

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

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

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

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

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

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

On his first day in office—very first day in office—President Biden rescinded the declaration of a national emergency at our southern border. He halted construction of the border wall. And he revoked a Trump administration order that called for the government to faithfully execute our immigration laws—all on the first day.

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

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

And the President's anti-border security efforts didn't end there. The President has significantly limited the ability of Immigration and Customs Enforcement and Customs and Border Protection to enforce immigration

laws. Deportations dropped precipitously during fiscal year 2021, as did arrests in the interior of the country. And earlier this week, the administration rescinded a 2019 rule expanding expedited removal for individuals here illegally.

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

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

#### VOTE ON LUGER NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

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

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

[Rollcall Vote No. 107 Ex.]

#### YEAS—60

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

#### NAYS—36

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

#### NOT VOTING—4

Casey	Manchin
Cassidy	Shaheen

The nomination was confirmed.

(Mr. WARNOCK assumed the Chair.)

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

#### UKRAINE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Food stability is essential to political stability. We may recall that it was an increase in food prices that

sparked mass protests throughout the Arab world a decade ago.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNIZING WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY VIKINGS WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

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

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

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

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

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

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

H. R. 4521

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I know the American people get this in an intuitive fashion. The informa-

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

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, I think it is incred-

ibly important that we read bills before we vote on them, that we have adequate debate, and that we really understand what we are doing.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

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

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

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

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

Let me give you a little bit more history on this. The original Magnitsky bill was originally attached to the PNTR for Russia, and it was aimed solely at the tragic death of Sergei Magnitsky. We wanted to hold those responsible for his death accountable.

That is why the language the Senator is referring to was included in the original act. It was aimed at one episode and one set of abusers.

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

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

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

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

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

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

We would be taking a step back. It was just a few days ago that President Zelenskyy asked us to expand the individual sanctions, and that is what is on the floor right now in the majority

leader's request, so we can expand it, we can give him the tools he needs, so that we can respond and help the people of Ukraine. That is what is involved here.

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

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

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

I object to the request.

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

Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pass this bill. Pass it now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Trust the oil and gas companies, they say, and FOX News says, “Yes, trust the oil and gas industry,” but that ar-

gument is leakier than an old oil tanker, and it has been proven again and again.

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

So here are the facts:

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

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

Why is that?

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

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

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

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

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

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

Big Oil has kept up their export she-

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

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

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

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

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

Here are some more facts:

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

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

Here is another way to break it down:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

dug for ourselves and our dependence upon that region.

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

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

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 4521

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Senator from Vermont.

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator is recognized.

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

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

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

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

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

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

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

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

And, unbelievably, during this terrible pandemic—which has cost us almost 1 million lives—when thousands of essential workers died, they died because they had to go to their jobs, and going to their jobs, they contracted the virus. During that same period of time, the billionaire class became much,

much wealthier. In fact, over 700 billionaires in America became nearly \$2 trillion richer during the pandemic. In other words, for the people on top, the pandemic has been a very, very good time economically.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A word about the microchip industry. We are talking about an industry that

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I yield the floor.

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

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

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

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

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

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

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

#### NOMINATION OF ERIC M. GARCETTI

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

At the time, I instructed my staff to complete this investigation in no more

than 2 weeks, since it is not my intent to drag this out. My staff spoke with additional whistleblowers and subsequently made three separate requests to representatives of the mayor to send us the city's investigative report—on March 11, 18, and 21. The mayor's staff provided me with a copy of the report on March 21. However, we were just notified last night, March 23, that there was also an updated report, along with a summary that was completed several months after the original report that my office received on March 21.

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

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

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

[Prior Statement]

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

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

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

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

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

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