta Jo Lewis, of Georgia, to be President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States for a term expiring January 20, 2025.

VOTE ON LEWIS NOMINATION

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

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 48 Ex.]

YEAS—56

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

NAYS—40

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

NOT VOTING—4

Barrasso	Luján
Blunt	Rounds

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on confirmation of the Stark and MacBride nominations.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Leonard Philip Stark, of Delaware, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Federal Circuit.

VOTE ON STARK NOMINATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Stark nomination?

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient question?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 49 Ex.]

YEAS—61

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

NAYS—35

Blackburn	Cruz	Hyde-Smith
Boozman	Daines	Inhofe
Braun	Ernst	Johnson
Cassidy	Fischer	Lankford
Cotton	Hagerty	Lee
Cramer	Hawley	Lummis
Crapo	Hoeven	Marshall

McConnell	Sasse	Thune
Moran	Scott (FL)	Tuberville
Paul	Scott (SC)	Wicker
Risch	Shelby	Young
Rubio	Sullivan	

NOT VOTING—4

Barrasso	Luján
Blunt	Rounds

The nomination was confirmed.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

VOTE ON MACBRIDE NOMINATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the MacBride nomination?

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The result was announced—yeas 61, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 50 Ex.]

YEAS—61

Bennet	Graham	Risch
Blumenthal	Grassley	Romney
Booker	Hassan	Rosen
Brown	Hickenlooper	Sasse
Burr	Kaine	Schatz
Cantwell	Kelly	Schumer
Capito	Kennedy	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Cassidy	Manchin	Tester
Collins	McConnell	Thune
Coons	Menendez	Tillis
Cornyn	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warner
Crapo	Murray	Warnock
Daines	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Padilla	Wicker
Durbin	Peters	Portman
Feinstein	Portman	Wyden
Gillibrand	Reed	

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Hirono	Moran
Blackburn	Hoeven	Paul
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lankford	Shelby
Cruz	Lee	Sullivan
Ernst	Lummis	Toomey
Fischer	Markey	Tuberville
Hagerty	Marshall	Warren
Hawley	Merkley	Young

NOT VOTING—6

Barrasso	Heinrich	Rounds
Blunt	Luján	Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority leader.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate now vote on the motion to discharge the Bagenstos nomination, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the question is on the motion to discharge.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN), are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 51 Ex.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—5

Barrasso	Heinrich	Rounds
Blunt	Luján	

The motion was agreed to.

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

The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, upon the conclusion of morning business tomorrow, February 10, the Senate proceed to consideration of Calendar No. 264, H.R. 4445; that the time until 11 a.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that at 11 a.m. the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill without further intervening action or debate; further, that upon on disposition of H.R. 4445, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Vekich nomination and, at 11:45, the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination, and, if cloture is invoked, the Senate vote on confirmation of the Vekich nomination at 1:45 p.m.; finally, if any nominations are confirmed during Thursday's session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, had I been present, I would have voted no on the confirmation of Scott A. Nathan, of Massachusetts, to be Chief Executive Officer of the U.S. International Development Finance Corporation.

REMEMBERING DR. DON GURNETT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to recognize the life and memory of Dr. Donald Gurnett. Dr. Gurnett recently passed away following a lifetime of scientific curiosity and achievements. Dr. Gurnett studied, taught, and researched at the University of Iowa for more than 60 years.

His career was rooted in his childhood interest in flight, where he built rockets and model planes, which led to studying electrical engineering at the University of Iowa. During his studies, he had the opportunity to work and learn with Dr. James Van Allen, who helped launch the first U.S. satellite into space and established the field of magnetospheric space research. Dr.

Gurnett's success led to working on more than 30 spacecraft projects, including *Voyager 1* and 2 flights to the outer planets, the *Galileo* mission to Jupiter, and the *Cassini* mission to Saturn.

His legacy remains with the students he mentored by pushing them to take on important projects and work towards their own success. In 2019, I wrote about the importance of STEM education and the accomplishments by Drs. Van Allen and Gurnett. I think my words then still encompass the curiosity and passion that Dr. Gurnett carried with him throughout his life.

For the students across Iowa heading to class in the new school year, remember to dream big. Don't forget that a couple of farm boys from Mount Pleasant and Fairfax reached for the stars and wrote new chapters of space innovation and exploration. Their odyssey took them all over the world and their scientific quest took their research beyond the solar system to interstellar space.

TRIBUTE TO THERESE FRANCIS GILES

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Ms. Therese Giles, a devoted public servant who tirelessly served our Nation with distinction in the Department of the Navy for almost four decades. Therese recently retired on December 31, 2021, after a successful 37-year government civil service career as an honored and distinguished senior flight controls computer scientist.

Therese's remarkable career and her immeasurable contributions to our national security can be categorized by so many unbelievable "firsts" and by a lifetime of selfless service.

As a child, Therese was always intrigued with the next technological offering—from watching NASA put the first man on the Moon, to the advances in next generation communications, to the invention of the integrated core processor. Inspired by these "firsts," she pushed to be one of the firsts in her class, team, and field, carrying a life's dream of making a difference in the technical field where women were very scarce and disappointingly undervalued.

At a time when women weren't encouraged to pursue technical careers and weren't thought of as computer scientists, Therese pushed forward and persevered to achieve undergraduate and advanced degrees in mathematics and computer science.

Wanting to be part of something bigger than herself, Therese found her calling with the Navy's aviation research and development command. As a junior software computer scientist in the mid-1980s, she was instrumental in developing the innovative, first-ever, advanced digital flight controls architecture that revolutionized the way all Navy and Marine Corps jet aircraft operated.

Therese was also instrumental in resolving the catastrophic failures of the V-22 Osprey in the early 1990s and gen-

erating the software solutions that eventually returned the V-22 to flight and to the successful combat operations of today.

With similar accomplishments across the F-14, A-6, F-18, E-2, and the F-35 spectrum of aircraft, Therese directly contributed and helped develop the flight control and safety control systems of the majority of every naval aircraft from 1985 to current day.

Throughout these many successes and "firsts," Therese has remained committed to supporting and inspiring the next generation of young women in STEM fields. Serving as an avid mentor, teacher, and leader of the people around her, Therese has been a North Star role model for generations of up-and-coming young women to follow their dreams and become technical leaders in public service.

In addition to her thirst for discovery and problem solving, a primary reason for Therese's tenacious focus is that she had personal "skin in the game" when it came to our Nation's security. Four of Therese's siblings proudly served in our Nation's military: Therese's brothers VADM Mat Winter, USN; CDR Tom Winter, USN; Capt. Steve Winter, USMC; and sister CDR Elizabeth Winter Scruggs, USNR, all put their lives in harm's way during their military careers to ensure our Nation's security. Therese's husband, Tim, is himself a retired member of the government civil service and an Army veteran. This is a family where duty and service run deep.

Therese, as you and your family celebrate your well-deserved retirement, I congratulate you and thank you for almost four decades of unbelievable and lasting impact. I thank you for the many years of sacrifice you and your family have made in service to our Nation. I join my colleagues in the Senate and all Americans in expressing our sincere appreciation and wish the very best for you, your husband, your son Eric, and daughter Meghan on your next exciting chapter.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO GLORIA BLICK

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, today I rise to recognize Mrs. Gloria Miller Blick, a Connecticut resident who turns 100 on March 1, 2022.

Mrs. Blick is a lifelong advocate for the elderly, who has worked tirelessly to inspire positive change.

She was appointed to the Commission for the Aged by then-mayor of Stamford, Dannel Malloy. Mrs. Blick was also active as a member of Stamford's Smith House Nursing and Rehabilitation Center's board of directors and Southwest CT Agency on Aging's advisory board. Later, she served 8 years as the chairwoman of Stamford's Senior Centers board of directors.

Mrs. Blick's advocacy had far-reaching results. Passionate about providing

end-of-life options and other choices for the elderly, she spoke before the Connecticut State Senate. Her statement took prominence in the State's discussion regarding access to medical marijuana for elderly people with glaucoma, a condition she has faced for nearly two decades. Her commitment to supporting those who are marginalized and underserved inspired her son, Dr. Gary Blick, to pursue a medical career and a lifetime of humanitarian work. She even worked as the office manager for his practice for over 20 years and his billing specialist for over 30, commuting independently at age 97.

A remarkable advocate, I applaud Mrs. Blick on her outstanding record of service. I hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating Mrs. Gloria Blick, her son Gary, and the rest of her family on this milestone of her 100th birthday.●

REMEMBERING HENRY C. "HOPPY" SHORES

• Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of a dedicated public servant, Army veteran, proud West Virginian, and my very good friend, Henry C. "Hoppy" Shores.

Put simply, Hoppy embodied what it means to be a true West Virginian, and the legacy he has left behind is an important part of our heritage. I believe that there is no greater accomplishment than being in a position to give back to your community, and Hoppy's work in public service truly benefited our home State in a profound way that touched countless lives. First Lady Eleanor Roosevelt once said, "Since you get more joy out of giving joy to others, you should put a good deal of thought into the happiness that you are able to give." In that spirit, I am forever grateful to Hoppy for his commitment to his community and our shared passion for serving the people of West Virginia.

Born in Dunbar in 1930 to the late Henry Eugene and Mary Elizabeth Shores, Hoppy spent much of his life in the Kanawha Valley. He excelled in athletics as a legendary running back for Stonewall Jackson High School. As the star of his 1947 State championship team, Hoppy capped off his high school career as a Kennedy Award winner. In addition, he held a longstanding record in the 440-yard dash and was elected class president his senior year. Even then, his leadership skills were widely recognized. Following his glowing high school career, Hoppy attended West Virginia University on the Loyalty Endowment Scholarship, where his wide range of accomplishments continued.

Hoppy's life of service began in the U.S. Army, where he rose to the rank of major. I have always said that West Virginia is home to the most patriotic, hard-working people in the Nation; and Hoppy was no exception. Returning to Kanawha County after his military

service to our Nation concluded, Hoppy continued giving back as a coach and supporter of one of the local Little League football teams. Hoppy was well-known as a tenacious supporter of youth sports in the Kanawha Valley and, for many years, would continue to support the youth of the valley in a variety of initiatives. Good coaches win games, but great coaches, like Hoppy, have a lasting impact on your life. They are models for how to manage success and failure—and how to take the lessons you have learned in athletics and apply them to your adult life. I can only begin to imagine how many leaders Hoppy forged throughout his time as a coach—and how many of his former athletes still look up to him to this day.

Hoppy and his beloved wife Bronson, who shared his life for 68 years, raised their four children in Charleston. Despite his illustrious life filled with awards, accolades and achievements, Hoppy always considered his family his greatest accomplishment of all. He built a successful career in insurance; eventually, this career would culminate in the Hoppy Shores Insurance Company. His impeccable work ethic was well-known, and all those he worked with considered him an honest, fair, and kind soul.

As a successful businessman, family man, and youth sports supporter, Hoppy extended his civic engagement to elected positions. Hoppy dedicated 42 years to the Kanawha County Commission where he will be remembered for his staunch commitment to Yeager Airport and the Kanawha County Parks and Recreation board. He loved “Hoppy’s Little Express Train” and his big smile atop the engine brought joy to each and every onlooker he rode past. As the longest serving Kanawha County commissioner in history, with an unmatched record of public service, the commission courtroom was named “The Henry C. ‘Hoppy’ Shores Courtroom” in his honor. I believe this outstanding tribute is a testament to his dedication to the citizens of Kanawha County. In addition to his 42 years on the Kanawha County Commission, Hoppy added 4 years of service in the West Virginia Legislature, where he will be remembered as a tenacious advocate for his neighbors in the Valley.

Everything Hoppy stood for and represented lives on in the hearts and minds of all who had the privilege of knowing him, myself included. I was honored to call him a friend, and I know I join so many when I say West Virginia has lost a shining star. Hundreds of tributes have poured in about our friend Hoppy since his passing, but there is one tribute that I think best shows who he was. Soccer was an emerging sport in the State, and Kanawha County was deliberating building a major soccer complex. The idea was hitting resistance, and it became the subject of a county commission meeting. During the public meeting, a young girl made a presentation

about the importance of soccer in her life. Some opponents of the project began heckling the brave young girl. It is reported that the lack of decorum and bullying displayed by those opponents angered Hoppy so much that he looked at fellow County Commissioners Kent Carper and Ben Salango and said, “Let’s just do it.” And that is how the Shawnee Sports Complex came to be. I know that every time I visit Shawnee, I will think of Hoppy siding with that brave little girl and smile.

So many people have inspirational stories about Hoppy. It is my hope that his many friends and family have found peace, strength, and support in one another and in the support of our entire home State for our shared loss of this wonderful person. He will be dearly missed by all who knew him.

What is most important is that he lived a full life, surrounded by the people he loved most. Gayle and I offer our deepest condolences to Hoppy’s wife of 68 years, Bronson; and their children, Henry, Sherry, Scott, and Lynn; his many friends; and extended family. We will forever keep Hoppy and his family in our thoughts and prayers.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CON PAULOS CHEVROLET

● Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator MIKE CRAPO and Representative MIKE SIMPSON, I rise to congratulate the Paulos Family on their 100th anniversary of having a Chevrolet Franchise continuously in operation.

On February 22, 1922, Con Paulos’ grandfather, Gus A. Paulos, opened a Chevrolet franchise in Magna, UT. After Gus was killed in an automobile accident, his sons carried on the family business for 42 years in Utah. In 1975, Pete G. Paulos and Ernest A. Paulos, along with their sons Con P. Paulos and Gus E. Paulos, moved the store from Magna to West Valley City, UT. In 1979, Con P. Paulos moved to Jerome, ID, and opened Con Paulos Chevrolet, which is the only Paulos family-owned store that continues to operate.

With the help of his outstanding staff, Con has built his business reputation on providing quality automobiles to his loyal customers honestly and ethically. Con has not only created a successful business, he has also become an important part of the Magic Valley region and the State through his community leadership. He is committed to growing, improving, and developing the local economy, while furthering opportunities for fellow Idahoans. For years, Con has participated in many community service projects and organizations: 60 Hours to Fight Hunger, Santa’s Cause, Sleep in Heavenly Peace, Sub for Santa, Boys & Girls Club, Rising Stars, Valley House, Business Plus, Chamber of Commerce, the Greater Twin Falls Area Transportation Committee, and the Rotary Club, to name just a few.

In our tenure serving Idaho in the statehouse and in Congress, we have

had the opportunity to work with Con on many important State and national issues. He is someone we trust to provide valuable insight and advice on many subjects. In addition, we have had the pleasure of recreating with Con in various settings, including a duck blind in Hagerman and on the links of Blue Lakes Country Club. Con is a straight shooter in the field, on the golf course, in his business, family, community, and his life.

Today, the fourth generation of the Paulos family, Peter “Costa” Paulos, is actively helping Con operate the dealership, continuing the family’s legacy. Costa also recently added a new member to the Paulos family with the birth of Gus, Con’s new grandson. Fore-shadowing the future, Baby Gus could possibly keep the Paulos family Chevrolet line intact for a remarkable fifth generation.

Congratulations to Con, his family, and all the employees of Con Paulos Chevrolet on 100 years of outstanding service to Magic Valley, ID and the Nation. You make our great State proud, and we look forward to your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:22 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 566. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 42 Main Street in Slatersville, Rhode Island, as the “Specialist Matthew R. Turcotte Post Office”.

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

H.R. 735. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 502 East Cotati Avenue in Cotati, California, as the “Arturo L. Ibleto Post Office Building”.

H.R. 2324. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2800 South Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the “D. Edwina Stephens Post Office”.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President.

At 12:49 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3485. An act to impose sanctions on foreign persons responsible for violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex (LGBTQI) individuals, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3539. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 223 West Chalan Santo Papa in Hagatna,

Guam, as the “Atanasio Taitano Perez Post Office”.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 735. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 502 East Cotati Avenue in Cotati, California, as the “Arturo L. Ibleto Post Office Building”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 2324. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2800 South Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the “D. Edwina Stephens Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 3485. An act to impose sanctions on foreign persons responsible for violations of internationally recognized human rights against lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer and intersex (LGBTQI) individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 3539. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 223 West Chalan Santo Papa in Hagatna, Guam, as the “Atanasio Taitano Perez Post Office”; 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. 3600. A bill to improve the cybersecurity of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3076. An act to provide stability to and enhance the services of the United States Postal Service, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6617. An act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 3623. A bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

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

Special Report entitled “National Suicide Hotline Designation Act of 2019” (Rept. No. 117-69).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Nani A. Coloretto, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

*Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

*Dimitri Kusnezov, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary for Science and Technology, Department of Homeland Security.

By Mr. SANDERS for the Committee on the Budget.

*Nani A. Coloretto, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

*Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

*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. COTTON:

S. 3604. A bill to prohibit Federal funds from being made available to any preschool, kindergarten, elementary school, or secondary school that has a facemask mandate; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. SMITH):

S. 3605. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide formula grants to States to improve higher education opportunities for foster youth and homeless youth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 3606. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to eliminate the requirement to specify an effective period of transfer of Post-9/11 educational assistance to a dependent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. REED, and Mr. GRAHAM):

S. 3607. A bill to award a Congressional gold medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

S. 3608. A bill to require the Federal Trade Commission to identify content-agnostic platform interventions to reduce the harm of algorithmic amplification and social media addiction on covered platforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. WARNOCK, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 3609. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a gasoline tax holiday; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 3610. A bill to establish a program to provide environmental assistance in the Chattahoochee River Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 3611. A bill to provide for improvements in the reimbursement of eligible health care providers through the Provider Relief Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND:

S. 3612. A bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 and the STOCK Act to require certain senior officials to report payments received from the Federal Government, to improve the filing and disclosure of financial disclosures by Members of Congress, congressional staff, very senior employees, and others, and to ban stock trading for certain senior Government officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 3613. A bill to prohibit the housing of chimpanzees at installations of the Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 3614. A bill to prohibit the importation of seafood and seafood products from the Russian Federation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 3615. A bill to establish a cap on costs for covered prescription drugs under Medicare parts B and D; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 3616. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the financial aid process for homeless and foster care youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

S. 3617. A bill to amend the Office of National Drug Control Policy Reauthorization Act of 2006 to modify the authority of the Office of National Drug Control Policy and the United States Anti-Doping Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 3618. A bill to amend the Federal Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2015 to require Federal agencies to obtain exemptions from certain cybersecurity requirements in order to avoid compliance with those requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 3619. A bill for the relief of Vichai Sae Tung (also known as Chai Chaowasaree); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 3620. A bill to establish the Commission for the Comprehensive Study of Health Data Use and Privacy Protection; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3621. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish a National Climate Adaptation Science Center and Regional Climate Adaptation Science Centers to respond to the effects of extreme weather events and climate trends, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3622. A bill to establish an AmeriCorps Administration to carry out the national and volunteer service programs, to expand participation in such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. BURR):

S. 3623. A bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes; read the first time.

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 and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. Res. 508. A resolution honoring the memories of the victims of the senseless attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14, 2018; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. Res. 509. A resolution honoring Thomas Edward Patrick Brady, Jr., the 7-time Super Bowl champion who played for the New England Patriots for 20 incredible seasons, and briefly the Tampa Bay Buccaneers for 2 seasons, for a combined 22 seasons in the National Football League; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable tax credit against income tax for the purchase of qualified access technology for the blind.

S. 657

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 657, a bill to modify the presumption of service connection for veterans who were exposed to herbicide agents while serving in the Armed Forces in Thailand during the Vietnam era, and for other purposes.

S. 819

At the request of Ms. ERNST, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 819, a bill to enhance the security of the United States and its allies, and for other purposes.

S. 1125

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, a bill to recommend that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation test the effect of a dementia care management model, and for other purposes.

S. 1289

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1289, a bill to amend the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 to re-

authorize and modify the John H. Prescott Marine Mammal Rescue Assistance Grant Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1408

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 1408, a bill to posthumously award the Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to Glen Doherty, Tyrone Woods, J. Christopher Stevens, and Sean Smith, in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 1486

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 1486, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 2342

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 2342, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration of disputes involving sexual assault and sexual harassment.

S. 2736

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2736, a bill to exclude vehicles to be used solely for competition from certain provisions of the Clean Air Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3017

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) 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. 3052

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3052, a bill to promote free and fair elections, democracy, political freedoms, and human rights in Cambodia, and for other purposes.

S. 3481

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3481, a bill to secure the dignity and safety of incarcerated women.

S. 3487

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3487, a bill to amend title 5,

United States Code, to increase death gratuities and funeral allowances for Federal employees, and for other purposes.

S. 3494

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3494, a bill to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require Members of Congress and their spouses and dependents to place certain assets into blind trusts, and for other purposes.

S. 3514

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3514, a bill to repeal COVID-19 vaccination requirements imposed by the District of Columbia.

S. 3522

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3522, a bill to provide enhanced authority for the President to enter into agreements with the Government of Ukraine to lend or lease defense articles to that Government to protect civilian populations in Ukraine from Russian military invasion, and for other purposes.

S. 3532

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3532, a bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to Ansarallah and its officials, agents, or affiliates for acts of international terrorism.

S. 3542

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3542, a bill to prevent the misuse of drones, and for other purposes.

S. 3546

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3546, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made to reporting of third party network transactions by the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.

S. 3599

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of Florida, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3599, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from requiring taxpayers to provide biometric information.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3621. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish

a National Climate Adaptation Science Center and Regional Climate Adaptation Science Centers to respond to the effects of extreme weather events and climate trends, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Climate Adaptation Science Center Act, or CASC Act. This bill authorizes the national and nine regional CASCs that came about after Congress appropriated funding for a National Climate Science Center in 2008 and subsequently, in 2009, Department of the Interior Secretary Salazar recognized the Department as the lead Agency for protecting the country's cultural and natural resources via secretarial order.

The national and regional CASCs are housed within the U.S. Geological Survey, USGS. The national CASC is located in Reston, VA, and the nine regional CASCs are dispersed throughout the country from Hawaii, to Alaska to Massachusetts. These regional CASCs service stakeholders in the continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska, U.S.-affiliated Pacific Islands, USAPI, and the U.S. Caribbean. The purpose of these CASCs is to help protect cultural and natural resources by developing the science and tools that on-the-ground managers need to respond to the effects of climate change.

One regional CASC, the Pacific Island CASC, or PI-CASC, is a partnership between the USGS and a university consortium hosted by the University of Hawaii at Manoa, with the University of Hawaii at Hilo and the University of Guam. PI-CASC was established in October 2011 and over the course of more than a decade has conducted important climate research informed by impacted stakeholders, developed products and tools for resource managers to address climate change, and provided programs to increase capacity and stakeholder networking.

Over 100 research projects have been completed to address stakeholder needs across the Hawaiian Islands and USAPI, such as prioritization planning for coastal wetland restoration on Molokai, developing a climate and GIS data portal for American Samoa, and predicting and mitigating avian disease at Hakalau Forest National Wildlife Refuge on Hawaii Island. Over a dozen different products and tools have been developed by PI-CASC, including sea level forecasting tools for communities throughout the Pacific, a database on weed fire risk throughout Hawaii, and an agroforestry tool for Marshallese agricultural producers. Programs that have been made possible by the PI-CASC include a Manager Climate Corps on Hawaii Island, a Summer Undergraduate Research Fellowship, and a Pacific Regional Invasive Species & Climate Change Management Program.

These are just examples of research, products, and programs made possible by one regional CASC. The nine re-

gional CASCs are providing similar services all across the country. Currently, stakeholder demand for CASC system services outpaces available resources. Additionally, in the coming years and decades, the challenges that on-the-ground resource managers face with climate change are only going to become more numerous and complex. As such, this bill is necessary to formally establish the CASCs in law so that the important work that the national and nine regional CASCs conduct can continue assisting stakeholders all across the country for decades to come.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. COONS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3622. A bill to establish an AmeriCorps Administration to carry out the national and volunteer service programs, to expand participation in such programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, service is at the heart of the Americans ethos. We take inspiration from those who have answered the call to serve, whether in defense of our Nation abroad or in strengthening our communities at home. Finding common cause through service is how we will overcome the major challenges of our time, from recovering from the COVID-19 pandemic to addressing inequality to strengthening civil society and democratic institutions to leaving a healthy, resilient planet to future generations. That is why I am proud to join Congressman JOHN LARSON of Connecticut in introducing the America's Call to Improving Opportunities Now, ACTION for National Service Act. Our legislation calls for a historic expansion of the number of service opportunities and an increased investment in those who serve.

The ACTION for National Service Act will honor our national value of service, while addressing the barriers that limit citizens' opportunities to serve. Our legislation will set us on a path to 1 million national service positions within 10 years. It will increase the educational award so that an individual completing 2 full years of service will earn the equivalent of 4 years of the average in-state tuition at a public college or university. Indeed, those who are willing to serve should not be left to carry a heavy financial burden of student loan debt. The ACTION for National Service Act will also ease other financial barriers to service by increasing the living allowance and eliminating the tax liability for the education awards and living stipends. The bill calls for a robust outreach effort to ensure that all young people will know about the many opportunities to serve their country and their communities. It will mobilize a Civilian Climate Corps to address the urgent needs of hardest hit communities.

Finally, the ACTION for National Service Act calls for elevating the Corporation for National and Community Service to a Cabinet-level Agency and establishes a National Service Foundation to leverage private sector resources to support national service activities.

Mr. President, it is time we reinvigorate the social contract we have with each other. Americans have a deep tradition of service, starting with the dedicated men and women of our Armed Forces and including all those who have served in AmeriCorps, Senior Corps, and the Peace Corps. However, as more Americans desire to serve, it is important that they be given the opportunity to do so. It is just as important to invest in the education and professional development of those who have sacrificed and given so much to our Nation. Developing the talents of our most committed citizens pays lifelong dividends. Our investment in the GI Bill not only honors our servicemembers but also enriches our Nation. Similarly, the education awards for those who have served through our national programs have economic impacts beyond the individuals who earn them. That is the new deal that the ACTION for National Service Act offers.

All AmeriCorps members take a pledge to get things done for Americans, to make communities safer, smarter and healthier, and to bring us together. It is a pledge we all should commit ourselves to.

I would like to thank Senators COONS, BALDWIN, BROWN, BLUMENTHAL, GILLIBRAND, and KLOBUCHAR for joining me as original cosponsors of the ACTION for National Service Act and to urge our colleagues to join us in working for its passage so we can ensure that all who aspire to serve have the opportunity to do so.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. BURR):

S. 3623. A bill to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes; read the first time.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Violence Against Women Act Reauthorization Act of 2022.

This bipartisan bill would reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act through 2027 and provide important updates to modernize the law that has been critical to protecting and supporting the survivors of domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking.

I was proud to support the original Violence Against Women Act in 1994 and have supported each reauthorization of the law.

This includes the most recent reauthorization in 2013, which passed the Senate by a strong bipartisan vote of 78 to 22.

It is an honor to introduce this reauthorization and expansion of protections for survivors.

This bill is the result of a truly bipartisan effort. I would like to thank Senator ERNST, Senator DURBIN, and Senator MURKOWSKI for working with me to prepare this important piece of legislation.

We have also had help from a number of our Senate colleagues who have made important contributions to this effort. I am proud that this bill has received strong bipartisan support in the Senate.

I would also like to thank the many advocates who have lent their thoughts and support to this effort. This bill was written in close consultation with the people who are on the frontlines helping survivors of domestic violence every day. It is not a Democratic bill or a Republican bill—it is a bill for survivors.

Together, we drafted a bill that preserves the good work of the last Violence Against Women Act reauthorization and strengthens existing programs.

For nearly 30 years, the Violence Against Women Act has played a vital role in the Federal response to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking. I hope that this bill will be an effective tool to build upon those efforts.

Despite the progress made over the last three decades, sexual, emotional, and physical abuse are still painful realities for far too many Americans. More than one in three women experience rape, physical violence, or stalking by an intimate partner in their lifetime. Nationwide, an average of three women are killed each day by a current or former intimate partner.

According to the National Network to End Domestic Violence, in a single day in 2020, 76,525 domestic violence survivors received the resources they needed thanks to programs funded and supported by the Violence Against Women Act.

It is clear that the programs created by the Violence Against Women Act are necessary, and they need to be continually updated to meet the needs of survivors. The bipartisan bill that we are introducing today reauthorizes these important programs and provides the necessary updates to strengthen them.

This bill enhances and expands services for survivors of domestic violence, including survivors in rural communities, LGBT survivors, survivors with disabilities, and survivors who experience abuse later in life.

This bill reauthorizes and strengthens the criminal justice response to domestic violence, including by improving the Justice Department's STOP grant program; expanding support provided to survivors in the legal system;

and strengthening the ability of Tribal courts to address instances of domestic violence on Tribal lands.

This bill also invests in prevention education efforts, improves the healthcare system's response to sexual violence across the country, and establishes a pilot program on restorative practices that focuses on preventing or addressing domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking through community based, victim-initiated efforts to seek accountability.

I am pleased that we have strong bipartisan support for this bill, but our work is not done. The survivors—who this bill is for—need the Senate to not only introduce this bill but to pass it. The prevention of domestic violence and the support for survivors of these heinous crimes is not a partisan issue.

This is not a perfect bill. I regret that certain provisions were not able to be included in this bill, most notably the closure of the “boyfriend loophole” to ensure that individuals convicted of domestic abuse against a dating partner could not purchase firearms. Individuals convicted of domestic violence against a spouse are already prevented from purchasing a firearm, and it is deeply disappointing that there is not sufficient bipartisan support for this commonsense provision to close this loophole. I would have liked to include those additional provisions, as would many of my Senate colleagues. But though it is not perfect, it is a strong bill.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to advance this bill through the Senate and get it signed into law as soon as possible.

The time to act is now. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bipartisan legislation, and I hope that it will come to the floor for a vote quickly.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 508—HONORING THE MEMORIES OF THE VICTIMS OF THE SENSELESS ATTACK AT MARJORY STONEMAN DOUGLAS HIGH SCHOOL ON FEBRUARY 14, 2018

Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 508

Whereas, on February 14, 2018, a mass shooting that claimed the lives of 17 teachers and students took place at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School in Parkland, Florida;

Whereas the people of the United States continue to pray for the individuals who were affected by this tragedy;

Whereas the Parkland community has shown strength, compassion, and unity in the past 4 years; and

Whereas February 14, 2022, marks 4 years since the horrific attack: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the memories of the victims of the senseless attack at Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School on February 14, 2018, and offers heartfelt condolences and deepest sympathies to the families, loved ones, and friends of the victims;

(2) honors the survivors of the attack and pledges continued support for their recovery;

(3) recognizes the strength and resilience of the Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School community; and

(4) expresses gratitude to the emergency medical and health care professionals of the Parkland community for their efforts in responding to the attack and caring for the victims and survivors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 509—HONORING THOMAS EDWARD PATRICK BRADY, JR., THE 7-TIME SUPER BOWL CHAMPION WHO PLAYED FOR THE NEW ENGLAND PATRIOTS FOR 20 INCREDIBLE SEASONS, AND BRIEFLY THE TAMPA BAY BUCCANEERS FOR 2 SEASONS, FOR A COMBINED 22 SEASONS IN THE NATIONAL FOOTBALL LEAGUE

Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. REED, Mr. KING, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 509

Whereas Tom Brady, commonly known as “TB12” or “the GOAT”, was born in San Mateo, California, on August 3, 1977;

Whereas, after graduating from Junipero Serra High School, Tom Brady matriculated at the University of Michigan, where he led the Wolverines football team to wins in the Citrus and Orange Bowls;

Whereas Tom Brady was drafted in the sixth round of the 2000 National Football League (referred to in this preamble as the “NFL”) Draft with the 199th pick by the New England Patriots, a selection that many football analysts now regard as the best draft pick of all time;

Whereas Tom Brady was named the starting quarterback of the New England Patriots during the 2001 season and subsequently never had a losing season as a starting quarterback during his time in the NFL;

Whereas Tom Brady was instrumental in creating iconic moments in New England sports history, including—

(1) on January 19, 2002, leading the Patriots to a come-from-behind win in the American Football Conference Divisional playoffs against the Oakland Raiders during a blizzard in the last game ever played at Foxboro Stadium;

(2) on February 2, 2002, leading the New England Patriots to the franchise's first Super Bowl victory against the heavily favored St. Louis Rams;

(3) during the 2007 season, leading the New England Patriots with a record setting passing touchdown performance to a perfect 16-0 regular season; and

(4) on February 5, 2017, overcoming a 28-3 deficit against the Atlanta Falcons to win Super Bowl LI;

Whereas Tom Brady has won 7 Super Bowls, including 6 with the New England Patriots, and was a key member during the franchise's dynasty era, which spanned 2 decades;

Whereas Tom Brady has been—

- (1) selected 3 times as the NFL's Most Valuable Player;
- (2) selected 5 times as the Most Valuable Player of the Super Bowl;
- (3) selected 6 times as an All-Pro player;
- (4) selected to 15 Pro Bowls; and
- (5) a consistent NFL leader in passing touchdowns, passing yards, passer rating, and completion percentage;

Whereas Tom Brady holds numerous NFL records, including—

- (1) the most Super Bowl wins with 7;
- (2) the most Super Bowl appearances with 10;
- (3) the most career wins with 243;
- (4) the most career passing completions with 7,263;
- (5) the most career passing touchdowns with 624; and
- (6) the most career passing yards with 84,520;

Whereas Tom Brady taught all of New England that the most important championship ring was "the next one";

Whereas Tom Brady earned the love and admiration of New England sports fans everywhere and buoyed the spirits of children through his work with the Make-A-Wish Foundation and Best Buddies;

Whereas Tom Brady brought incredible joy to New England and all of Patriots Nation, who loved watching him play; and

Whereas Tom Brady played his final NFL game on January 23, 2022: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the legendary career of Thomas Edward Patrick Brady, Jr., whose leadership, tenacity, and hard work defined a generation for Patriots Nation and whose legacy will continue to live on for years to come; and

(2) wishes Tom Brady a fulfilling post-professional football career as he bids farewell to the gridiron.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have 12 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 AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 9, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

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, February 9, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

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, February 9, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the ses-

sion of the Senate on Wednesday, February 9, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a classified briefing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 9, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 9, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 9, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 9, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

The Subcommittee on Financial Institutions and Consumer Protection of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 9, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a 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, February 9, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NEAR EAST, SOUTH ASIA, CENTRAL ASIA AND COUNTERTERRORISM

The Subcommittee on Near East, South Asia, Central Asia, and Counterterrorism of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 9, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPACE AND SCIENCE

The Subcommittee on Space and Science of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, February 9, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, first, I would like to ask unanimous consent that my Defense fellow, Leslie Cornwell, be given floor privileges for the remainder of the 117th Congress.

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

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 3623

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3623) to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. I now ask for a second reading and, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will receive its second reading on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m. on Thursday, February 10; that following the prayer and the pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 264, H.R. 4445, as provided under the previous order.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. For the information of Senators, we expect to have one roll-call vote at 11:45 a.m. and one vote at 1:45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:56 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, February 10, 2022, at 10 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination pursuant to S. Res. 27 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

SAMUEL R. BAGENSTOS, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 9, 2022:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JOHN PATRICK COFFEY, OF NEW YORK, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY.

ALEXANDRA BAKER, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.

DOUGLAS R. BUSH, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE CORPORATION

SCOTT A. NATHAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCE CORPORATION.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY	THE JUDICIARY	EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES
NEIL HARVEY MACBRIDE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY.	LEONARD PHILIP STARK, OF DELAWARE, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.	RETA JO LEWIS, OF GEORGIA, TO BE PRESIDENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 20, 2025.