Paul	Rounds	Scott (FL)
Risch	Sasse	Scott (SC)

NOT VOTING—5

Barrasso	Burr	Tillis
Blunt	Cruz	

The motion was agreed to.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS AND EXTENSIONS ACT, 2023

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1437) entitled ''An Act to amend the Weather Research and Forecasting Innovation Act of 2017 to direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to provide comprehensive and regularly updated Federal precipitation information, and for other purposes'', with a House amendment to Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 6534

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment with an amendment No. 6534, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] moves to concur with the House amendment to the Senate amendment with an amendment numbered 6534.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment (No. 6534) is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6535 TO AMENDMENT NO. 6534

Mr. SCHUMER. I have an amendment at the desk to amendment No. 6534, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 6535 to amendment No. 6534.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that further reading be dispensed with.

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

The amendment (No. 6535) is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 3, strike ''1'' and insert ''2''.

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 6536

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to refer the House message to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment No. 6536.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] moves to refer the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 6536.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that further reading be waived.

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

The amendment (No. 6536) is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 4 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6537 TO AMENDMENT NO. 6536

Mr. SCHUMER. I have an amendment to the instructions, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 6537 to the instructions to the motion to refer.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that further reading be waived.

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

The amendment (No. 6537) is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, line 3, strike ''4'' and insert ''5''.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 6538 TO AMENDMENT NO. 6537

Mr. SCHUMER. I have an amendment to amendment No. 6537, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 6538 to amendment No. 6537.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived.

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

The amendment (No. 6538) is as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the effective date)

On page 1, strike ''5'' and insert ''6''.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

NO TIKTOK ON GOVERNMENT DEVICES ACT

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, last night, the Senate took the important step of unanimously, on a bipartisan basis, passing legislation to ban TikTok on all Government devices.

Now, this has been a longtime coming. I first introduced this piece of legislation almost 3 years ago. But last night's legislation is vitally important because never has the security threat to the American people from the Chinese Communist Party been more grave and never has the determination on the part of the Chinese Communist Party to leverage every possible asset, every possible platform to gather information—personal information—from the American people been more serious than it is now. That is why last night's action by this body is so critical.

Let's talk about TikTok for a moment, the most downloaded app in the world for the last 2 and 3 years running. Back in 2020, over 100 million Americans—100 million—used TikTok, and that was over 2 years ago. Since 2022, TikTok's average monthly users—and this year, every quarter of this year—has increased by 234 percent. It is incredible growth. You can see why. It is a fun app to use.

Here is what Americans don't know because TikTok doesn't want them to know. It is that the app runs continuously in the background of your phone or device. It collects your keystrokes. It has access to your email, access to your calendars, access to the notes and clipboard functions of your computer or iPhone or tablet or device. It, of course, tracks your geolocation. It is essentially an evidence-gathering, data-gathering machine that runs on your phone.

Can you turn it off? Can you stop it from doing these things? No, you can't, not if you want to use the app.

What is the connection to Beijing? Only this: that TikTok is owned by ByteDance. Under Chinese law that company must—must—provide all data to the Chinese Communist Party that the party wants upon its request.

We know that there are Chinese Communist Party members in TikTok leadership. We know that the Chinese Communist Party has held so-called training sessions for ByteDance and TikTok

employees. We know that this data—Americans' data—is available to the Chinese Communist Party, to Beijing, because of TikTok, and it is time we did something to protect American users.

We have been warned repeatedly by our own intelligence Agencies that TikTok is a security threat. Heck, the Director of the FBI has testified under oath that TikTok poses major security risks. That is why the Pentagon, the State Department, the Department of Homeland Security, TSA, the Navy, the Army, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps have already banned the use of TikTok on Government devices. The only sensible next step is for this Congress to act to make that ban across the board for all Federal devices.

Now TikTok has tried to get in on the act. They issued a statement this morning admitting that there may be national security concerns with their platform, after denying it under oath for years on end to Congress. But they also begged Congress not to do anything rash like actually take action. They said: No, no, no, no. Wait, wait. Negotiate with us.

Well, I just say this: The time to wait to secure the privacy of American citizens is long past, and the least we can do, the very first step we can take, is to ban this app and its use on Federal Government devices.

I hope that now the House and the Senate will act together to move this legislation quickly to the President's desk and we can take the further historic step of seeing this legislation enacted into law, protecting the privacy and the security of every single American.

It is within our reach. Let's act now and get it done.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican leader.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK J. TOOMEY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, the Senate is often labeled as the world's greatest deliberative body—a place where generations of titanic statesmen have asked the deep questions about America, questions like: How do we balance individual liberty with the common good? What role should we play on the world stage? and ''How should tax depreciation affect a small restaurant owner who is buying a new Fry-o-lator?''

Anyone around the Senate would recognize that last query as the work of our detail-oriented, hometown-focused, economic whiz—the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, PAT TOOMEY.

PAT's entire sterling career—from the private sector to the House, to nonprofit activism, to the Senate—has revolved around the reality that economics is central to daily life. What can seem like dry details or esoteric issues can determine whether whole societies rise or fall and whether hard-working families struggle or succeed. For two terms in the Senate and almost two decades total in Congress, PAT's commanding mastery of economic issues has had a massive, massive impact on his State and his country.

Our friend takes particular pride, as he should, in his leading role in delivering the generational tax reform of 2017. Most people involved in that massive effort found it exhausting. PAT considered it energizing. Our resident economist was actually in his element, and the work he helped lead created one of the best economic moments for working Americans in a generation, before the pandemic.

But tax reform is far from the only fruit of PAT's labors. From the JOBS Act of 2012, which put financial markets more within the reach of everyday investors, to the CARES Act, where PAT helped steer our bedrock financial institutions through pandemic turmoil, we knew we were getting a principled firebrand when our friend joined the Senate.

We have also gotten a collegial consensus-builder. Whether it was PAT's work on the 2011 supercommittee or his tenure at the top of the Banking Committee, PAT has blended principle, pragmatism, and persuasion.

He is always professional and respectful to his colleagues, to nominees—to everybody. He is unusually skilled at fighting the fight and unusually skilled at getting an outcome.

PAT's life and career have brought him a long way, but you still see the seeds that were planted by his father—a marine vet and utility worker. There wasn't any legacy fast track into the Ivy League, but thanks to a good upbringing, it was hard work and sheer brainpower that paved our friend's PATh to a prep school merit scholarship and then on to Harvard.

PAT cut his professional teeth as a trader in New York and Hong Kong—a free marketeer right from the start. But right as his Wall Street opportunities were taking off, PAT hit pause on his big city rise and put his economic instincts to an even higher stakes test: He actually headed back to Allentown to set up a family business from scratch. The small restaurant PAT and his brothers started was a proving ground for PAT's deep convictions in the community-building, life-changing power of free enterprise and entrepreneurship.

I understand PAT's first venture into elected office, a local commission, was mostly just an effort to make sure bureaucrats didn't meddle with the success of Rookies Restaurant and others like it.

The rest, of course, is history. PAT Toomey became a formidable Congressman, then a pivotal outside player, and finally a masterful and essential Senator. PAT has led the charge for his fellow Pennsylvanians on one front after another.

In one instance, he responded to tragedy close to home with a solution for the entire country. Heinous buck-passing on child abuse in public schools, known as passing the trash, had let an offender who had abused a child in Pennsylvania proceed to strike again in West Virginia. With the help of the senior Senator from that State, PAT spearheaded legislation that compels States to crack down on this abhorrent practice.

Another time, through sheer willpower, PAT literally became a life-saving legislative guardian angel for a young Pennsylvanian battling cystic fibrosis. Sarah Murnaghan was only 12 years old when outdated and tangled rules around lung transplants put her young life in serious peril. PAT rallied a coalition of Members. They relentlessly lobbied the executive branch. A Federal judge weighed in, and, long story short, that young lady got her transplant and is still with us today.

PAT's creative problem-solving has known few bounds. The way I hear it, one time, our colleague literally leveraged the America's Cup sailboat race as a way to get a specialized transport ship reflagged so that Pennsylvania's natural gas industry could keep moving useful byproducts to market.

In the midst of all of this, PAT made sure his office's casework for Pennsylvanians was just as superlative. His team's incredibly tight turnaround for responding to constituents has earned PAT praise from unlikely corners. I understand that, one time, former President Clinton went out of his way to inform our colleague that a friend of his in the Keystone State couldn't believe how quick and substantive was a reply he or she had gotten from Senator TOOMEY's office.

While many Capitol Hill offices struggle just to turn around the correspondence that comes in, I have it on good authority that PAT will literally go combing through local newspapers' ''Letters to the Editor'' so that he can proactively initiate contact with Pennsylvanians who haven't even sought him out.

Even the most eager morning people on PAT's staff have learned to expect the lights will already be on when they get to the office—their boss, already primed with ideas and questions: ''I think we could come at this a few different ways'' or ''Have you seen how German Government bonds are trading today?''

But our colleague is also known for his thoughtful, almost fatherly leadership style. PAT holds everyone to a high standard, especially himself, but if something goes amiss, there is no quick temper, are no harsh words—just a facial expression that his team affectionately calls ''that 'disappointed dad' look.'' And no matter what happens, everyone is invited to the annual pool party at PAT's house.

Talk about an interesting Senate creature—a man with a brain formed on the trading floor and a heart shaped by Lehigh Valley kitchen tables.

PAT's true loves are family and free enterprise. This combination has made him a formidable Senator, but it has

also shown us the writing on the wall: The Senate was never going to keep our friend forever.

PAT is always careful to refer to his Senate service as the ''greatest professional honor of my life.'' Note the caveat, because everyone knows what PAT sees as the greatest honor overall. We have seen our friend fiercely guard every possible moment of family normalcy with Kris and their three kids. We have seen hours blocked off on PAT's calendar on a weeknight under the label ''Duncan's Baseball Practice.'' We have heard about evening sprints to the train station in order to make it to a Christmas pageant—only to see our friend right back here the very next morning.

So like I said, Madam President, family and free enterprise—the two great loves.

I heard a classic PAT TOOMEY story where a young intern in his office was excitedly telling his friends about the prestigious ivory tower Path that he was aspiring to. Apparently, his boss, the Senator, chimed in with something to the effect of, Yeah, that sounds great, but have you ever considered opening up a small business?

So while we are going to miss PAT around these parts, none of us can claim surprise that family and free enterprise have teamed up to steal him back.

Since we are talking about an all-star Senate dad, let me put it this way: PAT, your colleagues and I aren't mad. We are just disappointed.

(Laughter.)

You have achieved so much. You have done just what you hoped to.

Congratulations, and thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

FAREWELL TO THE SENATE

Mr. TOOMEY. Madam President, I rise for the customary farewell address.

I would like to begin by thanking our colleague and our leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, for his very, very kind words.

I appreciate that, Leader MCCONNELL. I would also like to say that I appreciate the confidence you have repeatedly placed in me. Your recollections have brought back many memories.

One was the supercommittee. I served on the supercommittee, but what most of you probably don't know is that Leader MCCONNELL had great reservations about putting me on the supercommittee. Oh, yes, he grilled me for what seemed like hours over several occasions.

Here is why: He grilled me because he wanted an outcome. And his concern was, will this be firebrand from the Club for Growth be willing to compromise, be willing to reach an agreement that couldn't possibly be exactly what he wanted?

What was most important—as I recall from our conversations—to Leader MCCONNELL was that the people on that supercommittee, at least the ones that he could appoint, be interested in a successful outcome?

I would suggest that one of the things that is underappreciated about Leader MCCONNELL is how relentlessly focused he is on outcomes. It is hard to know because he doesn't tell us that much about what he is thinking, if you haven't noticed, but I am pretty sure that that is a big driver.

So, Leader MCCONNELL, I appreciate your leadership. I appreciate the confidence you placed in me. I appreciate our friendship and terrific working relationship.

For the many thanks that I have to give, I will start with my family. Starting with my parents, they did a great job raising six kids, I will tell you that much.

I have to really stress my gratitude for my wife Kris. Most of you probably don't know, but Kris had a very successful and promising career as a consultant, which she put aside so that I could pursue mine. So, in many ways, I think she had a tougher job because she was home raising three kids. And she has done a phenomenal job of that.

Last month, we celebrated our 25th wedding anniversary, and I think I will spend the next 25 years letting her know how much I appreciate her.

Our kids are here. Bridget is 22; Patrick is 21; and Duncan is 12½.

You know, growing up in a political family has its disadvantages. You would be surprised to learn, but it seems like about every 6 years or so people ran some really nasty ads about me on television. They did. The kids see ads, obviously. Also, I missed more of their activities than I would have liked to because I had to be here, but they were always terrifically understanding about that. I am sure looking forward to spending more time with each of them.

For those of us who serve on this body, we all know that staffs are the unsung heroes of our successes. I have been luckier than anybody deserves to be with the teams that I have had working for me over the years—18 years in public office over a 24-year period; 6 in the House and 12 in the Senate. I have just had wonderful, wonderful folks—mostly younger people, as we know our staffs tend to be, but just terrifically capable, hard-working, bright people.

My State staff, for instance—Leader MCCONNELL was kind enough to point out—the reputation that we had. I don't deserve the credit for that. They are the ones who worked so hard on behalf of our constituents.

From Philly to Erie and the other 65 counties and enumerable little boroughs and townships, every day they approached constituent service with enthusiasm and professionalism that was amazing. I mean, little boroughs requesting Federal grants and businesses struggling with Federal bureaucracies and regulations, veterans stymied by the VA or the Social Security Administration—it didn't matter what it was, my staff was on the ball getting the job done and doing it with a great attitude.

My personal office here in DC, both when I was in the House and in the Senate, also are just terrific, terrific people.

You know, I represent a very big State that is relatively close to DC so we have a huge number of constituents who want to come down and make their case, as they should. Most of those meetings end up getting taken by our staff, as you know. They have just done such a great job.

Our leg and comms shops are always working so hard to get the policy exactly right and get our message right; the administrative staff that kept things running smoothly so I never had to worry about anything.

I have to say a special thanks to the Banking Committee staff. I have been on the Banking Committee since I got here, but only the last 2 years have I been the ranking member on the committee. I honestly think we accomplished about as much as you can when you are in the minority, and so much of it is because it is a great team.

We focused on all the areas of jurisdiction of the committee: financial services, monetary policy, housing, transit. We did a lot of important work on the nominees to important regulatory posts. I think we did a good job of providing the oversight of powerful regulators, including encouraging them to stay in their lanes. I will always be grateful to them.

By the way, many of them are still here, and they will be here to the bitter end. We are still processing requests for the omni.

I have got to say a big thanks to the campaign teams that I have had over the years. You know, my first House primary was a very improbable success. I know most of you are thinking any election that I won was an improbable success. I get that. But I can tell you for sure, it wouldn't have happened without a terrifically talented and dedicated campaign staff, some of whom became part of the official staff, others have chosen to stay on the political side.

As for all of you guys, my colleagues, I have teamed up with every Republican at some point over the years, and most of my Democratic colleagues also at one time or another, and it has been a real honor and it has been a privilege to work with each of you. You folks have been terrific allies, even when it is on an item that is a rare item of agreement.

Speaking of which, let me say a word about my colleague BOB CASEY. You know, I don't think you could ask for a more collegial, thoughtful colleague than the fellow that shares the senatorial responsibilities with me for Pennsylvania. The fact is, we canceled each other's vote out almost every time—that is a true fact—but we have also worked together when we could.

One of the areas where we had just tremendous success is filling vacancies on the Federal bench in Pennsylvania.

In fact, Senator CASEY, and according to the last count that I have, you and I working together these last 12 years got 33 Federal judges confirmed to the bench in Pennsylvania.

Now, that happens because we have great staff work happening; we have volunteers who do a wonderful job of vetting candidates across our Commonwealth; but it also happens because BOB and I wanted to get this job done so that the people of Pennsylvania could have justice. And I think that only two—only New York and California have had more judges confirmed in this time.

So, Senator CASEY, I appreciate the great working relationship we have had.

As a general matter, as a body, I think we all understand we are not that popular, but I don't think I have ever worked with a more impressive group of individuals. So I appreciate having had that chance.

I also have to thank the people of this great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that my family and I get to live in. Leader MCCONNELL used my line. It is true, and I say it all the time, and it will always be true, representing Pennsylvania in the U.S. Senate for these 12 years has been the greatest honor of my professional life. I will always be enormously grateful to the wonderful people of this great State for their entrusting me with this awesome responsibility.

I am also uniquely grateful to the people, the volunteers, who made those campaigns successful.

When I think about my mission in the Senate, I think about two complimentary aspects of it.

First, it is to represent and defend the specific interests of Pennsylvania, and I tried to do that to the best of my ability.

You know, I think sometimes we are such a big and diverse State that what is good for Pennsylvania is usually good for America and vice versa, but it has also been important to me to defend and advance the cause of personal freedom. In the hierarchy of political values, freedom is first for me.

I think the purpose, the real purpose of government is to secure the blessings of liberty, and government too often is the source of restrictions on our freedom instead.

But in this category of defending and advancing personal freedom, my focus has tended to be the economic realm. Economic freedom is a fundamental aspect of personal freedom, and there is a well-documented high correlation between a society's economic freedom and the level of prosperity and the standard of living of the people in that society.

So you probably won't be surprised to learn that I think my biggest legislative accomplishment was that opportunity that I had to be a part of a small group of Senators, Finance Committee members, who got a chance to develop and help pass the 2017 tax reform. That group included Senator PORTMAN, Senator SCOTT, Senator THUNE, and countless hours that we spent in a conference room dealing with what was a very complex product.

We took our draft, and we presented it to our colleagues, and over a course of many weeks, we kind of iterated our way to what became the most sweeping tax reform in at least 30 years. And we expanded economic freedom with that product. Honestly, I have to tell you, I think the results were even better than what we had hoped for.

By the time the tax reform had been fully implemented—I think calendar year 2019—we had the strongest economy of my lifetime. We had strong economic growth, a 50-year low unemployment, alltime record-low unemployment for African Americans, alltime record-low unemployment for Hispanic Americans and other ethnic minority groups. Wages were growing, and they were growing faster than the rate of inflation, which means that workers were able to see a rise in their standard of living. And wages were growing fastest for the lowest income Americans so we were also narrowing the income gap.

We ended corporate inversions. There hasn't been one since. Remember how frequently they were occurring?

And with a lower corporate tax rate but also fewer deductions, business boomed. The corporate tax rate was down to 21 percent. This year, with a 21-percent top rate, we are exceeding the revenue projections that were made prior to tax reform when the rate was 35 percent. This is not just about inflation. As a share of our economy, total Federal tax revenue is at a multidecade high. So much for the thought that we were going to increase the size of the deficit from the tax reform.

Oh, and by the way, we also made the Tax Code even more progressive than it was. That is right. Higher earners now pay a greater portion of the total tax burden than they did before our tax reform.

I know my Democratic colleagues were skeptical about this, and I understand. But I would like to suggest, the data is in, and it is really good. There are important provisions that are scheduled to expire, and I do hope that Congress and the administration can find a bipartisan path to extending—or better still—making permanent these otherwise expiring provisions.

I hope you will indulge me for just a few moments to make a couple of other recommendations. I have got one for my Republican colleagues; I have got one for my Democratic colleagues—mostly for my Democratic colleagues—and two for this institution that we have had this privilege to serve in.

For my Republican colleagues, let me just say, our party can't be about or beholden to any one man. We are much bigger than that. Our party is much bigger than that. We are the political representation of this huge center-right coalition across America. On a good day, that is more than half of Americans.

And I hope we resist the temptation to adopt the protectionist, nativist, isolationist, redistributive policies that some are suggesting we embrace. I think those are inconsistent with the core values of a majority of the people in this coalition. More important, I think those ideas lead to bad outcomes for our country.

For my Democratic colleagues, I have heard many of you passionately—and I believe sincerely—declare your determination to defend our democracy, but I would suggest we all remember that democracy requires much more than the ease of voting in an election.

Elections are absolutely necessary, but they are an insufficient condition for a truly democratic society.

Elections really are a means to an end; they are not the end themselves. The end, or purpose, of elections is to provide the mechanism of accountability of the government to the people whose consent is our sole source of legitimacy.

When we hand over Congress's responsibilities to unelected and, therefore, unaccountable parts of our government—be that the courts or independent regulators or executive branch Agencies—we really undermine our democracy, which, of course, is really our Republic, because we weaken the accountability of our government.

Now, look, both sides have done this over time, but I would just hope we could all agree that preserving more responsibility and, therefore, accountability for the legislative branch of government is a good thing for our Republic.

And then two suggestions for this amazing, historic institution. The first one—and it is the most important one: Please keep the filibuster. It is the only mechanism that forces bipartisan consensus. It prevents government governance from the extremes. By forcing bipartisanship, it results in more durable legislation and so lessens the likelihood of big swings in policies. It provides stability for our constituents. And if you want to see more polarization, get rid of the filibuster and we will have much more polarization.

The second thought I had that I wanted to share with you is, I think we can all agree that the Senate has not been functioning as well as it once did and as it really should. I don't think too many committees are producing too much legislation the old-fashioned way. The old-fashioned way was actually a pretty good vetting process for developing legislative ideas. And when legislation does get to the floor, typically, there are very few substantive amendments that are allowed to be considered.

The result is, as a body, it is very difficult for us to discover whether and

where there might be a consensus. I know there are a lot of reasons for this, including political polarization, reasons why the Senate behaves in a way that tends to block debate and voting.

But there might be some relatively modest tweaks in Senate rules that might just facilitate restoring some of what used to be normal functioning. I know a lot of you have done a lot of work in this and that work is still underway. Let me suggest you consider one small tweak, a small but important technical change to a rule, the rule which enables the obstruction of the body.

I am not talking about the filibuster but, rather, the rule that effectively requires unanimous consent, in most cases, to allow a vote on an amendment, any amendment, even a germane amendment.

I can tell you, most Pennsylvanians are very surprised to learn that in order for a Senator to get a vote on almost anything, he or she needs the permission of every other Senator. I don't think this rule is workable any longer, and it contributes to the dysfunction. So I have just got a simple idea: Consider raising the threshold for blocking an amendment to some number greater than one.

Now, I support the filibuster because I think it is reasonable for 41 Senators to be able to block legislation. It just doesn't seem reasonable for one. So I don't know what the right number is, and I am not religious about this. Maybe it is 10. Maybe it is 20. Maybe it is 50. But I would just suggest that this body consider somehow raising the bar of preventing the Senate from functioning. There may be better ways to do it, but that is one suggestion.

Let me conclude with this: You know, we have all inherited something really, really, truly special. I know we all appreciate that, the fact that we live in the greatest country in the history of humanity and that we serve in this amazing legislative body.

I suspect we all get asked—I know I get asked from time to time—some version of the question: How worried are you about our country's future? And, often, there is some combination of national security, political polarization, and the future of our economy that is the primary concern of the people posing the question.

My short reply is usually: Look, we have gotten through much tougher times.

But think about it. I think that is so true, and it is important to remember. On national security, we have got real threats out there. Russia is obviously led by a violent, dangerous bully. The Chinese Communist Party is a rising and increasingly aggressive threat. But nowhere do we face the imminent threats that we faced during World War II and at several moments during the Cold War.

And we are polarized, and it is uncomfortable and it is problematic; but, in 1968, we had political assassinations and cities were being burned down. And this Chamber, this very Chamber we are in right now, first opened its doors in 1859. Imagine living through the decade that followed that.

As for the economy, look, there are always risks to any economy. Ours is no exception. I think inflation is a significant problem. There is a possibility we have a recession next year. We have huge and growing national debt, and I think that is going to be a real challenge for us.

But I think it is worth remembering this: The vast majority of Americans have a much higher standard of living today than our parents did when they were our age. And a rising standard of living is, after all, the purpose of economic growth.

So I always answer that question about America's future with the truth, and that is that, despite our challenges, I am extremely bullish on America. And I think my optimism is easily justified by our history.

America has always been able to survive and thrive, and America remains the greatest nation in the history of the world. If we keep on being Americans, we will remain the greatest nation on the planet.

Thank you, Madam President.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

TRIBUTE TO PATRICK J. TOOMEY

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise to offer some remarks about my colleague from Pennsylvania, Senator TOOMEY.

I think you can tell from his presentation today what he holds most dear, and, of course, that is his family—both Kris, his wife, and his children—and I am so happy that he is going to be able to spend more time with them.

I thought I would offer some remarks about his service as well as the ways that we have worked together. Let me start with the basic assertion which Senator TOOMEY made reference to that he and I didn't agree on much. And I think it is probably—I am not going to speak for him, but I kind of am in this moment. I am not sure he wanted to be caught dead agreeing with me on some issues, and that is just the way it works around here.

But one thing we tried to do from the opening day that he got here in January of 2011—I had been here a few years at that point—was we tried to—and I think we were successful over 12 years—have a kind of mutual respect, which is easy to articulate and harder to effectuate, and it requires both sides to give and take. And I am grateful that we were able to do that together.

There are a lot of ways in the Senate, as is true in the House or any other legislative body, even when you are from the same State, to kind of poke each other on a regular basis. We refrained from that. It didn't mean we were praising each other's legislative result or point of view, but we tried to demonstrate that basic mutual respect and not to try to undermine each other.

As Senator TOOMEY outlined, I think the manifestation of the work we did together—or maybe the most evident manifestation of that—was the work we did on Federal district court judges. As everyone knows who follows the work of the Senate, Senators make recommendations to an administration about who should serve on the district courts in their State. In our State, we have an Eastern District, a Middle District, and a Western District. Depending on which month or year you are in, you have vacancies in each of those Federal districts throughout the State. And if you want a judge or a candidate to be a judge to advance, you have to work with your colleague.

Now, it is a little easier when you have two Democrats and two Republicans. It is more challenging when you have a split delegation in the Senate. But we worked together. And as Senator TOOMEY made reference to, we vetted and then advanced for nomination and then saw through the confirmation of 33 Federal and district court judges in 12 years.

He mentioned that it was the third highest other than California and Texas. But what is noteworthy about that—really significant, I believe—is that it was from a split-delegation State. The two States I just mentioned didn't have that split. So it is a singular achievement that we should both be proud of. But, as he also indicated, our staffs deserve the lion's share of the credit. They had to do so much work in making sure that those nominees were vetted and could be advanced.

So I am grateful for that work that he did with me and with our office for the State of Pennsylvania. And, PAT, I can't thank you enough for the work we did together on Federal district court judges.

We also worked together most recently, the last couple of years, on some nursing home reforms—maybe, more particularly, the oversight that the Federal Government provides with respect to nursing homes when you have a program—they call it the Special Focus Facility Program—where the intent of that program is to focus on the poor-performing nursing homes.

But we did an investigation where we saw that there are some nursing homes that were not quite on the list that they should have been on and weren't getting that kind of special focus of attention. I also worked with Senator TOOMEY on that nursing home legislation.

So on a range of issues important to Pennsylvania and important in the Nation, we tried every day to, when we were at our best, work well together.

I especially appreciate what he had to do not just as a Member of the Senate but, in this case, in the early days of 2021 as a Republican Senator when he had two big decisions to make. He had a decision to make on January 6

about how he would vote on the certification question; and he, in my judgment, voted the right way and, I think, voted in a way that was courageous.

And then just a few weeks went by and there was the impeachment proceedings here in the Senate for the then-former President, and that was maybe an even more difficult vote, to cast the vote that he cast in that impeachment proceeding.

Both votes were exceedingly difficult for any political figure, for any member of a political party at any time in history. And it was a very difficult time, I am sure, for him to cast those votes. But he did because he wanted to advance the interests of democracy and he wanted to advance the concept that we claim to hold dear, which is the rule of law and upholding the rule of law.

And I can't imagine a more difficult set of votes so close in time for any Senator, and I am grateful that he voted the way that he did. And I know the people of Pennsylvania were grateful.

So on so many fronts, I said—recently, we had a gathering of Pennsylvanians. On so many fronts, even when we didn't agree on big issues, we were able to come together on some Pennsylvania priorities as well as issues that related to the Federal judiciary.

One thing that I think we are in agreement on and have always been in agreement on is both of us, in our personal capacities, married way above our class. I married above my class when I married Terese, and I think the same is true of PAT when he married Kris. We agree on that, right? We do. OK.

I am happy for PAT TOOMEY and Kris and their children, but I will miss working with him and serving alongside him. As he said, it is a privilege to serve in this institution, and he served this institution and the people of our State with honor and with distinction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, when it was reported a few years ago that Senator PAT TOOMEY had taken up beekeeping, he said this about the appeal of his new hobby:

> When you're in my line of work, you're often dealing with abstractions. It's fun to have something tangible, where you can see the results.

Well, my good friend from Pennsylvania has, of course, produced many tangible results during his 12 years in the Senate. As Senator TOOMEY's service here draws to a close, I rise today in tribute to an outstanding leader who has been as busy and beneficial as those hard-working bees he tends.

PAT came to the Senate in 2011 well prepared for this line of work by his three terms in the House. With his background in the financial services industry and as the owner and operator of a small family business with his brothers, he has been an effective voice for economic growth, regulatory reform, and fiscal responsibility. His respectful demeanor, his integrity, and his commitment to getting the facts have earned him the respect of colleagues on both sides of the aisle. His persuasive and principled arguments often convince his opponents to become his allies.

I always personally looked forward to Senator TOOMEY coming to visit me to discuss a nominee or a piece of legislation. Inevitably, he would arrive with all the facts, all the data, all the quotations, and make his case. He didn't rely simply on rhetoric or an appeal to party loyalty—not at all. His approach was to present a solid case for why I should agree with him, and his track record, I must say, was very good.

Throughout his time in Congress, PAT has focused on creating good jobs for the people in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and across our entire country. He knows that America has the best workers in the world, and when they have a level playing field, they can compete with anyone.

Drawing on his expertise in finance, PAT pushed for policies that supported workers and were conducive to the startup and growth of businesses. He played an absolutely essential role in shaping the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, which reduced the tax burden for American families. He coauthored sections of the JOBS Act, which made it easier for businesses to invest and expand. He has always worked to cut red-tape to help unleash economic opportunities.

There is another side to PAT as well. He is a true champion for those who are vulnerable in our society. I have worked with him on many issues over the years, including legislation to safeguard seniors from financial exploitation, as well as a bill to support 50 million Americans who serve as family caregivers. PAT has led efforts to better protect children from abuse, as well as to prevent animal cruelty.

PAT is a determined leader. He is a leader who seeks bipartisan solutions. After the horrendous and heartbreaking Sandy Hook school shooting in 2012 that took the lives of 26 people, including 20 children, he reached across the aisle to work with another good friend of mine, Senator JOE MANCHIN, on comprehensive legislation to keep firearms out of the hands of criminals, terrorists, and those who are dangerously mentally ill. That initiative laid the foundation for the Safer Communities Act that became law this year. It was a pleasure to serve with PAT on the bipartisan 20- Member working group who forged that landmark law.

PAT, it has been such an honor to serve with you, and I cherish our friendship. I will miss those visits to my office to straighten me out on certain issues and to educate me.

In all sincerity, I really did look forward to those visits because they were always an intellectual exchange, and you always made such a great case.

I wish you, Kris, and your wonderful children all the best. You will be missed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about my dear friend PAT TOOMEY. My dear friend from Maine mentioned what we worked on. We worked on many pieces of legislation together, and PAT was always a stalwart.

As far as when it came to financial matters, I think PAT was the go-to person, whether you were a Democrat or Republican, to get his opinion on finances. Basically, whether it be taxes or tax credits or extenders, whatever it may be, PAT would give you an answer, and PAT was accurate.

But I saw a different side of PAT on December 14, 2012, when 26 people were killed in Sandy Hook. Twenty of them were children, 6 and 7 years old. And I saw the heart and soul of PAT TOOMEY.

I knew I had to do something. I couldn't live with it. I come from what we call a very gun-friendly atmosphere, environment in my State of West Virginia. PAT, being my next door neighbor in Pennsylvania, had the same, and we knew that it was difficult. So I decided that I wanted to introduce a bill, but I needed a partner. I needed a true partner who believed. PAT stepped forward, and we had the Manchin-Toomey background check.

It was the beginning. And what drove us was the compassion, PAT's compassion and his heart and soul. This massacre that happened to these children should never have happened. School should be the safest place a child goes and a parent can at least breathe easily. And seeing what they went through—and I think we bonded with all of the parents. We still to this day talk to them, and our hearts and prayers are with them.

PAT was with me side by side to fight the good fight. We came up a few votes short. Looking back on that, that would have been a tremendous beginning many years ago. It could have prevented an awful lot of the senseless, horrific tragedies that have happened, with families losing their children.

With that, my dear friend, I want to say thank you. That was a bill that—I think we did everything in that bill for the right reason. We didn't want to take anyone's guns away from them. We wanted to make sure people could still enjoy the hunting that we grew up with, the sports shooting that we enjoyed—all of the recreational things you do with guns when you come from a gun culture. PAT and I called it gun sense. You just have to have some gun sense. And it is the truth, but we had to educate people.

On the other hand, we were saying we wanted to make sure that—we grew up in an atmosphere where we were taught as young children: You know, you don't sell your gun to a stranger.

You don't even loan your gun to a family member who is irresponsible. That is your prized possession. You are responsible. That is a lethal weapon. You are responsible.

That is how we were raised. We both understood that. But if we were understanding that, then basically we thought, We all had to have permits when we went and bought a gun. We all bought guns and went through background checks, and everybody should. So if I didn't want to sell my gun to a stranger, why should a gun show with loopholes do it? Why should you be able to mail a gun across State lines and do it? Why should that happen?

That is what we were trying to do, is close the loopholes. Make this common gun sense.

PAT, you stood tall. You really did, buddy. And I know it was a tough, tough period of time. But we did the right thing, and we are seeing some changes now. We need more changes. But it is gun sense and common sense but also protecting people's rights. We can do both in America.

We are going to miss you, buddy. We really are going to miss you. You have been something special here.

I met both of your children. I went up and spoke to their school at Harvard, and I just enjoyed it very much. And when they introduced themselves, I could tell right away that they were their mother's children and they had the spirit of their dad. I can tell you that too.

But, anyway, it has been a pleasure calling you my friend, and you always will be my friend. God bless and Godspeed, my friend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I, too, rise to thank Senator TOOMEY for his distinguished public service. I first got to know PAT TOOMEY back in 2011.

For those who have been around here a long time or at least a medium amount of time, you may remember the budget impasse in 2011 between the House and the Senate. At that time, there were constant threats of government shutdowns. There was, of course, the issue of the debt ceiling.

What finally happened was that a piece of legislation or an agreement was reached that said: We are going to create what was then called a supercommittee to try to work out some of these budget issues, and if the supercommittee did not reach an agreement, then this Rube Goldberg machine would take effect, providing automatic budget cuts both to defense and nondefense spending.

Everybody agreed that having this automatic sequester take place would not serve the best interests of the country and hoped that this supercommittee would be able to come up with a solution.

Senator TOOMEY was new to the Senate then, but because of his great expertise and because of the fact that he was trusted by Leader MCCONNELL, he was appointed as one of the very few people—about three or four people from the Senate—to participate on the supercommittee, and I was appointed by Speaker PELOSI to serve on the supercommittee.

We did not, in the end, succeed in reaching an agreement, but one of the really good things that came out of that supercommittee from my perspective was getting to know and work with PAT TOOMEY. We disagreed on a lot of those issues, and, of course, ultimately the disagreements in the supercommittee overwhelmed our ability to get to some kind of yes. But what I learned during that process was, when you are talking to PAT TOOMEY, you are talking to somebody who is incredibly knowledgeable and presents his perspective very well.

You also found somebody who was trustworthy. PAT TOOMEY never said anything in that process where he went back on his word. He was always very clear about where he stood. Once he said he was for something, he would stick with it, and if he was against it, you would know he was against it.

You also knew he was someone you could trust in terms of confidence because when you are in a situation like the supercommittee—and we worked for weeks. It was a good-faith effort. We worked for weeks. But you have to learn to trust each other because you are talking about different proposals that ultimately would require a compromise, and we all know that compromise can sometimes be very difficult and politically charged.

So during that period of time, I recognized that PAT TOOMEY was someone you could trust. Because of that, when I came to the U.S. Senate, it was a great privilege to work with my by then friend PAT TOOMEY on a range of issues.

Senator TOOMEY talked today about his passion and conviction for expanding freedom. That passion extends to extending freedom to people around the world. We were able to team up on a number of measures to try to do exactly that. One was the Otto Warmbier BRINK Act, which was legislation that has been passed into law to try to make sure that we hold North Korea accountable for its nuclear program and also hold them accountable on human rights. It is named after an American who was mistreated in North Korea and then came home and died.

We worked on that legislation, and, again, it was always a back-and-forth. It was secondary sanctions legislation, which has now been used by multiple administrations to apply sanctions to try to advance our policies to try to denuclearize the Korean Peninsula and bring more pressure on the North Korean regime.

In that same vein, we worked together on the Hong Kong Autonomy Act after we saw China violate its commitments and agreements with respect to Hong Kong. That empowered the executive branch to apply sanctions on officials in China who were participating directly in depriving citizens in Hong Kong of their freedom, and that legislation passed as well.

Now, even in the closing days of this session, we are working together with respect to our efforts to cut off Putin's bank account that funds his war machine against Ukraine by backing up the Biden administration and G7's proposal for the oil price cap, which many have heard more about recently since this just took effect. We believe that in order for it to be effective in the long term, we need to be sure we have global compliance. To do that, that also should be backed up with a measure to provide more teeth and the prospect of sanctions.

I just wanted to come to the floor to say that, PAT, it has been great working with you on these issues. As others have said, we can always disagree, but you know how to disagree agreeably. You know how to argue your point in a respectful manner, and you have found common ground wherever you could. I am grateful.

I said a few good words about PAT TOOMEY the other day that were picked up in the Philadelphia Inquirer, and PAT said: You know, you might have gotten yourself in trouble.

I said: I have probably gotten you in just as much trouble. Of course, you are now stepping down after 12 distinguished years.

But that is the kind of trouble we should all be willing to get into, working together for the good of the country and the people of our States.

PAT, to you and Kris and your three children, as you leave here, we give you all our very best wishes, and I know and I am confident you will remain engaged in the public debate going forward. But you have earned this departure from the United States Senate. Thank you for your distinguished service to the people of Pennsylvania and to the people of the United States of America. Godspeed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

JAMES M. INHOFE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023—Resumed

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume consideration of the message to accompany H.R. 7776; that notwithstanding rule XXII, it be in order to make motions to concur with the following amendments: Sullivan, 6522; Johnson-Cruz, 6526; that if Senator SULLIVAN makes the motion to concur with amendment, there be up to 60 minutes of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that upon the use or yielding back of the time, the Sullivan motion and motion to refer be withdrawn; the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to concur with Manchin amendment 6513; that upon