United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2022 No. 182

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 29, 2022, at 2 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 2022

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MAZIE K. HIRONO, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

God of might and miracles, You are our defense. You are our shelter and Savior. You give daily victories to those who trust You. Because of You, our Nation continues to be blessed.

We thank You for Your greatness and understanding. Thank You for Your kindness, for being slow to anger and full of constant love.

Lord, meet the needs of our Senators as they seek to serve humanity. Be near to them as they work, and guide their thoughts as they deliberate.

Show us Your compassion and hear our prayers. Protect all who love Your providential leading, and fill us with Your joy.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, November 28, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MAZIE K. HIRONO, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. HIRONO thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

RESPECT FOR MARRIAGE ACT—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 8404, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 8404) to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Schumer (for Baldwin) amendment No. 6487, in the nature of a substitute.

Schumer amendment No. 6488 (to amendment No. 6487), to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 6489 (to amendment No. 6488), to add an effective date.

Schumer motion to refer the bill to the Committee on the Judiciary, with instructions, Schumer amendment No. 6490, to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 6491 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 6490), to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 6492 (to amendment No. 6491), to add an effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

THANKSGIVING

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, let me welcome you and all of my colleagues back to the Senate. I hope everyone had a wonderful Thanksgiving surrounded by loved ones and a lot of good food.

For the Schumer household, the Thanksgiving holiday this year was a bittersweet occasion. It was 1 year ago this past week that we said goodbye to my father, Abe Schumer, after a very long and rich life. Not a day goes by that I don't miss him, and to celebrate my first Thanksgiving without him at the table is a reminder to never take the blessings of life for granted. But life goes on, the circles of life go on, and we also celebrated my 4-year-old grandson's birthday on the day before

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

Printed on recycled paper.

Thanksgiving as well. So the generations continue, but my father's memory is with us.

ANTI-SEMITISM

Madam President, now on anti-Semitism, before I begin the substance of my remarks on the floor, I want to say a few things about the disgusting news that came out of Mar-a-Lago over the Thanksgiving break.

Last week, it was reported that Donald Trump—the former President of the United States and Republican standard bearer—had dinner at Mar-a-Lago with a notorious bigot who fancies himself a leading thinker on the extreme edges of the hard right, embracing everything from White nationalism, to anti-Semitism, to outright Holocaust denial.

For a former President to sit down and have dinner with a high-profile anti-Semite is disgusting and dangerous. To give an anti-Semite even the smallest platform, much less an audience over dinner, is pure evil. Even assuming the former President didn't realize Mr. Fuentes was coming to Mar-a-Lago, for him to refuse to condemn Fuentes and his bigoted words after the dinner is appalling, and it is dangerous.

Now, I am glad that some of the former President's friends and allies, particularly those in the Jewish community, are pushing him to do the right thing by condemning this vicious anti-Semite since the former President does not seem to have the honor, the decency, the humanity to do it on his own.

I vociferously condemn the former President's decision to meet with this anti-Semite and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

H.R. 8404

Madam President, on respect for marriage, as the Senate gavels back into session for the final session of the 117th Congress, there is a lot we must do before the end of the calendar year. Many of these things will require Republican cooperation to get done.

First, the Senate begins this week by picking up where we left off on the Respect for Marriage Act. As a reminder, this Chamber voted 62 to 37 before Thanksgiving to move forward on this bill, with 12 Republicans in favor. The Senate is scheduled to hold the next procedural vote later this afternoon, and in the meantime, both sides are continuing working together on an agreement to move this bill quickly through the Chamber. I hope we can get it done with all due speed because millions of Americans deserve equal justice under the law and peace of mind, knowing their right to marry the person they love is protected.

Taking a step back, it is notable that the Senate is having this debate to begin with. A decade ago, it would have strained all our imaginations to envision both sides talking about protecting the rights of same-sex married couples. America does move forward, although sometimes in difficult ways. Sometimes it is two steps forward, one step back, but today is a big step forward.

We all know that, for all the progress we have made on same-sex marriage, the rights of all married couples will never truly be safe without the proper protections under Federal law, and that is why the Respect for Marriage Act is necessary.

As I have said many times, this legislation is deeply personal to many of us in this Chamber, myself included. Passing this bill is our chance to send a message to Americans everywhere: No matter who you are or whom you love, you, too, deserve dignity and equal treatment under the law. That is about as American an ideal as it comes, and so I hope the Senate can finish the work we have started and pass the Respect for Marriage Act as soon as possible.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Madam President, now on government funding, once the Senate passes Respect for Marriage, there is a lot on the to-do list that we must cross off before the end of the calendar year. Chief among them, of course, is working together to fund the government by December 16. Failure to act by then will result in a pointless and painful government shutdown right as the holiday season kicks into high gear.

The best option for avoiding a shutdown, of course, is for Republicans to work with us on an omnibus, ensuring the Federal Government is fully prepared to serve the public in the next fiscal year. A continuing resolution, on the other hand, is far less desirable for many reasons. A CR would cause grave harm to our troops in uniform at a time when national defense is critical. With Russian aggression in Europe and China's aggression in the Indo-Pacific, the last thing we can afford right now is to turn government funding into another political tit-for-tat. Government funding should rise above politics when the well-being of our troops and our national defense are on the line.

Just this morning, Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin wrote to congressional leaders explaining why a CR is the wrong solution for national defense. It will not only cost our military billions every month; it will also freeze new investments in critical military infrastructure. It will mean many staffing and personnel decisions will be put on hold.

When we see some of the advances some of our competitors—China and Russia—have made in military equipment, we can't afford to sit still. That is what a CR would do. We would just sit still as others gain on us. As China continues to dial up its saber-rattling over Taiwan, a CR will doom the Department of Defense's hopes of beginning new strategic initiatives in the Indo-Pacific region. To quote Secretary Austin, ''We can't outcompete China with our hands tied behind our back three, four, five or six months of every fiscal year.'' He is absolutely right. I hope my Republican colleagues are listening.

The best gift Congress can give our troops in uniform is certainty—certainty of resources, certainty of purpose, and certainty that Congress will act to give our military servicemembers the tools they need to keep us safe. The only way that will happen is by Congress working together to pass an omnibus bill in the coming weeks.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Madam President, now on the NDAA, as the U.S. Senate works on passing government funding, we must also work on a bipartisan basis to pass our national defense bill too. For more than six decades, Congress has faithfully passed the NDAA on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, and I expect this year will be no different. But today I want to highlight one of the many reasons that passing the NDAA is especially important: We need to stay tough on the Chinese Government and its actions.

Last month, I introduced an amendment to the NDAA with Senator CORNYN that will prohibit the U.S. Government from doing business with companies that rely on certain Chinese chipmakers that the Pentagon has labeled Chinese Government military contractors. National security leaders have weighed in in support of this amendment because they know it keeps our country safe.

To this day, many Chinese companies have well-known ties to the Chinese Communist Party and continue to sell microchips to U.S. businesses that have contracts with the Federal Government. That poses serious risks to Americans' privacy and national security.

The main idea here is simple: If American business wants the Federal Government to buy their products or services, they shouldn't be using the kinds of Chinese-made chips that, because of Chinese Government involvement, put our national security at risk. We need our government and our economy to rely on chips made right here in America—something my amendment, along with Senator CORNYN, would encourage.

Many on both sides rightfully like to talk about staying tough on the Chinese Government. Our amendment would do just that. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and urge all of us to work quickly to pass the NDAA when the time comes next month.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

INFLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, last week, our Nation celebrated one of our great, distinctly American holidays. In President Reagan's Thanksgiving proclamation in 1982, he wrote eloquently of the ''divine plan [that] placed this great continent here between the oceans to be found by people from every corner of the Earth who had a special love of faith and freedom.''

On Thursday, millions of families sat down to catch up with loved ones, enjoy food and fellowship, and reflect on the incredible blessing it is to get to call the United States of America our home, and we kept in our prayers the many brave servicemembers and first responders who were missing at their own families' holiday tables this year in order to keep the rest of us safe and protected at ours.

This year, for too many families, Thanksgiving also brought added stress and anxiety: 2 years of ruinous inflation that have pushed up the costs of everything from food to travel, to housing, to home heating and electricity.

In January 2021, with inflation well within a normal range, President Biden and this all-Democratic Party government took power, talking a big game about ''rebuild[ing] the middle class.'' Instead, they promptly set out eroding away the ground from right underneath middle-class families' feet, taking a match to trillions of dollars and igniting the worst inflation in 40 years.

On President Biden's watch, the average American household is paying an extra $110 a month on food, an extra $111 on housing, $270 more on transportation, and $147 more on energy. That is more than $750 in hidden Democratic inflation taxes for the average household—thousands of extra dollars per family, per year, because Washington Democrats jumped headlong into party-line reckless spending that every expert and every Republican warned would hurt our country.

All in all, prices have soared by 13.9 percent since President Biden put his hand on the Bible. Thanks to his party's reckless spending, inflation is the highest it has been since the fallout of the Carter administration.

So it is no wonder this was a painfully costly Thanksgiving. Staples from turkey to potatoes, to green beans have seen double-digit price increases in just the past year—inflation literally on top of inflation.

This runaway inflation has been hitting families hard everywhere. In the State of Georgia, for example, local food assistance organizations reported skyrocketing demand heading into the holidays. The CEO of the Atlanta Community Food Bank said: ''We're basically back to the same level of demand we were at during the height''—the height—''of the pandemic.''

There is a charitable organization saying that Democrats' party-line policies have created an economic environment that is on par with the worst of the COVID shutdown.

On the Democrats' watch, rising housing costs in Georgia outpaced the already big jump in the nationwide average. One relief agency says requests for emergency rent, utility, and food assistance have jumped 40 percent this year.

Two years of one-party Democratic control in Washington have been a disaster for working families in Georgia, and their two Senators haven't just failed to stop the damage. They have helped cause it and cheered it on.

Georgia's Senate delegation of two Democratic Senators has been a lockstep rubberstamp along party lines for every bit of reckless liberal spending and painful tax hikes. Just when working families in Georgia needed checks and balances, what they got were reckless rubberstamps.

Earlier this month, after the American people voted to break up Democrats' one-party government, President Biden insisted defiantly: ''I'm not going to change the direction.''

It has been 2 years since the Senate Democratic leader said that if he got Georgia's two Senate seats, he would change America. Well, they certainly have done that. On party lines, Democrats' squandered a promising economic comeback and spent us into staggering inflation. And now President Biden says he has learned nothing and will change nothing.

The Democrats have shown the American people what they will do with power. But in the United States of America, the power ultimately lies with the people, and in a little over a week, the people of Georgia will have the ability to make their choice—between a check and balance or a rubberstamp.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I hope my colleagues had a good time with their families over Thanksgiving. I sure did. The flu intervened in some of our visitations, but we were able to join by Zoom and by telephone and had a great time in that holiday. I am looking forward to even better times for the Christmas holiday that is coming up.

Before we can leave for Christmas, we have some work to do. There is a priority for this Congress as it ends this calendar year and fiscal year. We have many challenges ahead of us.

The leader came to the floor and talked to us about the Omnibus appropriations bill, which we know has to be done. We don't want the government shutting down.

We have the National Defense Authorization Act, which is critically important for the defense of our Nation and for our continued presence in places like Ukraine, to provide assistance to the people there who are fighting for their freedom and literally fighting Vladimir Putin for their lives.

We also have issues before us such as the Respect for Marriage Act, which confirms, I hope, on a bipartisan basis in the Senate, that we stand behind the Obergefell decision, that we believe people should be able to make their own decisions about the people they love and marry on a civil basis. And I believe that should pass—and I hope it does pass—before we leave for Christmas.

DREAM ACT

Madam President, there is another issue that is of urgent priority that is personal to me. It deals with the legal limbo that has been created for hundreds of thousands of Dreamers and DACA recipients who are now uncertain of their future.

These recipients are immigrants who were brought to the United States as children. Some were toddlers and infants; others, kids in their teens, brought here by their families. They didn't make the decision to come, but they made a life when they came. They attended school. They grew up in America. They stood up in the classroom every morning, as all kids do across this country, pledging allegiance to that flag, believing it was their flag and their country. But that is not how the law sees it.

Some of those, just babies when they arrived, grew up here and were educated in school. They went to school with our kids and our grandkids. Their parents attended church with our families.

Responding to the need to take care of these young people and give them a path to citizenship—a chance to become a permanent part of America, legally in this country—20 years ago, I introduced the DREAM Act. We came up with the term ''DREAM Act'' between myself and Senator Orrin Hatch, a Republican conservative from Utah, who was my original cosponsor of the bill.

It was a bipartisan bill. Here was DURBIN from the State of Illinois and Hatch from Utah, agreeing on a bill that was so important that we argued between ourselves who would be the lead sponsor. I deferred to Senator HATCH the first time we introduced it because the Republicans were in the majority and I thought it gave us a better chance to pass it.

As time passed, Senator Hatch lost his interest in the issue and withdrew as a sponsor. But over the years we have had the sponsorship of many Republicans who believe, as I do, that these young Dreamers deserve a chance to prove themselves and to earn their way to citizenship in the United States.

We have had a few conservative Republican cosponsors, but we needed many more. We needed 60 votes to pass

the bill on the floor of the U.S. Senate. We had several attempts at it—I think almost five—where we brought the measure of the DREAM Act to the floor. And we made it clear: You had to have come to the United States as a child; you must have lived here without any substantial legal or criminal record; and you must be given a chance to have a citizenship opportunity in your life. That was basically the bill.

We brought it to the floor five different times. We had a majority each time. But in the Senate, a majority is not enough. As you know, it takes 60 votes. We fell short each of those times.

I remember one Saturday—it was a lameduck session at the end of the year—and we decided to make a try for the DREAM Act. Harry Reid was the Democratic leader in the Senate. He said: I will give you a chance for a vote. So we had that vote on a Saturday morning. The whole Gallery was filled with young Dreamers. They decided to come in their caps and gowns from their graduation ceremonies. So they brought those caps and gowns out of storage and wore them on the floor to prove that they were a valuable addition to the future of the United States. They were so excited to think that this will be their chance.

Well, sadly, we had a majority but not the supermajority that the Senate requires. I met with them afterward, and there were a lot of tears that were shed by them—and by me—as they thought about what it meant. They were so uncertain about where they were going to go and what their future was going to be.

I decided to try a different approach. If we couldn't pass the DREAM Act in the Senate, maybe, just maybe, my cosponsor in the DREAM Act, the former Illinois Senator Barack Obama, could find a way as President of the United States to help. And thank the Lord, he did. He came up with DACA. This was the approach that said to these young people: Here is what I can give you. If you will stand up and apply each year to be protected in the United States, we will give you a chance. If we check your background and everything is fine, we will give you 2 years at a time to stay here and live in the United States as Dreamers, be able to work legally, and no fear of deportation. He issued that Executive order. I remember it well. The day was August 15, 2012, 10 years ago—more than 10 years ago. Congressman Luis Gutierrez of Chicago and I decided that we would have a signup occasion at Navy Pier, a well-known landmark in the city of Chicago. We didn't know how many young people were going to show up to sign up for DACA. We brought together a few immigration attorneys who volunteered their time to help them fill out the forms.

And we waited.

We started hearing this rumbling of people who were interested. I remember speaking to Congressman Gutierrez and wondering: Are we going to have 100, 200? The estimate started going up just wildly as people started saying there will be many more than you could imagine. It turned out there were thousands. Ten thousand applicants showed up at Navy Pier on that day. They overwhelmed all the volunteer attorneys that we had. Some of them had been waiting outside through the night to make sure they had their chance to sign up for DACA. In the end, some 780,000—maybe even more—across the United States answered President Obama's call and were protected by DACA. What they have done with their lives is nothing short of remarkable.

Let me tell you about one who I think is just so amazing. This is a young lady who was in the line set up in 2012, August of 2012. She was one of the first Dreamers to receive the protection of DACA—a young woman from Chicago. Her name is Karen Villagomez. Karen's parents brought her to America from Mexico when she was just 2 years old—same age my mother was when her family came to the United States. I know the Presiding Officer is an immigrant herself and proud of her family story, the courage your mother showed especially bringing you and your family to the United States. Karen was 2 years old when she was brought into the United States from Mexico. She didn't really discover that she was undocumented until she applied for college. She was accepted. She grew up in Chicago and had been accepted to college at the University of Rochester in New York. But because she was undocumented and DACA, she, unfortunately, didn't qualify for any Federal assistance to help her through school. That meant working jobs, her parents helping her, putting together all the money they could so that she could go to college. She wasn't eligible for 10 cents in Federal financial aid, but she wasn't going to be stopped.

Karen was a freshman at the University of Rochester of New York when I first heard of her. It was spring break of her freshman year in college. She was hoping to fly home to Chicago to surprise her family. Instead, she was arrested and detained by ICE. One lawyer told her she probably had about 4 months before she was going to be deported back to Mexico. Karen and her family called my office. There was a lot of emotion in that phone conversation. My staff and I reached out to the Federal Agencies and said: Don't deport her. Give her a chance. You won't regret it. She has no background that suggests she is any danger to this country, but she has so much promise and determination. Give her a chance.

Well, they decided to give us a reprieve, a short-term suspension of the deportation. Karen went on with one reprieve after another, never knowing whether she was going to be deported before she could even finish college. But she finally did. Then she came back to Chicago. She was accepted at Northwestern University Law School—law school. With DACA, she was able to work as a paralegal, then as a counsel for the city of Chicago. Graduating law school, she became a clerk for a Federal judge in Chicago. She got married.

Three weeks ago, on election day, at long last, she was sworn in, naturalized as an American citizen. I was there to see her take the oath of citizenship. You know what she was going to do as soon as the ceremony ended? Walk across the street, register to vote, and vote as an American citizen for the first time on the day that she was naturalized. There wasn't a dry eye in that court chamber as we all celebrated this wonderful journey of this amazing young woman. And, incidentally, there is a baby on the way. She and her husband are so proud they are both part of this country and its future.

More than 830,000 young people just like her have been able to live safely and work in America because of DACA. But there is an uncertainty as to what is going to happen in the future. Last month, the Fifth Circuit Federal Court remanded a case to the lower court to determine whether DACA would remain the law of the land. It is still under attack.

Here is what it gets down to: Unless Congress acts in the next 3 weeks to protect DACA recipients, DACA could end as soon as next year. An average of 1,000 DACA recipients would lose their jobs and their legal right to work every single week in healthcare and in education, sectors of our economy that are so essential to our growth. DACA recipients are doing the work. They turn out to be the nurses, sometimes the doctors, as well as teachers, engineers, policemen, firefighters. And they are going to be deported if we don't come to their rescue and finally make DACA legal once and for all.

Does anyone think for one minute America would be better off if we started deporting doctors and nurses and teachers who are now protected by DACA or men and women who are risking their lives in the military or our police and firefighters? The answer is clearly no.

You know, right before Thanksgiving, a few hundred Dreamers flew to Washington. I think the Presiding Officer said you met with them. They met with me and were telling me what is at stake here.

One young man, in particular—what an amazing story. Because of DACA, he was able to graduate from college with an engineering degree. He decided he would start his own company since he had that opportunity. Now he has started several companies and is paying—he said last year, he paid $180,000 in Federal taxes. And I said to the group he assembled there, there are many large corporations in America that don't pay as much in taxes as this young man, this DACA protectee, was able to pay. It is an indication of the creativity, determination, and the quality of these young people. We have

to give them a chance to be part of our future.

Some Republicans have cosponsored the Dream Act. Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, my friend, former chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, is currently a lead sponsor with me. I have also worked with Senator GRAHAM and other Republican Senators over the years to deal with comprehensive immigration reform.

I have had conversations with a number of Republican and Democratic Senators who understand the urgency of dealing with this issue. I am not going to name names here or in the hallway, but I will tell you, conversations are taking place, and I am encouraged by them. I will join them and provide whatever resources I can or, if I can help by standing to the side, I will do that too. The goal is to make sure these DACA recipients have a future. We need 10 Republican Senators to join all the Democrats to get that done—just 10. We can break the filibuster, get the supermajority we need under the Senate rules.

I have heard many Republican colleagues say they won't help DACA recipients or even talk about immigration until we stop this so-called flood of immigrants and asylum seekers at the southern border. Look, every Democrat in the Senate agrees we need an orderly process at our border, but simply closing the border to families fleeing violence is not a simple or practical or worthwhile situation. That is why Biden, as President, is adding capacity and building better systems at the border. We need to do more, and we should do it together on a bipartisan basis.

Today, there are over 23,000 Customs and Border Protection agents working at the southwest border, and ICE has surged over 1,300 personnel to stop human smuggling networks. The administration is also building new migrant processing facilities, working on a system that allows meritorious asylum claims to be processed sooner.

But we can't fix these problems alone. We can't do it all in 3 weeks. Many of my Republican colleagues have tried to blame the families who are coming across the border for fentanyl. The overwhelming majority of fentanyl that enters this country isn't being smuggled in by undocumented immigrants. It is coming in through legal ports of entry by people who are authorized to enter the United States. Many of these people are U.S. citizens. I am not making excuses for them, but for goodness' sake, let's be honest about the source of the problem.

Let me give you a few numbers that tell the story. This fiscal year, Customs and Border Patrol seized six times more illegal drugs from authorized travelers at land ports of entry than they did from migrants crossing the border—six times—and nearly seven times more fentanyl was seized at land ports of entry than at the border.

I want to stop the deadly flow of fentanyl. It hits my State and all across America. You won't do it by turning away asylum seekers and separating parents and children. You do it scanning every passenger and commercial vehicle and all freight traffic crossing the border. We have the technology to do it. Let's get it done on a bipartisan basis.

President Biden has signed the omnibus funding legislation and infrastructure bill, which we talked about before. It included resources to meet the screening goal, which ought to be our basic starting point of this conversation. Sadly, a majority of Republican Senators voted against both of these bills, but I beg them to come back and join us again and see if there is some common ground. We can fix America's immigration system in a way that honors our values and does make us safer.

We need to focus on reality. We need less political posturing and more compromise and we need to start in that lameduck session to protect the Dreamers for their future and our own.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). The Senator from Oregon.

H.R. 8404

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, a little later today, the Senate is going to vote on the Respect for Marriage Act.

This vote is an affirmation that the U.S. Senate will stand up and protect the rights of all Americans to marry the person they love. Although this is about codifying rights that same-sex couples already enjoy, this is an important step in a long-running battle for equality.

During my 1996 campaign for the Senate, I ran on the proposition that there is a fundamental right to privacy in America, and I summed it up by saying ''If you don't like gay marriage, don't get one.''

So I became the first Member of the Senate to openly support marriage equality. Soon afterwards, there was a debate on a truly bad law, the Defense of Marriage Act, which I opposed for the same reasons. It was a breach of our country's fundamental right to privacy. Now the Senate has a chance to rectify that wrong and repeal it.

I am always going to go to the mat to defend the right to privacy in America. The bottom line is that protecting somebody else's rights doesn't take anything away from your own rights. Our country is indisputably stronger when everyone's rights are protected.

Some Members of this body have questioned why we need to pass this bill when marriage equality is the law of the land. The answer is pretty straightforward. The Dobbs ruling, which overturned Roe v. Wade, showed that the Senate cannot take any modern legal precedent for granted.

With the possible exception of Brown v. Board, no precedent is safe as long as Clarence Thomas and Sam Alito are openly calling for the Court to revisit major rulings. It is not just Justice Thomas and Justice Alito making these arguments in public. These days, many Republicans have openly talked about their belief that the Court ruled incorrectly in some of the most significant cases dealing with the expansion and recognition of individual rights in America: The Obergefell ruling, marriage equality; the Griswold v. Connecticut ruling, the rights of women to use contraception; even the Loving v. Virginia ruling, the right to interracial marriage. Some Members of Congress have called all those other legal precedents into question.

These backward debates now unfold in Congress, in courts, and in statehouses. The backdrop behind them is frightening, raising levels of hatred and bile spewed at LGBTQ Americans every day of the week.

The far right is now targeting gay and trans Americans in an effort to scare everybody else into taking away their rights. There is no question that when leaders participate in ratcheting up antigay rhetoric, it spills out into the real world across the country.

The community of Colorado Springs is still mourning the lives lost in a mass shooting at a gay nightclub a few days before Thanksgiving. Five people were killed. More than a dozen others were hospitalized with gunshot wounds.

If not for the actions of a few brave individuals, including a military veteran, the death toll would have been much higher.

Passing the Respect for Marriage Act is not going to end the hateful rhetoric and violence for good, but the Senate has an opportunity and an obligation to declare with this vote that hate is wrong, that we will stand up and defend the vulnerable, that we will protect the individual rights of all Americans from a far-right Supreme Court majority determined to turn the clock back by decades.

There just is no place for hate or intolerance in our great country. So today I am proud to be able to cast a vote in a bit for individual rights, for freedom, for privacy, and for equality.

I want to thank all the Members of this body who have worked for months to bring the bill to the floor with bipartisan support, and I hope that the Senate will be able to continue this progress with colleagues on both sides in the months and years ahead.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as the Senate knows, this week, we will be voting on a bill called the Respect for Marriage Act. Tonight, we will vote on a procedural matter to move that legislation along.

Supporters of this legislation have framed it as a way to protect the rights of same-sex couples to get married in any State in America. To be clear, that is already the law of the land. It has been so since 2015 when the Supreme Court ruled in the Obergefell case, and there is no reason to believe that this decision is in any imminent jeopardy.

Some colleagues have tried to claim that because of the Supreme Court's decision in the Dobbs case, which overruled Roe v. Wade, that somehow that has opened the floodgates of the Supreme Court to overrule all of the precedent that it disagrees with. Well, the Justices, in their concurring opinions in Dobbs, made clear that is not true. For example, they mentioned landmark precedents like Griswold v. Connecticut, Loving v. Virginia, and, notably, Obergefell v. Hodges.

One Justice wrote:

> I emphasize what the Court today states: Overruling Roe does not mean the overruling of those precedents, and does not threaten or cast doubt on those precedents.

I don't know what more the Supreme Court can say to indicate that Obergefell is not threatened by this Court anytime soon. So I am left with the conclusion that this idea that we have to pass this legislation in order to preserve what has already been recognized by the Supreme Court as a constitutional right, that this is based on, frankly, a scare tactic. Nevertheless, some of our colleagues claim this legislation is absolutely necessary.

But while this bill does not move the needle on same-sex marriage, this legislation will raise serious issues for religious liberty. We all know that many Americans hold sincere beliefs—religious beliefs—objecting to same-sex marriage. Obergefell did not place any new requirement on those individuals or their religious institutions. The Obergefell decision coexists today with other Supreme Court precedents, like Masterpiece Cakeshop or Fulton v. City of Philadelphia or Burwell v. Hobby Lobby.

Each of these decisions recognized that religious liberties shall and must be protected as required by our Constitution; namely, the equal protection clause and the free exercise clause.

For example, Obergefell doesn't compel Catholic priests or Jewish rabbis to conduct marriage ceremonies for same-sex couples, but it certainly doesn't subject religious organizations or faith-based institutions or even private citizens to lawsuits for exercising their deeply-held religious objections to same-sex marriage. If the Respect for Marriage Act becomes law as it is currently proposed, without amendment, that would change. Unlike Obergefell, this legislation expressly empowers private litigants to sue religious institutions, faith-based organizations, and private parties who oppose or have sincere, religious-held beliefs against same-sex marriage.

Think back to the Masterpiece Cakeshop lawsuit. The owner of a bakery in Colorado declined the request to make a wedding cake for a same-sex couple because it didn't align with his religious beliefs. If this legislation passes, we can expect similar lawsuits by secular warriors targeting people, from cake bakers, to florists, to website creators, to venue owners, or just about any other small business that doesn't bend a knee to their world view.

But it is not just individuals with deeply held religious beliefs who will have a target placed on their backs; it is also religious institutions themselves. I am not talking about churches or synagogues or mosques; I am talking about many of the faith-based social service agencies, nongovernmental organizations, and charities that are supported by people of faith as part of their mission. Well, this legislation would permit a private lawsuit against let's say an institution of higher learning, like a major university, or your child's preschool or Mother's Day Out. It includes religious charities and nonprofits that carry out incredibly meaningful and important work, and it includes anyone acting ''under [the] color of State law.''

Now, that is an interesting choice of the scope of this right of a private right of action—anyone acting under the color of State law. This is a very broad term that comes directly from the text of the bill, and it is not clear entirely who would be subject to this provision.

If a person receives a professional license from their State to serve as a lawyer, an accountant, a bartender, a realtor, or a barber, are they acting under color of State law? I think that is a plausible argument. If a nonprofit receives public funds to perform a service on behalf of the government, are they acting under color of State law? It is not clear, and it needs to be clear.

The range of people who can be sued will only be limited by lawyers' imaginations. Trial lawyers and the Biden Department of Justice could have a field day. Individuals and organizations that are trying to do good works consistent with their faith would be forced to spend a small fortune defending themselves in court, just as the owner of Masterpiece Cakeshop did for 10 years.

This legislation could open the door for the government to take serious action against religious institutions for adhering to their sincerely held religious beliefs. The Federal Government could deny grants for research to colleges and universities like Baylor University, Southern Methodist University or Texas Christian University in my State. Faith-based groups and nongovernmental organizations could be barred from working with the Federal Government to take care of the tens of thousands of unaccompanied children who are coming across our border as part of the current border crisis. Cities and States could deny foster care permits and licenses to religious organizations that do an immeasurable amount of good, including Catholic Charities, the Little Sisters of the Poor, and Buckner International. The Internal Revenue Service could seek to revoke the tax-exempt status of organizations that fail to comply with this new secular mandate.

Now, lest we think that is a fever dream or a conspiracy theory, let me just take you back to the Obergefell argument. Justice Alito asked the Solicitor General if an institution that opposed same-sex marriage could lose its tax-exempt status. The Solicitor General said: ''It's certainly going to be an issue.'' He was correct, and now the issue is front and center.

Now, I believe that the sponsors of this legislation sincerely believe that the consequences I am describing will not follow. They may believe, in good faith, that they have protected the free exercise of religion and religious liberties. But I don't believe they have been successful in doing that. That is why I believe that the amendments that have been proposed by Senator RUBIO, Senator LEE, and Senator LANKFORD should be voted on to make clear what I think the sponsors of this legislation intended to do but weren't quite successful in clearly accomplishing.

Well, just remember the IRS has virtually unlimited authority to target religious schools, nonprofits, and organizations by revoking their tax-exempt status, leaving them to the dead end of ruinous and years-consuming litigation.

Now, this isn't, like I said, a far-fetched conspiracy or an unrealistic doomsday scenario. We have seen what a politically motivated Internal Revenue Service can do.

Perhaps we all remember the IRS targeting controversy under the Obama administration. Under the leadership of Lois Lerner, bureaucrats subjected conservative groups to a different level of scrutiny, when examining their tax-exempt status, from left-leaning groups. Employees of the IRS actually developed a spreadsheet that became known as the ''Be on the Lookout'' list or simply the BOLO list. If the name of the political group included terms like ''tea party'' or ''patriot,'' it was subjected to a different level of scrutiny.

These IRS bureaucrats delayed the approval of these organizations' tax-exempt status and requested completely unnecessary information. It asked some applicants to disclose the names of their donors, as well as the amounts of each donation, which is constitutionally suspect. A pro-life group was even asked to provide the percentage of time that the group spent on prayer groups compared with their other activities.

Well, this IRS targeting scandal happened about a decade ago, but, since then, the IRS has been given even more power and more authority. The most recent reckless tax-and-spending bill, the so-called Inflation Reduction Act,

gave the Internal Revenue Service an additional $80 billion and 87,000 new IRS agents. This army of new agents would have the capability to turn its attention on every church school and organization that did not recognize same-sex marriage because of their sincerely held religious beliefs.

So you have to wonder: Who will be on the BOLO list next? Given everything we have seen and the experience we have had in this area, I can't say I have much confidence in how this will be handled.

So, to summarize, this legislation does not move the needle in terms of the rights of same-sex couples. They can already marry in every State in the country, and this bill doesn't change that. What it will do is force religious organizations to make an impossible choice: Abandon your beliefs or face the wrath of the U.S. Government.

So let me just repeat what I said a moment ago. I believe the proponents of this legislation thought they were protecting and preserving the religious liberties of people with sincerely held religious beliefs. But when they include a private right-of-action for someone acting under ''color of State law,'' it refers to any public act, any right or claim, and, as I said, you can interpret ''color of state law'' to cover everything from professional licensing to teaching certificates, to building permits, to food and beverage licenses.

So, I think, if the proponents of this legislation really believe that protecting religious liberty should be our goal, the best way to accomplish that is to allow votes on these amendments by Senator LEE, Senator RUBIO, and Senator LANKFORD, who provided an extra clear assurance that this legislation does not constitute a national policy endorsing a specific view of marriage.

I know it may sound like a simple clarification, but it could mean the difference between faith-based nonprofits ending up in the crosshairs of the IRS or some private-party lawsuit claiming they are operating under color of State law and the ability to maintain their tax-exempt status or carry on the important good work that many organizations do in our communities all across the country.

So if that indeed is the purpose of our colleagues—to try to protect those religious organizations, those people of faith who are doing good works that we want to encourage and we want to support—then I believe that we can accomplish their goal by passing the amendments that have been proposed by Senator LEE, Senator RUBIO, and Senator LANKFORD. If that is their goal, they shouldn't have any objection to this clarification.

But we simply can't stand by and allow this legislation—or any legislation, for that matter—to foot stomp the First Amendment rights of people of faith. Unless this bill is amended, it will invite a wave of lawsuits against churches, synagogues, mosques, and religious nonprofits, simply because they are living in accordance with their faith.

One other thing I should point out that was mentioned by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops is that, in the one area that I would call it a safe harbor to protect religious liberty—I think it is 6(b) in the bill that has been offered—the protection of religious liberty that, again, I think, our colleagues in good faith intended to provide, is limited to those ''whose principal purpose is the study, practice, or advancement of religion.'' So that clearly would involve things like church services or religious observations at a mosque or synagogue. But would it cover a church's daycare facility that provides for the children whose parents attend their church? Would it cover universities like I mentioned earlier—Baylor University, a Baptist university, Southern Methodist University, Texas Christian University—and the work they do? How about Catholic Charities, which is one of the principal providers of humanitarian services at the border, which resulted due to the border crisis that we are experiencing.

None of those would be protected, I would argue, under the limitation in section 6(b), and this was actually pointed out by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops. I think they are right.

But again, if the goal of the bill is to preserve religious liberty, I think the bill needs to be amended. Religious liberty is the cornerstone of our democracy. It is explicitly protected by the U.S. Constitution, and we cannot allow it to be trampled on.

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.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. 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.

MILITARY READINESS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, for the past 2 years, the COVID pandemic dominated every news cycle, and if the mainstream media is to be believed, it was the leading topic of conversation at every dinner table, whether it was Washington or Nashville or San Francisco. As the months wore on, it became glaringly obvious that, while the pandemic was a concern, people were less worried about the virus itself and more worried about how the Democrats were using it to justify one power grab after another.

Even in the face of catastrophic inflation, the employment crisis, the failure of public education, and the slow creep of lethal opioids into rural communities, the Democrats chose power over progress every single time and, in doing so, abandoned their duty to the American people.

And now, as this year draws to a close, my Democratic colleagues have declared that now it is time for everybody to just move on, move on from the pandemic. When Dr. Fauci appeared for a final press conference before his conveniently timed retirement, the White House made sure he wouldn't have to answer any questions on the origins of COVID–19.

The talking heads in the mainstream media have spun the harm done to students by virtual schooling as a tragedy rather than the completely predictable effects of forced isolation on our precious children, and the White House remains determined to blame inflation and shortages in the energy market on Vladimir Putin.

They want us to ignore their own self-proclaimed war on American energy independence. I suppose they think that if they just erase the mess that they have made from the daily talking points, the American people will just forget about it and move on. I hate to spoil their ending, but the American people are not ready for that. They want some answers. They will never ever forget the damage that these policies have done to their families and to their communities.

Now, the left tried their best to frame the debates over lockdowns and mask mandates and vaccine mandates as conspiracy fodder, but we all found out, no, it was not; it was personal, especially after it became clear that control was the Democrats' end game. Yes, control over you, over your life, over your children, over their education, over student loans. Control is what they want.

Now, the science changed but the narrative never did, and Tennesseans have noticed this. They have caught on to this. The ongoing fight over the military's vaccine mandate is particularly raw for Tennesseans because it is proof that the Democrats are willing to jeopardize our national security to score points against political rivals. This desire for power and control is in direct opposition to the Federal Government's sworn mission to provide for the defense of our Nation. This isn't a matter of opinion; it is a fact, confirmed by President Biden's chosen military commanders.

This year, the number of new servicemembers joining the ranks has hit an alltime low; so did academy applications for our Nation's prestigious military academies. The Army fell 15,000 soldiers short of their recruitment goal for 2022. The other services and the National Guard are also struggling.

The Pentagon doesn't expect the situation to improve even for the next few years. The Army predicts they will be down 21,000 troops in 2023, and the National Guard says they are going to lose 14,000 soldiers by the end of 2024.

The strongest, fastest, and most lethal fighting force on the planet is moving backward. Meanwhile, the new

axis of evil, they are marching forward. We know for a fact that Tehran is sending drones and military equipment to Moscow to support Putin's war in Ukraine. North Korea is conducting ballistic missile tests that threaten South Korean sovereignty. And the Chinese Communist Party is doing the exact opposite of what the Pentagon is doing: They are focusing on readiness and building up their military.

In June, they christened their first-ever aircraft carrier to be completely designed and developed in China. Their goal is to increase their fleet by 40 percent by the end of 2040 and quadruple their nuclear stockpile by the end of the decade. This is all consistent with Beijing's broader goal of becoming a military superpower.

They are focused on global domination. They are focused on readiness. They are focused on defeating us. Meanwhile, our Pentagon is focused on a vaccine mandate. The strong men in control of Russia, China, Iran, and North Korea—that axis of evil—are notorious for their aggression, and none of them have bothered to keep their hatred of the United States of America a secret.

The wolves are at the door, Mr. President, yet here we are, debating a military vaccine mandate that has zero—zero—basis in science or common sense. It will gut the ranks of the military and make us more vulnerable to the rising threat from the new axis of evil.

This isn't just my opinion; it is another fact confirmed by the people President Biden trusts to lead our Nation's military. The Army confirmed in a November 4 press release that the vaccine mandate has already separated 1,796 Active-Duty soldiers from their service.

Bear in mind, they raised their hand; they took an oath. They did this because they want to serve, protect, defend. And what has happened? What has happened to that service, to that loyalty? Look at what has happened. They are getting a slap across the face. As I said, 1,796 were shown the door because they would not take a COVID shot. They wouldn't take a shot. For the soldiers who remain, the Army has approved less than 4 percent of medical exemptions and just over 1 percent of religious exemptions. The Guard has only approved 15 percent of the medical exemptions and—get this—0.0047 percent of religious exemptions. And the Reserves, they have approved little more than 5 percent of their medical exemptions and 0.0044 percent of religious exemptions.

Leader SCHUMER left Washington for the Thanksgiving holiday without acknowledging this manpower crisis in our military and without offering a clear answer on when we will take up the fiscal year 2023 National Defense Authorization Act.

Now that we are back in session, I would hope that he has a plan to stop dangling this bill over the heads of our servicemembers and their families. But while we are waiting, I would like to offer a small improvement to what is already a very strong and bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. President, as you know, the Senate Armed Services Committee finished their work on this bill back in June. When we were debating the NDAA in the Armed Services Committee, I introduced two amendments that would have protected servicemembers from the arbitrary effects of the vaccine mandate. The first would prohibit the involuntary separation of any servicemember for refusing the COVID–19 shot until each service achieves its authorized end strength—good common sense. It is not saying you can't implement your mandate, just saying you can't do it until you have reached your goal, your recruitment and your retention goals.

The Second Amendment would make sure that members of the National Guard or Reserve maintain access to both pay and benefits while their request for a medical or religious accommodation is pending.

My Democratic colleagues on the Armed Services Committee killed these amendments, but I do hope they will change their mind and support them now that they have had the opportunity to hear from folks back home, to hear from our military, our Guard, our Reserves. I hope they will give this another look; but if they don't, they will have another opportunity to fix this mistake.

I have combined the amendments into a single bill called the Preserving the Readiness of Our Armed Forces Act, and I would be happy to add each and every one of them as a cosponsor. As we begin what I am sure will be a mad dash to the end of the year, I want to encourage my Democratic colleagues to keep preserving readiness at the front of their mind.

When the Pentagon first revealed this vaccine mandate, veterans, military experts, and Active-Duty servicemembers up and down the ranks told us exactly what would happen if the Biden administration went through with this. And do you know what? They were accurate in their assessment. Because of the Democratic actions, this White House's actions, they have fired thousands of servicemembers, and tens of thousands more are in jeopardy. Bear in mind, these are people who have chosen to serve. This chaos has prompted thousands of potential soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines to decide against entering the service, and who knows how many will choose not to enter the National Guard.

The Biden administration is digging in their heels at the worst possible time. The new axis of evil—they are on the rise, and they are counting on the rest of the world to remain complacent.

Over the past few years, each of these nations has been exposed on the international stage as factories of repression, violence, and misery, but in the aftermath, nothing changed.

Just last week, the CCP reminded us how little value they place on human life. Ten people in Xinjiang burned to death when their apartment building caught fire. The firefighters couldn't get to them in time because of the barricades CCP officials had constructed to enforce their zero-COVID policy.

Protesters took to the streets and forced the international press to pay attention. In response, the CCP brutalized journalists, censored videos shot the night of the fire, and claimed that the residents who died were too weak to save themselves.

I would remind my colleagues that these are the same officials who claimed that the Uighur Muslims are comfortable in their concentration camps, that the Tibetans welcomed ethnic cleansing, and that firing missiles at Taiwan is part of normal military operations. Exposure will not stop them. Outrage will not give them pause because they are on a quest for global domination, and they are not going to take a timeout because the Democrats in control of our government decided to prioritize a shot over our Nation's security.

Let that sink in. They are going full steam ahead. They are increasing their military rights. They are building their navy. They are working to develop new missiles. And we are focused on removing military members because they will not take a shot. By the way, you can get vaccinated and boosted, and it doesn't keep you from getting COVID.

Unfortunately, our adversaries have decided to take advantage of weak leaders in the White House and in Congress and to exploit our vulnerabilities until we force them to stop.

Our military is not the only tool we use to keep this country safe, but it certainly has the power to be the most decisive, and I cannot think of anything more foolish than to sabotage it while the enemy watches and says: Look at America's priority.

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 1148.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jerry W. Blackwell, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. 1148, Jerry W. Blackwell, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Jeff Merkley, Tina Smith, Sheldon Whitehouse, Benjamin L. Cardin, Maria Cantwell, Amy Klobuchar, Jon Ossoff, Mark Kelly, Jacky Rosen, Brian Schatz, Mazie K. Hirono, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Sherrod Brown, Tim Kaine.

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. 1129.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The clerk read the nomination of Doris L. Pryor, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. 1129, Doris L. Pryor, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Jeff Merkley, Tina Smith, Sheldon Whitehouse, Benjamin L. Cardin, Maria Cantwell, Amy Klobuchar, Jon Ossoff, Mark Kelly, Jacky Rosen, Brian Schatz, Mazie K. Hirono, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Sherrod Brown, Tim Kaine.

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, November 28, be waived.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the Baldwin substitute amendment No. 6487 to Calendar No. 449, H.R. 8404, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Baldwin, Kyrsten Sinema, John W. Hickenlooper, Tina Smith, Sheldon Whitehouse, Benjamin L. Cardin, Maria Cantwell, Amy Klobuchar, Jon Ossoff, Mark Kelly, Jacky Rosen, Cory A. Booker, Brian Schatz, Mazie K. Hirono, Angus S. King, Jr., Thomas R. Carper, Sherrod Brown, Tim Kaine.

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 amendment No. 6487 offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] to H.R. 8404, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE), and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 61, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 358 Ex.]

Yeas—61

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

NAYS—35

Blackburn	Cassidy	Cramer
Boozman	Cornyn	Crapo
Braun	Cotton	Cruz
Daines	Johnson	Rounds
Fischer	Kennedy	Rubio
Graham	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Grassley	Lee	Scott (SC)
Hagerty	Marshall	Shelby
Hawley	McConnell	Thune
Hoeven	Moran	Tuberville
Hyde-Smith	Paul	Wicker
Inhofe	Risch	

NOT VOTING—4

Barrasso	Toomey
Sasse	Warnock

(Mr. HEINRICH assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). On this vote, the yeas are 61, the nays are 35.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

Cloture having been invoked, the motion to refer and the amendments pending thereto fall.

The majority leader.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to consider the following amendments to the substitute: Lee, No. 6482; Lankford, No. 6496; and Rubio, No. 6493; that at 3:45 p.m. on Tuesday, November 29, all postcloture time be considered expired, that if any of these amendments are offered, the Senate vote in relation to the amendments in the order listed, with 60 affirmative votes required for the adoption of the Lee amendment; that there be 2 minutes for debate equally divided prior to each vote; that any remaining amendments except Senate amendment No. 6487 be withdrawn; that the substitute amendment, as amended, if amended, be agreed to; that the cloture motion with respect to H.R. 8404 be withdrawn; that the bill 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; finally, that the remaining cloture motions filed on November 17 ripen on disposition of H.R. 8404.

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

And there is one more important item before I leave the floor.

CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, our great Senator from Maryland, has been waiting a while to give tribute to Joan Kleinman, his State director. We want to thank her for her great work—did he say 17 years?—19 years. I don't want to cut this short.

And one of her other additional great features is that her family is from New York. So welcome and thank you for waiting.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

TRIBUTE TO JOAN KLEINMAN

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. As the majority leader said, I rise to honor the stellar public service of Joan Kleinman, a senior member of my office team, who retired in February after 19 years of working on behalf of the people of Maryland and the United States.

Today, I would like to share with the Senate the depth of her commitment to

the people of Maryland and her extraordinary legacy of good works, and have her story inscribed in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that it might be a source of wisdom and inspiration for all time.

I first met Joan Kleinman in 1990, when I started working at the Washington, DC, law firm of Arent Fox. Joan was also a fellow lawyer, who was in charge of managing the staffing of cases in the litigation department. For those of us who were litigation associates, that meant we had better be on Joan's good side.

While I was practicing law at Arent Fox, I was also serving 3 months a year in Maryland's part-time legislature. I knew Joan and her husband Sam were raising their family in Montgomery County, and that Joan had a keen interest in what was happening in our community.

At the time, I needed someone to be treasurer for my State senate campaign committee, somebody who was really well organized, someone who cared about our community, and somebody who I could trust completely. Joan fit the bill. But would she do it?

I will confess that I was a little scared to ask her. I finally mustered up the courage to knock on her office door, and luckily for me, Joan had no idea what she was getting into, and she said yes.

The rest is history.

In 2001, with Joan's encouragement, I launched my campaign for the House of Representatives. That campaign started at the kitchen table in our home in Kensington and with my wife Katherine and a small cadre of friends and dedicated volunteers, including Joan.

We knew it would be a tough fight, but we thought we had a shot. Our campaign grew quickly. It was powered by hundreds of volunteers and thousands of small contributions that kept coming in.

And, now, as treasurer of my congressional campaign, Joan would keep track of the flurry of small contributions that arrived every week. It was a ton of work. And Joan also worked on other aspects of the campaign at the same time. As another veteran member of that congressional campaign recently told me, ''for Joan, 3 a.m. was as much a part of the normal workday as 3 p.m.''

We won that campaign, and Joan was key to our success. So when the campaign ended, I had some very big decisions to make, including who would run our congressional district office? I wanted someone who was dedicated to our community, someone who could manage that important job, and, again, someone whom I could trust completely. The person who met all those requirements was Joan Kleinman.

I will admit—and we would all admit—that in those early days, we were flying by the seat of our pants, and Joan was charged with building out our constituent services program from the ground up. She had to do all of the big picture things, like building relationships with community stakeholders and forging bonds with Federal Agency officials. She also had to bring on our entire constituent service team and our community outreach team and develop an intake and tracking system for constituent cases to make sure nothing would fall through the cracks.

Joan built out our Maryland offices day after day, week after week, month after month, until we became the gold standard in constituent services. She instilled an ethic of persistence in our casework team to ensure that we did everything—and I mean everything—in our power to deliver results for our constituents.

I started receiving buckets of handwritten thank-you letters from folks across our congressional district. People would stop me in the street to thank me for our help. In fact, under Joan's leadership, our office became so well known for our top-notch constituent services that we started getting calls from people in all the other congressional districts in our State.

We solved that challenge when I ran for the U.S. Senate, and, after that campaign, Joan assumed responsibility for maintaining excellent constituent services and outreach for all Marylanders. And that she did.

The letters of appreciation we received from constituents are now kept in large binders that filled up whole bookshelves. And now people across our entire State stop me on a regular basis to acknowledge their appreciation for something that Joan and her team did to help them, which leaves me with one big question: How does that happen? How did we grow from that empty office space after my congressional election in 2002 into an operation that is renowned for delivering amazing services to people throughout our State? And the answer is Joan Kleinman.

Our story of success is the story of Joan Kleinman and the team that she built, and I would like to reflect on the qualities that made that happen. And there are many, but three big ones jump out.

No. 1, follow the golden rule. Joan established an ethic in the office that every constituent—every one—was to be treated the way we would want to be treated, with respect. She told our team that when someone calls our office, handle the case like it is your mom calling or your dad or your brother or sister. And it did not matter if the problem related to a Federal issue, a State issue, a county issue, or anything else. We were there to deliver results.

Joan knew how frustrating it could be to pick up the phone, call a government office asking for help, only to be told to call a different government office. So even if the issue fell in someone else's jurisdiction, we connected them to ensure they could get the help they needed.

Joan constantly reminded her team that if someone is calling us, it is because they need help, and they had likely tried and exhausted all other avenues to resolve the problem themselves.

Another of Joan's sterling qualities is real leadership. Now, leadership can mean different things to different people, but you know it when you see it. Joan is a strong leader and an excellent manager because she leads by example. Like a good general who leads their troops into battle from the front, Joan was always willing to take on any task, large or small, for the success of the team. She worked crazy hours. She read every letter. There was nothing that she would ask others to do that she would not do first.

Her exemplary leadership also flowed from her emphasis on detail and determination, a good combination. Good intentions about helping our constituents are great, but good intentions without implementation and accountability are empty promises. And good advocacy on behalf of constituents requires constant coaxing and constant followup.

So let's be clear. Joan's team has always been civil in pressing agencies and organizations to help our constituents, but her team has also been firm, polite, but always persistent.

And Joan's leadership powered a sense of common purpose and joint accomplishment. She would always highlight the achievements of members of her team who served our constituents, from helping our veterans and seniors obtain their benefits, to getting a passport approved so a constituent could visit a sick loved one, to getting student loans forgiven, to reuniting entire families, to helping folks avoid foreclosure, and hundreds and hundreds of other matters.

Joan ensured that the success of our office belonged to everyone on the team. She lifted everyone up. And on those days when this job can be frustrating and discouraging—and the Presiding Officer knows we face our share of those—on those days, reading the notes of appreciation that Joan would circulate from constituents thanking us for helping them in their greatest hour of need, or about how our work had changed their life for the better, reminded me and everyone on our team of the importance of public service and the good that we can do.

A third quality Joan has in abundance is compassion for those she worked with. Like the good Jewish mother she is, Joan brought that same sense of caring and nurturing to members of her family away from home, her office family. She was often the first to reach out to new staff, inviting them to lunch or coffee. She would circulate cartoons from the New Yorker that particularly resonated, which mostly got chuckles. She would laugh generously at other's jokes, even if they weren't all that funny. And she spent hours mentoring and coaching each member of our team. As a senior member of my staff remarked recently,

''Joan believed in me more than I believed in myself.''

Her good counsel helped guide staff members while they worked in our office and also served them well in their future endeavors. We are especially grateful that Joan helped groom one member of our staff who started as an intern under Joan's tutelage and then worked as a staff member in our office before going to practice law, as Joan had once done. This member of our team later returned to our office well prepared to take on Joan's job when Joan left the office in February.

And Joan wasn't just a mentor on professional matters. She was also there for staff members navigating the ups and downs of life. She has been a consoler-in-chief in times of loss and a cheerleader-in-chief in times of joy. Her warmth radiated in moments of hurt and of happiness.

And my office hasn't been the only beneficiary of Joan's love. It also extends to members of her wonderful family, who have joined Joan in the Senate Gallery this evening: her husband Sam, their daughter Molly, their son Ari, and their son Ben, with his wife Saryn. It is a joy to have them here for this special occasion.

I also want to give a shout-out to Joan's grandson, little Miles, who is at home. And I want to salute Joan's late father and her amazing mother Evelyn. Both of her parents helped raise her to be the woman she is today, and her mother, in particular, has always been very vocal about her thoughts about my cable TV appearances.

Thank you all for sharing Joan with us all those years.

And Joan's commitment also extends to her family of faith. Joan isn't just a good Jewish mother to everyone. She is also a devoted member of her synagogue. Her life has been driven by the spirit of ''tikkun olam,'' repairing the world. And this year, for Rosh Hashanah, Joan was invited by her congregation to speak from the pulpit and offer an interpretation of religious text.

In her remarks, Joan shared this reflection:

> I know we all want to be remembered for the personal qualities that we value. But I think it's important that we also seek to be remembered for how we respond to the challenges of our times.

That isn't just a meditation on faith; that is a meditation on service. In Joan's eyes, each of us has a responsibility to match our strong words with even stronger deeds. We honor our values only through our action. It isn't enough to envision a more perfect world. We need to build it ourselves—brick by brick, hour by hour, good deed by good deed.

Joan has spent her life realizing the promise of that creed, and because of it, she leaves behind a legacy of good works that not only fill up bookshelves but also fill up the lives and hearts of countless people in our State of Maryland.

She has helped guide people in need. She has met the moment. She has changed lives for the better. She has done so much good for so many Marylanders for so many years that our State will always be better because of it.

So on behalf of me and my entire family, on behalf of our entire staff, past and present, on behalf of all the people in the State of Maryland, we thank you, Joan Kleinman. Your legacy of good works has left the world a much better place.

Joan, we love you.

Even though Joan has retired from our office, I will continue to seek her counsel and relish her friendship for years to come.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

HONDURAS

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today marks the 1-year anniversary of the election of Xiomara Castro Sarmiento, the first woman to hold the office of President of Honduras. She succeeded Juan Orlando Hernandez who had discredited the office of the Presidency by colluding with drug traffickers, corrupt business owners, and other criminals; abusing his authority by pressuring corrupt legislators and judges to dismantle the institutions of democracy; and using the armed forces and police to brutally silence his critics. The many crimes committed by his government were well documented, yet numerous U.S. officials treated him like a legitimate partner even after his stolen reelection in 2017, until he was finally arrested and extradited to the United States.

The election of President Castro gave the people of Honduras a new sense of hope that finally that dark period was behind them, that rather than seeking to enrich themselves and hold onto power, she and her administration would finally tackle the grinding poverty, inequality, injustice, impunity, and insecurity that have caused so many Hondurans to seek a better, safer life outside the country.

It has now been 10 months since President Castro was sworn in, and her record is mixed. She has taken a number of important steps to reverse the improper and illegal practices of her predecessor and to put the country on a brighter path. By doing so, she has distinguished herself from her counterparts in El Salvador and Guatemala who have chosen to continue down the dark path of authoritarianism, corruption, and impunity. But while her administration faces every imaginable challenge, none is more urgent and necessary than reversing the Hernandez administration's assault on the independence of the judiciary and the rule of law. Under President Hernandez, the very concept of justice was turned on its head. Anyone with money could get away with practically anything, including murder, and the government could arrest and imprison anyone with impunity. The vast majority of crimes went unpunished.

Recognizing the need to establish public confidence in the courts and Office of the Attorney General, one of President Castro's most important promises during her campaign was to create a Comision International Contra la Impunidad en Honduras—CICIH—to succeed the defunct Mission to Support the Fight Against Corruption and Impunity—MACCIH—which was shut down by President Hernandez. Yet, nearly a year after her election, a formal agreement between the United Nations and Honduras, or convenio, to establish an independent CICIH, has not been signed.

One of the lessons the people of Central America have learned is that the only way to establish the rule of law and end impunity in their countries is with the active participation of international institutions and experts and the unequivocal commitment of local officials. Despite millions of dollars invested by the United States and other donor countries, that local commitment was lacking for the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala—CICIG—and the MACCIH in Honduras. Each was pointed to by the former leaders of those countries as proof of their commitment to the rule of law. Yet each was vulnerable to manipulation, and each was shut down by those same leaders when it became clear that they themselves could be held accountable for their crimes. Their only interest was in appearing to support the institutions of justice while all the time ensuring that they, their families, and their corrupt accomplices in government and the private sector remained above the law.

Considering how easily CICIG and MACCIH were sabotaged by the previous leaders of those countries and how much is at stake for the people of Honduras and the country's future development, nothing is more important than firmly establishing a culture of respect for the rule of law and for those whose job it is to administer it.

Doing so will take years, but the essential first step in that process is for the Castro administration to complete the negotiations with the United Nations and sign a convenio for the installation of a fully independent CICIH headed by a commissioner with the necessary experience, professionalism, and integrity, selected by the United Nations.

An independent commissioner will work with local judicial authorities in applying the law to the facts, wherever they lead. Past partial solutions only resulted in money wasted, time lost, and justice denied. Only after such a convenio is signed, which should occur without further delay, will the Honduran people and the international community have confidence that President Castro will keep her word and that Honduras will finally be on a path toward real justice and accountability.

WORLD DAY OF REMEMBRANCE FOR ROAD TRAFFIC VICTIMS

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, November 20, 2022, marked the 27th World Day of Remembrance—WDoR—for Road Traffic Victims, commemorating the millions of people killed and injured on the world's roads. It is also a day to thank emergency responders for their role in saving lives, to reflect on the impact of road traffic deaths and injuries on families and communities, and to draw attention to the need for improved legislation, awareness, infrastructure, and technology to save more families from the tragedy of losing a loved one.

More than 1 million people die from road crashes every year, and tens of millions are seriously injured. Road traffic crashes are the No. 1 killer of young people aged 15–29 and the eighth leading cause of death among all people worldwide. Rochelle Sobel, president of the Association for Safe International Road Travel, highlighted the gravity of this issue and the imperative to fix it: ''Every 27 seconds, somewhere in the world, a person dies in a road crash.''

On this 27th anniversary of World Day of Remembrance for Road Traffic Victims, it is important to remember the history and recommit to the goals of this day. It was initiated in 1995 as the European Day of Remembrance and quickly spread around the globe to countries in Africa, South America, and Asia. In 2005, the UN General Assembly adopted resolution 60/2, recognizing November 15 as the World Day of Remembrance for Road Traffic Victims. Since that time, the observance of this day has continued to spread to a growing number of countries on every continent.

Last year marked the start of the new Decade of Action for Road Safety 2021–2030, during which the WDoR will highlight the reasons for all of the necessary actions to be taken during this coming decade. Indeed, the day has become an important moment to focus international attention on this preventable epidemic and as an advocacy tool in global efforts to reduce road casualties. As a result of the growing awareness and global call to action that World Day of Remembrance for Road Traffic Victims has generated, in September 2020, the United Nations passed a resolution declaring the years 2021 to 2030 a new Decade of Action for Road Safety. The declaration affirms the UN's commitment to work vigorously to implement a new, ambitious agenda to halve road crash deaths by 2030.

Additionally, the UN Sustainable Development Goal 3.6 calls on governments and their stakeholders, including NGOs and private citizens, to address the personal, medical, and financial burdens associated with road traffic deaths and injuries.

The devastation of losing a child, parent, sibling, partner, friend, caregiver, or caretaker is immeasurable, as are the challenges of caring for a permanently disabled loved. Road traffic crashes are preventable, and so we owe it to our communities to work together so that the hopes and dreams of our loved ones are not shattered on the roads of the United States and the world. We must all take action to prevent these avoidable tragedies and save lives.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JACKIE CRABTREE

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise today to recognize Pea Ridge Mayor Jackie Crabtree who is retiring after 27 years of leading his community.

When Crabtree was elected mayor of Pea Ridge in 1994, it was a part-time position that oversaw a population of 1,300 people. He helped usher in growth and development that, today, underpins a flourishing community that now boasts nearly 6,600 residents.

In his decades of service and commitment, Mayor Crabtree successfully met the moment to change the community including providing the services and needs citizens rely on such as a full-time fire department and paramedics and an expanded police department.

His leadership was crucial to improving the infrastructure in the city with an upgraded wastewater treatment plant, new water lines, and additional sidewalks.

The list of accomplishments he has directed is lengthy, but he is quick to credit his dedicated team. Mayor Crabtree's humility reflects his success as a leader and public servant.

The mayor considers it an honor and privilege to serve the people of Pea Ridge. They will surely miss his vision and dedication, but I am confident he will continue to be involved and engaged.

From a career at Walmart, to the Pea Ridge School Board and president of the Arkansas Municipal League, Mayor Crabtree has spent countless hours giving back to his community and beyond. I applaud him for his commitment to helping others and enacting positive change. I appreciate his example and many years of friendship.

I wish him the best of luck in his retirement where he will be able to spend more time with his wife and high school sweetheart Freida Sue Booth and their son Eric, daughter-in-law Shelly, and granddaughters Mahala and Kaylea.•

TRIBUTE TO DANA CONNORS

• Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, it is a great pleasure to join people throughout the State of Maine in thanking Dana Connors for a remarkable career of nearly six decades of devoted service and lasting contributions in government and the private sector. In addition to being an outstanding leader, Dana is a cherished friend to me and so many others.

I first met Dana when I was working for Bill Cohen in Washington and he was the city manager of Presque Isle, a position he held for 16 years. Both of us are natives of Aroostook County, so we have always had that special county bond.

Years later, we served together in Governor John McKernan's cabinet, where he was commissioner of transportation. Everyone who worked with Dana during his 11 years in that challenging role was in awe of the fact that Dana could go into any meeting, and no matter how unhappy the people might be about the condition of a road or bridge in their community, they inevitably came out smiling. He just had a knack, which he still has, of always listening to people and making them feel valued.

From there, Dana stepped forward to serve as president of the chamber. Throughout his nearly 30 years of leadership, he has shown a deep understanding of the role of businesses in our State, particularly those that are owned by families. He is a staunch supporter of Maine's traditional industries, including farming, fishing, and forestry, and a champion of such emerging industries as advanced manufacturing and biotechnology.

What motivates Dana are his love for our State, his belief in our communities, and his deep affection for our hard-working, ingenious, and determined people. He understands the importance of creating an environment that is conducive to small businesses starting up, growing, and expanding. Above all, Dana is passionate about ensuring that Mainers have good jobs and are able to stay right here in Maine. There is no better demonstration of this desire than his strong and effective advocacy for vocational education, apprenticeships, and other programs that provide Mainers with skills that are in demand by Maine employers.

I am especially grateful to Dana for the advice he provided during the pandemic as I was drafting the Paycheck Protection Program. I knew I could turn to him for guidance on how it should be crafted and what would work best to help our small employers remain in business and continue to pay their employees. Dana was truly an invaluable resource during that crisis.

There is one special memory of Dana that I want to share. In 2016, he brought together all five of Maine's living U.S. Senators—George Mitchell, Bill Cohen, Olympia Snowe, Angus King, and me—for a forum about public confidence in government and bipartisanship. It is a testament to the enduring relationships Dana has forged and the respect he has earned from members of both parties that he was able to convince all five former and current Senators to come to the same event on the same night.

There is another part to that story that says so much about Dana. At the

time, my husband, Tom Daffron, was teaching a class at the University of Maine. He told Dana that the Senators forum would be a wonderful event for students to attend, but they could not afford to pay for the dinner. Dana quickly devised a solution. He offered students the opportunity to volunteer at the event, which would allow them to attend for free. Those students were absolutely thrilled to see five Maine Senators on the same stage discussing the issues of the day, all because of Dana's generosity and his caring for the next generation.

Dana has made such a positive difference for Maine in all of the positions he has held. His legacy is that Maine is an even better place to live, raise a family, and start a business. He has done so much, and I know that there is another chapter yet to come. In the meantime however, I offer my very best wishes to Dana and his wife, Joyce, and my deepest thanks.●

TRIBUTE TO LES GILMAN

● Mr. DAINES. Madam President, today I have the distinct honor of recognizing Les Gilman of Madison County for his longstanding dedication to protecting the land and people that make up Ruby Valley.

Les is a fifth generation Montana rancher in the Alder area with family roots that date back to the Gold Rush in Virginia City in 1863. The history of the Gilman family's revered land can be recounted by historical documents written and compiled by Les' father, Lowell Gilman, complete with photographs and stories of the agricultural and mining activity that took place over the years. Les and his wife, Donna, now proudly tend to their family's ranch alongside their son, Charlie, and daughter-in-law, Kaycee, in addition to their four grandchildren.

Beyond the property lines of the family ranch, Les maintains an esteemed record of public service to the Ruby Valley community, serving in many roles to ensure the well-being of his fellow Montanans and the land they all love. Over the years, Les has played an active role in his church, the Ruby Valley Hospital Foundation, the Alder Fire Department, and countless other community organizations. In 2018, Les received the 2018 Ruby Valley Conservation District Stewardship award for his involvement in many local natural resources management projects and for his dedication to his community.

After years of service, Les is nearing retirement from the Ruby Valley Strategic Alliance and the Ruby Habitat Foundation. He has been a dedicated member of the RVSA and has served as the executive director of the Ruby Habitat Foundation. In both endeavors, Les has been dedicated to the preservation and enhancement of the natural resources and social and economic makeup of the Ruby Valley.

It is my distinct honor to recognize Les Gilman for his passion to preserve our Montana way of life and for his involvement in the Ruby Valley community.

Keep up the great work, Les. You make Montana proud.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2021, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 22, 2022, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN) had signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 1941. An act to direct the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to standardize the use of core-based statistical area designations across Federal programs, to allow between 120 and 180 days for public comment on any proposed change to such designations, and to report on the scientific basis and estimated impact to Federal programs for any proposed change to such designations, and for other purposes.

S. 2159. An act to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 400 College Drive, Middleburg, Florida, as the ''Andrew K. Baker Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic'', and for other purposes.

S. 3510. An act to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance with respect to natural disaster resilience, and for other purposes.

S. 3655. An act to amend the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Collection Act of 2018 to extend the termination date of the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Review Board.

S. 3826. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1304 4th Avenue in Canyon, Texas, as the ''Gary James Fletcher Post Office Building''.

S. 3884. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 404 U.S. Highway 41 North in Baraga, Michigan, as the ''Cora Reynolds Anderson Post Office''.

H.R. 8454. An act to expand research on cannabidiol and marijuana, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 3, 2021, the enrolled bills were signed on November 22, 2022, during the adjournment of the Senate by the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, November 28, 2022, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1941. An act to direct the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to standardize the use of core-based statistical area designations across Federal programs, to allow between 120 and 180 days for public comment on any proposed change to such designations, and to report on the scientific basis and estimated impact to Federal programs for any proposed change to such designations, and for other purposes.

S. 2159. An act to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs located at 400 College Drive, Middleburg, Florida, as the ''Andrew K. Baker Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic'', and for other purposes.

S. 3510. An act to require the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to issue guidance with respect to natural disaster resilience, and other purposes.

S. 3655. Act to amend the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Collection Act of 2018 to extend the termination date of the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Review Board.

S. 3826. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1304 4th Avenue in Canyon, Texas, as the ''Gary James Fletcher Post Office Building''.

S. 3884. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 404 U.S. Highway 41 North in Baraga, Michigan, as the ''Cora Reynolds Anderson Post Office''.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC–5424. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2022–08, Introduction'' (FAC 2022–08) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 4, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5425. A communication from the Chair, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's annual submission regarding agency compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and revised Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A–123; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5426. A communication from the Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report for the period from October 1, 2021 through March 31, 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5427. A communication from the Executive Director, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Inspector General Act of 1978 for fiscal year 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5428. A communication from the Treasurer of the National Gallery of Art, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Gallery's Inspector General Report for fiscal year 2022; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5429. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–604, ''Players Lounge Tax Exemption Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5430. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–605, ''Torres Strait Way Designation Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5431. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

on D.C. Act 24–606, ''Kenilworth Courts Official Street Designation Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5432. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–607, ''District Government Paid Leave Enhancement Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5433. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–603, ''Wiltberger East Alleys Designation Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5434. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–602, ''Willie J. Hardy Memorial Bridge Designation Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5435. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–601, ''Navy Place Redesignation Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5436. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–588, ''Medical Marijuana Patient Access Extension Second Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5437. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–587, ''Tax Abatements For Affordable Housing in High-Need Areas Temportary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5438. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–611, ''Ghost Gun Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5439. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–612, ''Perinatal Mental Health Task Force Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5440. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–609, ''Department of Health Functions Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5441. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–610, ''Metropolitan Police Department Overtime Spending Accountability Temporary Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5442. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–608, ''Swampoodle Terrace Designation Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5443. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–621, ''Inspector General Oversight Consistency Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5444. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–623, ''Safer Streets Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5445. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–620, ''Board of Ethics and Government Accountability Delinquent Debt Recovery Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5446. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–619, ''Equal Access to Changing Tables Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5447. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–617, ''Council Vaccination Policy Enforcement Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5448. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–618, ''Migrant Services and Supports Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5449. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–616, ''Department of For Hire Vehicles Delivery Vehicle Traffic Enforcement Expansion Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5450. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–615, ''Post-Public Health Emergency Protections Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5451. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–614, ''Child Wealth Building Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5452. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–613, ''Battery and Electronic Stewardship Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5453. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–631, ''Constituent Unemployment Compensation Information Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5454. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–630, ''Fair Meals Delivery Temporary Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5455. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–624, ''Emergency Rental Assistance Reform Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5456. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–632, ''Advisory Neighborhood Commission Allotment Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5457. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–633, ''River Rock Court Designation Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5458. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–634, ''Overbeck Alley Designation Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5459. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting a legislative proposal entitled ''To provide for certain costs associated with an electric passenger carrier for transportation, and for other purposes''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5460. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–569, ''State Small Business Credit Initiative Venture Capital Program Grant-Making Establishment Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5461. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–570, ''Anti-SLAPP Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5462. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–571, ''Children's National Hospital Research and Innovation Campus Equitable Tax Relief Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5463. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–572, ''Local Rent Supplement Program Eligibility Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5464. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–573, ''Performing Arts Promotion Tax Rebate Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5465. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–574, ''2662 Martin Luther King, Jr. Avenue, Southeast Tax Sale Certificate Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5466. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–575, ''Notice Requirements for Evictions for Nonpayment of Rent Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2022''; to

the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5467. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–576, ''Back-to-School Safely Temporary Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5468. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–586, ''Short-Term Disability Insurance Benefit Protection Temporary Clarification Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5469. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–577, ''DCPS Digital Equity Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5470. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–578, ''Omnibus Barry Farm Redevelopment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5471. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–579, ''Non-Public Student Educational Continuity Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5472. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–580, ''Credit for Reinsurance Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–5473. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 24–581, ''Earned Income Tax Credit Expansion Clarification Amendment Act of 2022''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 4128. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to provide certain information with respect to unimplemented priority recommendations as part of the Comptroller General's annual reporting to Congress, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–213).

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 4882. A bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs (Rept. No. 117–214).

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 4209. An act to support remediation of illicit cross-border tunnels, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–215).

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 673. A bill to provide a temporary safe harbor for publishers of online content to collectively negotiate with dominant online platforms regarding the terms on which content may be distributed.

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. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 5135. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from requiring an issuer to disclose information relating to certain greenhouse gas emissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. Res. 849. A resolution designating November 2022 as ''National Hospice and Palliative Care Month''; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. Res. 850. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 25, 2022, as ''National Ataxia Awareness Day'', and raising awareness of ataxia, ataxia research, and the search for a cure; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 331

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 331, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the age requirement with respect to eligibility for qualified ABLE programs.

S. 1079

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1079, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the troops from the United States and the Philippines who defended Bataan and Corregidor, in recognition of their personal sacrifice and service during World War II.

S. 1112

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1112, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Chisholm National Historic Trail and the Western National Historic Trail, and for other purposes.

S. 1157

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1157, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow workers an above-the-line deduction for union dues and expenses and to allow a miscellaneous itemized deduction for workers for all unreimbursed expenses incurred in the trade or business of being an employee.

S. 2130

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2130, a bill to modify the disposition of certain outer Continental Shelf revenues and to open Federal financial sharing to heighten opportunities for renewable energy, and for other purposes.

S. 3417

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3417, a bill to prohibit discrimination against individuals with disabilities who need long-term services and supports, and for other purposes.

S. 3546

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) 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. 3797

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3797, a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to support stillbirth prevention and research, and for other purposes.

S. 3909

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3909, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make employers of spouses of military personnel eligible for the work opportunity credit.

S. 4117

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4117, a bill to make available additional frequencies in the 3.1–3.45 GHz band for non-Federal use, shared Federal and non-Federal use, or a combination thereof, and for other purposes.

S. 4466

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4466, a bill to amend the Peace Corps Act by reauthorizing the Peace Corps, providing better support for current, returning, and former volunteers, and for other purposes.

S. 4592

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4592, a bill to encourage the migration of Federal Government information technology systems to quantum-resistant cryptography, and for other purposes.

S. 4925

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from North

Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4925, a bill to preserve the readiness of the Armed Forces by limiting separations based on COVID–19 vaccination status and continuing pay and benefits for members while religious and health accommodations are pending.

S. 5021

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5021, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain broadband grants from gross income.

S. 5022

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5022, a bill to allow recipients of certain loans made or guaranteed by the Small Business Administration to use the loan proceeds to provide childcare services to employees, and for other purposes.

S. 5076

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5076, a bill to require training for employees of Federal agencies that award less than 3 percent of prime contracts to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 5130

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5130, a bill to amend the Camp Lejeune Justice Act of 2022 to appropriately limit attorney's fees.

S.J. RES. 60

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 60, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to ''Final Priorities, Requirements, Definitions, and Selection Criteria-Expanding Opportunity Through Quality Charter Schools Program (CSP)-Grants to State Entities (State Entity Grants); Grants to Charter Management Organizations for the Replication and Expansion of High-Quality Charter Schools (CMO Grants); and Grants to Charter School Developers for the Opening of New Charter Schools and for the Replication and Expansion of High-Quality Charter Schools (Developer Grants).

AMENDMENT NO. 5530

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 5530 intended to be proposed to H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 for military activities of the Department of Defense and for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 6482

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 6482 intended to be proposed to H.R. 8404, a bill to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 849—DESIGNATING NOVEMBER 2022 AS ''NATIONAL HOSPICE AND PALLIATIVE CARE MONTH''

Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 849

Whereas palliative care and hospice services—

(1) can empower individuals to live as fully as possible, surrounded and supported by family and loved ones, despite serious illnesses or injuries; and

(2) are critical parts of the continuum of supports and services that individuals with serious illness and their families need;

Whereas ensuring access to palliative care and hospice for all individuals in the United States who are in need, regardless of age, race, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status, is important;

Whereas palliative care and hospice aims to bring patients and family caregivers high-quality care delivered by an interdisciplinary team of skilled health care professionals, including—

(1) physicians;

(2) nurses;

(3) social workers;

(4) therapists;

(5) counselors;

(6) health aides;

(7) spiritual care providers; and

(8) other health care professionals;

Whereas there is a need to increase training opportunities for health care professionals to receive interdisciplinary team-based training in palliative care and hospice;

Whereas hospice focuses on quality of life through pain management and symptom control, caregiver assistance, and emotional and spiritual support, with the goal of allowing patients to live fully until the end of life, surrounded and supported by loved ones, friends, and caregivers;

Whereas trained palliative care and hospice professionals, during a time of trauma and loss, can provide grief and bereavement support services to individuals with a serious illness or injury, the family members of those individuals, and others;

Whereas palliative care is a patient and family-centered approach to care that—

(1) provides relief from symptoms and stress;

(2) can be complementary to curative treatments; and

(3) improves the quality of life of patients and their families;

Whereas, in 2020, more than 1,714,000 individuals in the United States living with a serious illness or injury, and the families of those individuals, received care and support from hospice programs in communities across the United States;

Whereas volunteers continue to play a vital role in supporting hospice care and operations; and

Whereas palliative care and hospice providers encourage all patients to learn more about their options for care and to share their preferences with family, loved ones, and health care professionals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates November 2022 as ''National Hospice and Palliative Care Month''; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States—

(A) to increase their understanding and awareness of—

(i) care for hospice patients with a serious illness or injury;

(ii) the benefits of integrating palliative care early into the treatment plans for patients with a serious illness or injury; and

(iii) the importance of grief support for caregivers and loved ones during hospice care and after death;

(B) to recognize the care and dedication of—

(i) millions of family caregivers; and

(ii) tens of thousands of palliative care and hospice staff and volunteers; and

(C) to observe ''National Hospice and Palliative Care Month'' with appropriate activities and programs.

SENATE RESOLUTION 850—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 25, 2022, AS ''NATIONAL ATAXIA AWARENESS DAY'', AND RAISING AWARENESS OF ATAXIA, ATAXIA RESEARCH, AND THE SEARCH FOR A CURE

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Ms. STABENOW, and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 850

Whereas ataxia is a clinical manifestation indicating degeneration or dysfunction of the brain that negatively affects the coordination, precision, and accurate timing of physical movements;

Whereas ataxia can strike individuals of all ages, including children;

Whereas the term ''ataxia'' is used to classify a group of rare, inherited neurodegenerative diseases including—

(1) ataxia telangiectasia;

(2) episodic ataxia;

(3) Friedreich's ataxia; and

(4) spinocerebellar ataxia;

Whereas there are many known types of genetic ataxia, but the genetic basis for ataxia in some patients is still unknown;

Whereas all inherited ataxias affect fewer than 200,000 individuals in the United States and, therefore, are recognized as rare diseases under the Orphan Drug Act (Public Law 97–414; 96 Stat. 2049);

Whereas some genetic ataxias are inherited in an autosomal dominant manner, while others are inherited in an autosomal recessive manner;

Whereas ataxia symptoms can also be caused by noninherited health conditions and other factors, including stroke, tumor, cerebral palsy, head trauma, multiple sclerosis, alcohol abuse, and certain medications;

Whereas ataxia can present physical, psychological, and financial challenges for patients and their families;

Whereas symptoms and outcomes of ataxia progress at different rates and include—

(1) lack of coordination;

(2) slurred speech;

(3) cardiomyopathy;

(4) scoliosis;

(5) eye movement abnormalities;
(6) difficulty walking;
(7) tremors;
(8) trouble eating and swallowing;
(9) difficulties with other activities that require fine motor skills; and
(10) death;

Whereas most patients with ataxia require the use of assistive devices, such as wheelchairs and walkers, to aid in their mobility, and many individuals may need physical and occupational therapy;

Whereas there is no treatment or cure approved by the Food and Drug Administration for ataxia; and

Whereas clinical research to develop safe and effective treatments for ataxia is ongoing: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the need for greater public awareness of ataxia;

(2) expresses support for the designation of September 25, 2022, as ''National Ataxia Awareness Day'';

(3) supports the goals of National Ataxia Awareness Day, which are—

(A) to raise awareness of the causes and symptoms of ataxia among the general public and health care professionals;

(B) to improve the diagnosis of ataxia and access to care for patients affected by ataxia; and

(C) to accelerate ataxia research, including on safe and effective treatment options and, ultimately, a cure;

(4) acknowledges the challenges facing individuals in the United States who have ataxia and the families of those individuals; and

(5) encourages States, territories, and localities to support the goals of National Ataxia Awareness Day.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 6493. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. HAWLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6494. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6495. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6496. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6497. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6498. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6499. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6500. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6501. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6482 submitted by Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SASSE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 8404, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 6502. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 5796, to amend title 35, United States Code, to establish a competition to award certificates that can be redeemed to accelerate certain matters at the Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 6493. Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. HAWLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Section 1738C of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 4, is amended by striking subsections (c) and (d) and inserting the following:

''(c) STATE DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'State' has the meaning given such term under section 7 of title 1.''.

SA 6494. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, beginning on line 3, strike ''No person acting under color of State law'' and insert ''No State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe''

On page 3, line 17, strike ''person'' and insert ''State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe''.

On page 3, strike lines 19 through 23.

On page 5, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 6, line 3, and insert the following:

(a) NO IMPACT ON BENEFITS, STATUS, OR RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to deny or alter any benefit, status, or right (including tax-exempt status, tax treatment, educational funding, or a grant, contract, agreement, guarantee, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, claim, or defense) of any entity or person—

(1) if such benefit, status, or right does not arise from a marriage; or

(2) if such potential denial or alteration would be based in whole or in part on the belief, practice, or observance, of the entity or person about marriage.

SA 6495. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, beginning on line 3, strike ''No person acting under color of State law'' and insert ''No State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe''

On page 3, line 17, strike ''person'' and insert ''State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe''.

On page 3, strike lines 19 through 23.

On page 5, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 6, line 3, and insert the following:

(a) NO IMPACT ON BENEFITS, STATUS, OR RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to deny or alter any benefit, status, or right (including tax-exempt status, tax treatment, educational funding, or a grant, contract, agreement, guarantee, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, claim, or defense) of any entity or person—

(1) if such benefit, status, or right does not arise from a marriage; or

(2) if such potential denial or alteration would be based in whole or in part on the belief, practice, or observance, of the entity or person about marriage.

On page 6, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(c) NO IMPACT FROM PARTNERSHIPS.—For purposes of this Act, and any amendment made by this Act, no faith-based organization shall be deemed to be a State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe on the basis of any partnership the organization entered into with the State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe.

SA 6496. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, beginning on line 3, strike ''No person acting under color of State law'' and insert ''No State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe''

On page 3, line 17, strike ''person'' and insert ''State, territory or possession of the United States, or Indian Tribe''.

On page 3, strike lines 19 through 23.

On page 5, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 6, line 3, and insert the following:

(a) NO IMPACT ON BENEFITS, STATUS, OR RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to

deny or alter any benefit, status, or right (including tax-exempt status, tax treatment, educational funding, or a grant, contract, agreement, guarantee, loan, scholarship, license, certification, accreditation, claim, or defense) of any entity or person—

(1) if such benefit, status, or right does not arise from a marriage; or

(2) if such potential denial or alteration would be based in whole or in part on the belief, practice, or observance, of the entity or person about marriage.

On page 6, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(c) NO IMPACT FROM PARTNERSHIPS.—For purposes of this Act, and any amendment made by this Act, no faith-based organization shall be considered to be acting under color of State law on the basis of any partnership the organization entered into with a government.

SA 6497. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Subsection (a) of section 1738C of title 28, United States Code, as added by section 4, is amended by striking ''No person acting under color of State law'' and inserting ''No State, territory, or possession of the United States or Indian tribe''.

SA 6498. Mr. CASSIDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE II—RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND MORAL CONVICTIONS

SEC. 201. PROHIBITION AGAINST DISCRIMINATION OR SEGREGATION IN PLACES OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION.

(a) PLACES OF PUBLIC ACCOMMODATION.—Section 201 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) any store, facility in a shopping center, or online retailer or provider of online services that has 1 or more employees in the current or preceding calendar year;

''(5) a social media platform provider; and'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1) or (5)'';

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking ''paragraph (4)'' and inserting ''paragraph (6)'';

(D) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(E) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following: ''(4) in the case of an establishment described in paragraph (4) of subsection (b), it sells or offers to sell a product or service that moves, or has moved, in commerce; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) The provisions of this title shall not apply to a religious institution, including place of worship, religious camp, or religious school.

''(g) For purposes of this title:

''(1) The term 'online retailer or provider of online services' means a commercial business, acting through a web page that invites the general public to purchase a good or service by use of a credit card or similar payment device over the internet, that provides content for the web page. The term does not mean a commercial business, acting through a web page that gives information, including information on quality, price, or availability, about a good or service but does not permit such purchase directly from the web page.

''(2) The term 'social media platform provider' means the provider of a public website or internet application, including a mobile internet application, social network, video sharing service, advertising network, mobile operating system, search engine, email service, or internet access service, that promotes users posting content and others consuming that content.''.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 208. EXCEPTION FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'small business' means an employer who does not have 15 or more employees for each working day in each of 20 or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—No small business shall be required, under this title or any other Federal, State, or local law, to provide a service related to a marriage of individuals of the same sex, if the small business declines to provide the service in accordance with a sincerely held religious belief, or moral conviction, that marriage is or should be recognized as a certain type of union. For purposes of this subsection, services related to marriage include services for any ceremony or related celebration of the marriage.''.

SEC. 202. DETERMINATION OF TAX-EXEMPT STATUS MADE WITHOUT REGARD TO RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.

Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking ''Corporations'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Corporations'', and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(B) DETERMINATION MADE WITHOUT REGARD TO RELIGIOUS BELIEFS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Any determination whether an organization is organized or operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, literary, or educational purposes or complies with legal standards of charity shall be made without regard to the organization's religious beliefs or practices concerning the validity of marriages between individuals of the same sex.

''(ii) RELIGIOUS.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'religious' includes all aspects of religious belief, observance, and practice, whether or not compelled by, or central to, a system of religion.''.

SEC. 203. CHILD WELFARE PROVIDER INCLUSION ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE OF SECTION.—This section may be cited as the ''Child Welfare Provider Inclusion Act of 2022''.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are as follows:

(1) To prohibit governmental entities from discriminating or taking an adverse action against a child welfare service provider on the basis that the provider declines to provide a child welfare service that conflicts, or under circumstances that conflict, with the sincerely held religious beliefs or moral convictions of the provider.

(2) To protect child welfare service providers' exercise of religion and to ensure that governmental entities will not be able to force those providers, either directly or indirectly, to discontinue all or some of their child welfare services because they decline to provide a child welfare service that conflicts, or under circumstances that conflict, with their sincerely held religious beliefs or moral convictions.

(3) To provide relief to child welfare service providers whose rights have been violated.

(c) DISCRIMINATION AND ADVERSE ACTIONS PROHIBITED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Government, and any State that receives Federal funding for any program that provides child welfare services under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq., 671 et seq.) (and any subdivision, office or department of such State) shall not discriminate or take an adverse action against a child welfare service provider on the basis that the provider has declined or will decline to provide, facilitate, or refer for a child welfare service that conflicts with, or under circumstances that conflict with, the provider's sincerely held religious beliefs or moral convictions.

(2) LIMITATION.—Paragraph (1) does not apply to conduct forbidden by paragraph (18) of section 471(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 671(a)(18)).

(d) FUNDS WITHHELD FOR VIOLATION.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall withhold from a State 15 percent of the Federal funds the State receives for a program that provides child welfare services under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq., 671 et seq.) if the State violates subsection (c) when administering or disbursing funds under such program.

(e) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A child welfare service provider aggrieved by a violation of subsection (c) may assert that violation as a claim or defense in a judicial proceeding and obtain all appropriate relief, including declaratory relief, injunctive relief, and compensatory damages, with respect to that violation.

(2) ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS.—A child welfare service provider that prevails in an action by establishing a violation of subsection (c) is entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees and costs.

(3) WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.—By accepting or expending Federal funds in connection with a program that provides child welfare services under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq., 671 et seq.), a State waives its sovereign immunity for any claim or defense that is raised under this subsection.

(f) SEVERABILITY.—If any provision of this section, or any application of such provision to any person or circumstance, is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this section and the application of the provision to any other person or circumstance shall not be affected.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall take effect on the 1st day of the 1st fiscal year beginning on or after the date of the enactment of

this section, and the withholding of funds authorized by subsection (d) shall apply to payments under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 621 et seq., 671 et seq.) for calendar quarters beginning on or after such date.

(2) EXCEPTION.—If legislation (other than legislation appropriating funds) is required for a governmental entity to bring itself into compliance with this section, the governmental entity shall not be regarded as violating this section before the 1st day of the 1st calendar quarter beginning after the 1st regular session of the legislative body that begins after the date of the enactment of this section. For purposes of the preceding sentence, if the governmental entity has a 2-year legislative session, each year of the session is deemed to be a separate regular session.

(h) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CHILD WELFARE SERVICE PROVIDER.—The term ''child welfare service provider'' includes organizations, corporations, groups, entities, or individuals that provide or seek to provide, or that apply for or receive a contract, subcontract, grant, or subgrant for the provision of, child welfare services. A provider need not be engaged exclusively in child welfare services to be considered a child welfare service provider for purposes of this section.

(2) CHILD WELFARE SERVICES.—The term ''child welfare services'' means social services provided to or on behalf of children, including assisting abused, neglected, or troubled children, counseling children or parents, promoting foster parenting, providing foster homes or temporary group shelters for children, recruiting foster parents, placing children in foster homes, licensing foster homes, promoting adoption, recruiting adoptive parents, assisting adoptions, supporting adoptive families, assisting kinship guardianships, assisting kinship caregivers, providing family preservation services, providing family support services, and providing time-limited family reunification services.

(3) STATE.—The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, any commonwealth, territory or possession of the United States, and any political subdivision thereof, and any Indian tribe, tribal organization, or tribal consortium that has a plan approved in accordance with section 479B of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 679c) or that has a cooperative agreement or contract with one of the 50 States for the administration or payment of funds under part B or E of title IV of the Social Security Act.

(4) FUNDING; FUNDED; FUNDS.—The terms ''funding'', ''funded'', or ''funds'' include money paid pursuant to a contract, grant, voucher, or similar means.

(5) ADVERSE ACTION.—The term ''adverse action'' includes, but is not limited to, denying a child welfare service provider's application for funding, refusing to renew the provider's funding, canceling the provider's funding, declining to enter into a contract with the provider, refusing to renew a contract with the provider, canceling a contract with the provider, declining to issue a license to the provider, refusing to renew the provider's license, canceling the provider's license, terminating the provider's employment, or any other adverse action that materially alters the terms or conditions of the provider's employment, funding, contract, or license.

SA 6499. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

After section 4 of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 4A. LIMITS ON RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN MARRIAGES.

(a) NO RECOGNITION OR FULL FAITH AND CREDIT FOR POLYGAMOUS MARRIAGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to require or authorize Federal recognition of a polygamous marriage;

(B) to give full faith and credit to an act, record, or proceeding pertaining to a polygamous marriage; or

(C) to require or authorize recognition of a right or claim arising from a polygamous marriage.

(2) COVERED MARRIAGE.—In this subsection, the term ''polygamous marriage'' means a marriage that is not a union—

(A) between no more than 2 or less than 2 individuals; and

(B) in which each of those individuals is in only 1 marriage.

(b) NO FULL FAITH AND CREDIT FOR MARRIAGES IN WHICH A PARTY IS BELOW A CERTAIN AGE LIMIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to give full faith and credit in a second State to an act, record, or proceeding pertaining to a marriage in a first State if either party, on the date of the marriage, was under the age of consent for marriage in the second State; or

(B) to require or authorize recognition in a second State of a right or claim arising from a marriage in a first State if either party, on the date of the marriage, was under that age.

(2) STATE DETERMINATION.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall prohibit a State from determining the age of consent for marriage in that State.

(c) NO FULL FAITH AND CREDIT FOR MARRIAGES IN WHICH THE PARTIES ARE TOO CLOSELY RELATED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to give full faith and credit in a second State to an act, record, or proceeding pertaining to a marriage in a first State in which the parties have a degree of consanguinity for which marriage is forbidden in the second State; or

(B) to require or authorize recognition in a second State of a right or claim arising from a marriage in a first State in which the parties have that degree of consanguinity.

(2) STATE DETERMINATION.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall prohibit a State from determining the degree of consanguinity for marriage in that State.

SA 6500. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6487 proposed by Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. LUMMIS)) to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike section 6(b) and insert the following:

(b) NO RECOGNITION OR FULL FAITH AND CREDIT FOR POLYGAMOUS MARRIAGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to require or authorize Federal recognition of a polygamous marriage;

(B) to give full faith and credit to an act, record, or proceeding pertaining to a polygamous marriage; or

(C) to require or authorize recognition of a right or claim arising from a polygamous marriage.

(2) COVERED MARRIAGE.—In this subsection, the term ''polygamous marriage'' means a marriage that is not a union—

(A) between no more than 2 or less than 2 individuals; and

(B) in which each of those individuals is in only 1 marriage.

(c) NO FULL FAITH AND CREDIT FOR MARRIAGES IN WHICH A PARTY IS BELOW A CERTAIN AGE LIMIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to give full faith and credit in a second State to an act, record, or proceeding pertaining to a marriage in a first State if either party, on the date of the marriage, was under the age of consent for marriage in the second State; or

(B) to require or authorize recognition in a second State of a right or claim arising from a marriage in a first State if either party, on the date of the marriage, was under that age.

(2) STATE DETERMINATION.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall prohibit a State from determining the age of consent for marriage in that State.

(d) NO FULL FAITH AND CREDIT FOR MARRIAGES IN WHICH THE PARTIES ARE TOO CLOSELY RELATED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to give full faith and credit in a second State to an act, record, or proceeding pertaining to a marriage in a first State in which the parties have a degree of consanguinity for which marriage is forbidden in the second State; or

(B) to require or authorize recognition in a second State of a right or claim arising from a marriage in a first State in which the parties have that degree of consanguinity.

(2) STATE DETERMINATION.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall prohibit a State from determining the degree of consanguinity for marriage in that State.

SA 6501. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 6482 submitted by Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. SASSE, Mr. THUNE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RISCH, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 8404, to repeal the Defense of Marriage Act and ensure respect for State regulation of marriage, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Insert before the title heading for title II the following:

SEC. ____. LIMITS ON RECOGNITION OF CERTAIN MARRIAGES.

(a) NO RECOGNITION OR FULL FAITH AND CREDIT FOR POLYGAMOUS MARRIAGES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to require or authorize Federal recognition of a polygamous marriage;

(B) to give full faith and credit to an act, record, or proceeding pertaining to a polygamous marriage; or

(C) to require or authorize recognition of a right or claim arising from a polygamous marriage.

(2) COVERED MARRIAGE.—In this subsection, the term ''polygamous marriage'' means a marriage that is not a union—

(A) between no more than 2 or less than 2 individuals; and

(B) in which each of those individuals is in only 1 marriage.

(b) NO FULL FAITH AND CREDIT FOR MARRIAGES IN WHICH A PARTY IS BELOW A CERTAIN AGE LIMIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to give full faith and credit in a second State to an act, record, or proceeding pertaining to a marriage in a first State if either party, on the date of the marriage, was under the age of consent for marriage in the second State; or

(B) to require or authorize recognition in a second State of a right or claim arising from a marriage in a first State if either party, on the date of the marriage, was under that age.

(2) STATE DETERMINATION.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall prohibit a State from determining the age of consent for marriage in that State.

(c) NO FULL FAITH AND CREDIT FOR MARRIAGES IN WHICH THE PARTIES ARE TOO CLOSELY RELATED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall be construed—

(A) to give full faith and credit in a second State to an act, record, or proceeding pertaining to a marriage in a first State in which the parties have a degree of consanguinity for which marriage is forbidden in the second State; or

(B) to require or authorize recognition in a second State of a right or claim arising from a marriage in a first State in which the parties have that degree of consanguinity.

(2) STATE DETERMINATION.—Nothing in this Act, or any amendment made by this Act, shall prohibit a State from determining the degree of consanguinity for marriage in that State.

SA 6502. Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for Mr. LEAHY (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY)) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 5796, to amend title 35, United States Code, to establish a competition to award certificates that can be redeemed to accelerate certain matters at the Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Patents for Humanity Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. AWARD OF CERTIFICATES TO ACCELERATE CERTAIN MATTERS AT THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE.

(a) AWARD.—Chapter 2 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 28. Award of certificates to accelerate certain matters at the Patent and Trademark Office

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'eligible entity' means an entity that—

''(1) submits an application under subsection (d) for a patent that addresses a humanitarian issue; and

''(2) meets the requirements specified by the Director.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a competition, to be held not less frequently than biennially, to award eligible entities certificates that can be redeemed to accelerate one of the following matters:

''(1) An ex parte reexamination proceeding, including 1 appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board from that proceeding.

''(2) An application for a patent, including 1 appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board from that application.

''(3) An appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of a claim twice rejected in a patent application or reissue application or finally rejected in an ex parte reexamination, without accelerating the underlying matter that generated the appeal.

''(4) A matter identified by the Director.

''(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Director shall administer the competition established under subsection (b).

''(d) APPLICATION.—An entity seeking an award under subsection (b) shall submit to the Director an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require.

''(e) PROMOTION OF COMPETITION.—The Director shall promote the competition established under subsection (b) through the satellite offices established pursuant to section 1.

''(f) TREATMENT AS SUCCESSOR.—The competition established under subsection (b) shall be treated as a successor to the Patents for Humanity Program (established in the notice entitled 'Humanitarian Awards Pilot Program', published at 77 Fed. Reg. 6544 (February 8, 2012)).''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, may be construed as affecting any action taken by the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office before the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the administration of the Patents for Humanity Program established in the notice entitled ''Humanitarian Awards Pilot Program'', published at 77 Fed. Reg. 6544 (February 8, 2012).

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 2 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''28. Award of certificates to accelerate certain matters at the Patent and Trademark Office.''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

PATENTS FOR HUMANITY ACT OF 2021

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 5796 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 5796) to amend title 35, United States Code, to establish a competition to award certificates that can be redeemed to accelerate certain matters at the Patent and Trademark Office, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I ask unanimous consent that the Leahy substitute amendment at the desk be agreed to; the bill, as amended, 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 6502), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Patents for Humanity Act of 2022''.

SEC. 2. AWARD OF CERTIFICATES TO ACCELERATE CERTAIN MATTERS AT THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE.

(a) AWARD.—Chapter 2 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 28. Award of certificates to accelerate certain matters at the Patent and Trademark Office

''(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'eligible entity' means an entity that—

''(1) submits an application under subsection (d) for a patent that addresses a humanitarian issue; and

''(2) meets the requirements specified by the Director.

''(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a competition, to be held not less frequently than biennially, to award eligible entities certificates that can be redeemed to accelerate one of the following matters:

''(1) An ex parte reexamination proceeding, including 1 appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board from that proceeding.

''(2) An application for a patent, including 1 appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board from that application.

''(3) An appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of a claim twice rejected in a patent application or reissue application or finally rejected in an ex parte reexamination, without accelerating the underlying matter that generated the appeal.

''(4) A matter identified by the Director.

''(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Director shall administer the competition established under subsection (b).

''(d) APPLICATION.—An entity seeking an award under subsection (b) shall submit to the Director an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Director may require.

''(e) PROMOTION OF COMPETITION.—The Director shall promote the competition established under subsection (b) through the satellite offices established pursuant to section 1.

''(f) TREATMENT AS SUCCESSOR.—The competition established under subsection (b) shall be treated as a successor to the Patents for Humanity Program (established in the notice entitled 'Humanitarian Awards Pilot Program', published at 77 Fed. Reg. 6544 (February 8, 2012)).''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, may be construed as affecting any action taken by the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office before the date of enactment of this Act with respect to the administration of the Patents for Humanity Program established in the notice entitled ''Humanitarian Awards Pilot Program'', published at 77 Fed. Reg. 6544 (February 8, 2012).

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 2 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''28. Award of certificates to accelerate certain matters at the Patent and Trademark Office.''.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 5796), as amended, was passed.

NATIONAL COMMUNITY POLICING WEEK

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 810.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 810) designating the week of October 2, 2022, through October 8, 2022, as ''National Community Policing Week''.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 810) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 29, 2022, under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

NATIONAL HOSPICE AND PALLIATIVE CARE MONTH

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 849, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 849) designating November 2022 as ''National Hospice and Palliative Care Month''.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I ask unanimous consent that 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. 849) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 25, 2022, AS ''NATIONAL ATAXIA AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 850, submitted earlier today.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 850) expressing support for the designation of September 25, 2022, as ''National Ataxia Awareness Day'', and raising awareness of ataxia, ataxia research, and the search for a cure.

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

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that 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. 850) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 29, 2022

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 noon on Tuesday, November 29; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of Calendar No. 449, H.R. 8404; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:20 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, November 29, 2022, at 12 noon.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Armed Services was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination pursuant to S. Res. 470 of the 113th Congress, and the nomination was referred sequentially to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs for 20 calendar days under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009:

TERRENCE EDWARDS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE NATIONAL RECONNAISSANCE OFFICE.