The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable Peter Welch, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

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

Let us pray.
Eternal Father, strong to save, whose arms have bound the restless waves, let Your still, small voice echo down time’s corridors to renew our lawmakers and to lift their vision of one Nation guided by Your wisdom. Inspire them to dedicate themselves to eternal values and to be unafraid of the consequences of following the highest standards they know.

Lord, guide them by Your living Word, as You infuse them with the spirit of service. Help them to see that nothing they do can separate them from Your love. Do for them, as You have promised, more than they can ask or imagine.

We pray in Your Holy 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 (Mrs. Murray).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

To the Senate:
Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable Peter Welch, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. Welch 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Orelia Eleta Merchant, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER
The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. Schumer. Mr. President, I hope you had a good birthday yesterday. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Thank you.

DEBT CEILING
Mr. Schumer. Mr. President, decades ago, President Reagan warned that debt ceiling brinksmanship “threatens the holders of government bonds and those who rely on social security and veterans benefit . . . [and] the United States.” He said, “has a special responsibility to itself and to the world to meet its obligations.

If President Reagan were around today, he might well be exiled by a modern Republican Party that in many ways seems dead set—dead set—on abandoning that special responsibility never to default.

We have less than a month to go until we hit June 1. Every day wasted is another day closer to catastrophe. At stake is the well-being of families, retirees, veterans, kids, and the very stability of our economy.

But by ramming the “Default on America Act” through the House—totally partisan, knowing full well this bill can never become law—Speaker McCarthy and the hard right have made the odds of default go up. By handing his gavel over to the hard right, the Speaker is giving the American people two terrible options: either default on the debt or default
on the country, with steep cuts to law enforcement, first responders, veterans, seniors, and even cancer research. Just think how radical such an ultimatum truly is. It is a dramatic break from how both parties have approached default in the past.

On default, a Republican default would crash the economy, increase costs, and kill American jobs. Unemployment would rise to at least 8 percent. Mortgage and car payments would all go up by a lot, while the value of pensions and 401(k)s would come crashing down. That is the future that Speaker McCarthy and the House Freedom Caucus have made more likely by passing the “Default on America Act.”

But the alternative is also a nightmare scenario. If the Republicans’ “Default on America Act” became law, 1 million seniors—1 million seniors—would lose access to Meals on Wheels. These are seniors who literally can’t get food from their own much of the time and rely on others bringing it to them. They would be on the chopping block if the GOP has its way. Deprive seniors who can’t leave their homes of food—what is that about?—so that some very wealthy, wealthy multibillionaires don’t have to pay any taxes? It is outrageous.

Here is another one. The Republican “Default on America Act” would eliminate 30,000 law enforcement jobs across the country. Do you know why that means? Gun violence will get even worse. Our neighborhoods will become less safe. Border security would be deprived of billions in crucial resources. The war on opioids would decline, and more addictions, crimes, and others from opioid use would go up. What is that all about?

Once again, the hard right—totally enthralled by the very wealthy, wealthy few who are so greedy, they don’t want to pay any taxes—say cut things like this. Cut law enforcement. Cut Meals on Wheels.

The “Default on America Act” would shamefully attack our Nation’s veterans, purging 80,000 VA jobs, leaving our Nation’s heroes without the care they have earned throughout a lifetime of service.

These are just three of many. Eliminate Meals on Wheels; greatly hurt our efforts at law enforcement and safety by dramatically cutting, defunding police; greatly—greatly—tying the hands of the VA so that veterans would get worse healthcare and they would have to wait even longer—as if what the Republicans’ “Default on America Act” does. That is why it is dead on arrival—worse healthcare and they would have to pay additional taxes; greatly hurt our neighborhoods; greatly hurt our neighborhoods; greatly hurt our neighborhoods; greatly hurt our neighborhoods. If the Republicans’ “Default on America Act” went into effect, what would it do to our neighborhoods? It would crash the economy, increase costs, and kill American jobs.

Whether it is kicking seniors to the curb, cutting law enforcement jobs, or abandoning our veterans, everything about the “Default on America Act” wreaks of MAGA extremism. So it is no wonder the Republicans did it in secret. It is no wonder that they didn’t want to do what they promised to do: have hearings, have witnesses, have bipartisan discussions and amendments.

But if Republicans won’t level with the American people about their terrible bill, Senate Democrats are going to do it for them. Tomorrow, the Senate Budget Committee will hold a hearing on how the “Default on America Act” would weaken the economy and the hands of stakeholders of jobs. I want to thank Chairman Whitehouse and all the members of the committee for doing the important work of bringing this bill to the public eye because the American people deserve better.

Incredible, tomorrow’s hearing will be the very first hearing in either House that actually looks at what the “Default on America Act” does. Amazing. This huge bill that affects almost every aspect of American life is going to start doing it, and that hearing will be the first, but there will be many others.

As Democrats shine a light on how unserious and extreme the Republican “Default on America Act” is, our view about the path forward remains the same: can’t choose the “Default on America Act”; must avoid the horrors of default; pass a clean bipartisan bill to avert default.

Mr. President, later today, I will join my colleagues and committee chairs at a press conference to talk about the next steps in the Senate’s effort to outcompete the Chinese Government and preserve America’s global leadership in the 21st century.

The Democratic-led Senate has done some important bipartisan work to outcompete the Chinese Communist Party in the areas of infrastructure, CHIPS and Science, and the omnibus bill did some in that regard. But we all know we can’t stop there. We have to build on this progress. This work is critical to our national security. It won’t be enough to outcompete the bad regime in any single area. We must be ready to compete with all of them on all these fronts, and that will require comprehensive and bipartisan legislation.

We must not aid and abet the Chinese Government’s development of advanced technologies—like microchips, 5G, AI, quantum computing, and more—that will shape the course of this century.

We must limit investment capital from flowing to the Xi regime—the Chinese Government—and prevent them from taking advantage of America’s critical assets. We must continue in investing in our workforce and other key technology areas that drive American innovation.

The Chinese Government is not constraining itself in its pursuit to dominate in the 21st century. That is why we have to work together to constrain Chinese potential aggression.

The Chinese Government is not constraining itself in its pursuit to dominate in the 21st century. That is why we have to work together to constrain Chinese potential aggression.

The United States cannot afford to cede its leadership to governments opposed to democracy and individual liberty. We cannot let authoritarianism call the shots in the 21st century. So that is why this bipartisan effort in the Senate will be so important.

The Senate has shown that both sides are capable of working together on this most important issue, and I thank my colleagues who will join me at our press conference later this afternoon.

Mr. President, finally, on Senate business, it is going to be another busy day here on the Senate floor. Later this morning, the Senate will vote on the confirmation of Orelia Merchant, whom I was proud to recommend to President Biden to serve as district judge for the Eastern District of New York. We will also advance the nomination of two more terrific nominees: Wesley Hsu to serve as a district judge for California and LaShonda Hunt to serve as a district judge for Illinois. By the end of this week, the Senate will have moved forward with one circuit judge, Anthony Johnstone, and as many as five new district court judges.

The Senate will continue doing the important work of ensuring the Federal bench is filled with excellent, moderately, and highly qualified judges in the weeks and months to come. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. 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.
leadership, President Biden has simply been MIA.

First, the President said he would not negotiate unless Speaker McCarthy and House Republicans passed their own bill. So they did. Our Republican colleagues in the House passed a responsible bill. It is the only legislation currently in existence that can pass even one Chamber of Congress, let alone both.

Let that sink in.

That is where we are. Senate Democrats and Leader Schumer can give all the angry speeches they want, but they have no bill. Leader Schumer has no plan that can earn 60 votes here in the Senate. He has no solution that can even pass his Chamber, let alone the House. Speaker McCarthy and House Republicans are the only people in Washington who have actually passed legislation to avoid default.

The Senate majority offers plenty of angry speeches and platitudes—but no solution is Presidential leadership. President Biden has been sleepwalking toward this crisis.

It is time to wake up—time to wake up.

The President has two options. He can endorse the responsible bill the House Republicans have already passed and instruct Senate Republicans not to block it in this Chamber or he can finally sit down with Speaker McCarthy and reach an agreement. The Speaker of the House has already announced the grow-your-name’s plan for $40 billion in bipartisan effort to avoid default.

Whatever President Biden and Speaker McCarthy can both agree to will pass the Senate easily. Any bill that doesn’t meet that description appears to have no chance.

So I am glad President Biden has begun backing down and finally advised the Speaker to begin negotiating. I accept his invitation to join the meeting myself, but I will continue to lend my support to the Speaker.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT VOTES

Mr. President, on another matter, today the Senate has two opportunities to roll back this administration’s overreach and redtape.

The first resolution is from our colleague Senator Marshall. It builds on bipartisan efforts to remedy a hugely painful side effect of the Endangered Species Act that is holding American farmers and other small businesses hostage to an animal called the lesser prairie-chicken—the lesser prairie-chicken. Americans in Kansas and Oklahoma were already striking a careful balance between prosperity and conservation without Washington meddling. A voluntary partnership between local landowners and officials had already secured 15 million acres of potential habitat.

Since 2013, the population of this particular bird is in actual up. But the Biden administration wants to pull ahead anyway, throw the book at these Americans, and threaten nearly $14 billion in agricultural production.

The second resolution tackles an issue that is top of the mind for many Senators: winning the economic competition with the Chinese Communist Party.

Last June, President Biden issued an emergency proclamation to halt unfairly traded Chinese solar panels enter U.S. markets without additional tariffs that should have applied. In other words, the Democrats went soft on China for the sake of their Green New Deal daydreams. At the time, President Biden’s Commerce Department was investigating Chinese producers for circumventing solar panel tariffs by rerouting products through other countries.

American workers and manufacturers were counting on the results of that investigation to reestablish a fair and level playing field. In December, a preliminary report did find the Chinese companies had cheated, but the administration threw in the towel and gave China a win.

Today, the Senate can join the House and take bipartisan action to freeze the President’s so-called emergency proclamation and make his administration hold China’s unfair trade practices actually accountable. I hope each of my colleagues will join me in supporting both of these common sense resolutions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. Durbin. Mr. President, the National Institutes of Health here in the Washington, DC, area is the leading health research Agency in the world—in the world. And we are very proud of that fact.

One of the leaders of the NIH, through Presidents of both political parties, was Dr. Francis Collins, who still is part of the Biden administration. But as head of NIH, he really brought the research capacity of that Agency to a historic high.

I visited him about 6 years ago and said: What can I do as a Member of the Senate to help you when it comes to medical research?

He said: Well, the researchers that we count on to come through with the breakthroughs in medical research are never sure what Congress is going to do. Are you going to fund us this year as much money as last year or are you going to cut our budgets? Some of the researchers give up even on promising projects because they are uncertain about the future. He said: The best thing you can do, Senator, is to get 5 percent real growth in the spending at the National Institutes of Health year in and year out.

I said: Dr. Collins, I will take you up on that.

I came back here to the Senate and discovered that the person I needed to win any point of view on this was Republican Senator Roy Blunt from Missouri. He chaired the Appropriations subcommittee, which funded that Agency. So I went to Roy, and I said: Here is what Dr. Collins said. We all respect him. For a man who discovered the human genome, we should respect him. He thinks 5 percent real growth can make a difference.

Roy Blunt, Republican, said: I need to talk to Senator Alexander and another Republican Senator on my side, and you need to make sure Patty Murray is on your side. I said: I am sure she is, but I will double check.

So we put together a team of four of us—two Democrats, two Republicans—and we did it—5 percent real growth in the budget of NIH—about 6 years ago.

The response was positive across the Nation. Researchers said: If this is going to be the future, we are going to stick with our research to see what we can find to help people alleviate suffering.

So our team put together an effort that raised the annual budget of the National Institutes of Health from $30 billion to $40 billion in a bipartisan effort and a good effort. Luckily, some of the research that they had undertaken was of practical value to families across America during the coronavirus pandemic. So we felt pretty good about it.

Medicinal Research

Let me switch to another topic. One of the most insidious diagnoses that a person can get is to learn that they have brain cancer, glioblastoma. There are 40,000 Americans each year who are diagnosed with brain cancer. If we get the research capacity up so we can get that diagnosis—14,000 Americans each year.

Ironically—coincidentally—it seems to have touched this body more than most. It was glioblastoma that took the life of Ted Kennedy and John McCain and one of our great friends in the Democratic cloakroom, Tim Mitch-ell. I don’t know why. I don’t know if that is just a coincidence, but it certainly drove home to all of us what a serious diagnosis this is—glioblastoma, brain cancer.

I am going to delve into territory here where my education has not prepared me. I am a liberal arts major and have a law degree. I will be talking a little about science, but, luckily, I will be reading it to make sure I get it right.

One of the real obstacles to treating brain cancer is what is known as the blood-brain barrier—in human brain you can’t inject—a medicine into an ordinary person, and it will flow through their veins, but it won’t get into the brain. So the treatment of many brain cancers is very basic—surgery—to try to remove the tumor with surgery. But they can’t capture every errant cancer cell that might be flowing through the brain, and eventually, the brain cancer overcomes even surgical attempts. So there has always been a barrier, the blood-brain barrier.

The treatment has been dealing with and trying to find a way to get into the brain with chemotherapy. The good
news is that this morning, it was announced that Northwestern University—which I am proud to represent in the city of Chicago—has made some breakthroughs. If you will bear with me for a moment, I want to make sure I state this properly.

For the first time, previously unusable chemotherapy drugs reached brain tumors in humans after a cutting-edge procedure at Northwestern University team [in Chicago]. Doctors would use the breakthrough, with an innovative mix of ultrasound and microbubbles that opened the blood-brain barrier to allow the drugs to pass through.

Dr. Adam Sonabend, one of the co-lead investigators, said:

"This is a starting point to open the doors for . . . 95% of drugs that are usually not [even] considered for treating brain diseases. The Northwestern team released a report on the use of the procedure to treat 17 patients with glioblastoma, the most common and malignant form of brain cancer that had been viewed as incurable. The treatment led to a four- to sixfold increase in drug concentrations in the patients' brains, the researchers said.

Dr. Sonabend goes on to explain the situation: The blood-brain barrier that blocks many drugs used to treat cancer also blocks the dye that they were using to see if they could finally go through with this procedure. Dr. Sonabend said when he injected the dye while using the new ultrasound procedure, the dye appeared first in the patient's blood vessels, but then it passed the blood-brain barrier and spread into the brain. The patient's brain lit up on the x-ray that was taken during this procedure to show the effectiveness of this approach.

Dr. Roger Stupp, chief of neurooncology at Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine also helped to lead the project. He said that "This is the first trial that has taken it to the next level with chemotherapy drugs" that you ordinarily could not use for brain tumors.

Dr. Sonabend said:

"In glioblastoma patients, cancer cells scattered through the brain surrounding the tumor inevitably linger after surgery. They have been impossible to get to . . ."

Now we have an avenue that might be promising to start dealing in more effective ways, not only with brain cancer but also with Parkinson's and Alzheimer's.

It is amazing to me. It literally made my day to read that story, that these researchers at the National Institutes of Health here in Washington may have finally come through with the ultimate breakthrough that will allow us to treat brain cancer more effectively. Can you imagine the hope this creates in the hearts and minds of so many Americans who have a victim of brain cancer in their family?

Now why do I raise this on the floor other than to tell you, I think, a fascinating and important story? I do it because it is a political issue. We just heard the majority leader of the Senate come forward and tell us that he supports the proposal by the House Republicans on budget cuts.

Do you know what the House Republican budget does to medical research at the NIH?

Let me read it to you. They propose ending the bipartisan commitment to the National Institutes of Health by cutting another $8 billion in 2024. That is 25 percent of the budget for medical research and more than $100 billion over the next 10 years. That will shutter hundreds of labs across the country, lead to fewer drugs being developed for cancer, diabetes, serious mental illness and other devastating conditions. It will decimate American biotechnology innovation and economic growth. Sadly, it will allow China to become the global leader in biomedical R&D.

So when we talk about the budget here and budget cuts and they say: We are just going to cut $10 billion, we have got to step back and say: Well, what does that do for medical research in America? Take a step backwards. I thought that one was dead. I thought that it was called scientific dishonesty—this is the first trial that has taken it to the next level with chemotherapy drugs. So we had a hearing yesterday on the subject. We invited witnesses from the Republican side and the Democratic side to comment on the current state of affairs. If the Chief Justice could not appear or would not appear, we went forward with the investigation, which is our responsibility under the law.

Now asking a Justice of the Supreme Court to come and testify before a congressional committee is not unusual. Ninety-two appearances have been made by Justices of the Supreme Court since 1960 before the committees of Congress. But yesterday, neither the Chief Justice nor any other Justice on the Supreme Court appeared before us. So what we found was a surprise to me. I thought there would be bipartisanism in this, because in the not-too-distant past, two Senators on the committee had crafted an ethics bill on the disclosure of stock holdings, sent not only to the President to sign, but it was embraced as well by the Supreme Court—bipartisan, thoughtful measure, for sure.

But yesterday, I am afraid things were very partisan. First, there was a question as to whether or not this was an attempt to attack the conservative members of the Supreme Court by raising ethical questions. I tried to make a point, several times, that the first letter that I sent to the Chief Justice—
this Chief Justice—on the issue of a code of ethics in the Supreme Court. I delivered on February 13, 2012, during the Obama administration. So this is not some newfound interest. I have been working on it for years. My colleague Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE also has a major part of his Senate career on this issue of ethical standards before the Supreme Court. So the notion that we just invented this because of unhappiness with recent court decisions just doesn’t hold up. No, they have been working on this issue for years—years before any of these decisions were handed down.

There was also an argument that the Congress has no authority to establish standards for the Supreme Court. As I mentioned earlier when we had this stock disclosure law passed last year, it was embraced by the Court. The Court goes through some form of financial disclosure based on the law passed in 1978. By and large, there are many ways that the Congress interfaces with the Supreme Court, not the least of which is its budget. So we are in constant communication with the Court and its operation.

I believe that we clearly have the authority to establish ethical standards in law for the Supreme Court. The Republicans on our committee, to a person, disagree with it.

We also had an argument made that somehow we had singled out Laurence Thomas, a Justice on the Supreme Court, and decided that he was going to be persecuted by this type of inquiry. Well, let me say, the facts that were disclosed about his gift-taking from a Texas billionaire were extraordinary. I think they were a surprise to most people.

Justice Thomas is not denying the fact that he took hundreds of thousands of dollars’ worth of vacations—yacht trips to Indonesia, private aircraft rides, vacation homes, and so forth. He dismissed it and said it was personal hospitality. Personal hospitality does not include transportation, and, of course, this included a lot of the most luxurious transportation imaginable that the Justice received. So to say that this was acceptable conduct, it clearly was to Republicans yesterday, but I think most Americans want to know more about the relationship that would lead a Justice to take hundreds of thousands of dollars’ worth of trips. Not to mention that this same billionaire bought his mother’s home and allowed her to live there afterwards. So that was worth at least $140,000 to the benefit of the Justice’s family again.

There were questions raised throughout as to why we would pick on one conservative Justice. I will tell you, the disclosures that have come out since the Thomas article about the gifts he received from the Texas billionaire have included many members of the conservative majority. And I think a lot of these wouldn’t be put in the conservative category, and questions have been raised.

Questions are raised about Members of Congress all the time, and they should be. I know each year when I disclose my taxes and my net worth in detail, somebody is going to call it into question: Explain this item to me. Explain that item to me. That is part of the responsibility of public service. It is not fun, but it is part of the job. If you want to be a public figure, I think you owe it to the people to be assuring them in every step of the way that you are being honest in the way you discharge your duties.

So we haven’t given up. When it comes to the Senate Judiciary Committee and the issue of ethics, we are far from finished. We had good testimony yesterday from witnesses who I think give us a basis for moving forward in this area.

At the end of the day, we want to make sure that people, as skeptical as they are of politicians, as they have every right to be, believe the institutions that they put their trust in—the Supreme Court or the President’s office—are at least credible and trustworthy. Establishing a fundamental ethical standard that assures that fact is absolutely essential, and the Senate Judiciary Committee will continue in that pursuit.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

the electricity demand, and as the report underscored, that situation is being driven by anti-conventional energy policies.

The Wall Street Journal, which weighed in after the FJR PM report was released, noted that "most of the power plant closures are policy driven." That is what the report says. In other words, powerplants aren't closing because they have reached the end of their operating lives; they are closing because of policies designed to discourage conventional energy.

I have already mentioned the EPA's new good neighbor rule, which could force powerplants in 22 States to close. Then there are things like utility company environmental, social, and governance—or ESG—policies. They are policies that utility companies can voluntarily adopt but that this administration wants to mandate, which the FJR report highlights as a factor in plant closures.

Now it is no overreaching ESG policies that force some of our most reliable energy facilities offline, these facilities are also being replaced with technologies like solar that are inherently intermittent and can't be dispatched in times of high demand.

The Wall Street Journal notes that "Illinois and New Jersey climate policies could reduce generation by 8,900 [megawatts]." That amount of energy would be enough to power 7 million households.

So, in other words, policies that discourage conventional energy are already having an effect and threatening our Nation's energy supply. If the President continues to pursue these types of policies, his Presidency may be remembered not just for a historic inflation crisis but for setting off a long-term energy crisis caused by an unreliable and insufficient energy supply.

Instead of trying to bring about a clean energy future before we have the technology to get us there, the President should be pursuing an "all of the above" energy policy—an energy policy that embraces the full spectrum of available energy sources, both renewable and conventional.

I am a strong supporter of clean energy, like so many of my Republican colleagues, but unlike Democrats, Republicans recognize that our Nation is not yet ready to fully transition to 100-percent zero-emission energy anytime soon no matter how much the administration would like it to. There are a lot of hurdles to be crossed before we can rely solely on clean energy.

So Republicans are committed to supporting both alternative energy and the responsible development and deployment of the conventional energy we need to keep our Nation's energy grid reliable and Americans' energy costs affordable. At the same time, we need look no further than the energy legislation recently passed by the Republican-led House of Representatives, which would advance both responsible conventional energy development and clean energy technologies.

Predictably, the Senate Democrat leader has declared this legislation "dead on arrival" in the U.S. Senate. Democrats are so beholden to the radical environmental wing of their party that anything that doesn't adhere to their Green New Deal orthodoxy isn't up for discussion. But Democrats' opposition is unfortunate, not just because this would help ensure an adequate supply of conventional energy but also—also—because it would help advance alternative energy projects.

Republicans' legislation would tackle permitting delays, which are a leading impediment to energy development, including alternative energy development. Republicans' legislation would also actually help support the electric car development that Democrats are so fond of. It would help ensure the development of critical mineral resources here at home—the same critical minerals that are essential ingredients in electric car batteries.

While I am on the subject of cars, I will say that the President made one right decision on energy last Friday by approving the sale of E15 fuel for this summer. Americans saved $57 million last year thanks to summertime E15 sales. Without that many jobs. It is unfortunate, not just because producers and consumers wanting to pay a heavy price. The President has already ensured that he will be remembered for a historic inflation crisis. He should make sure he isn't also the instigator of a future energy crisis as well.

An "all of the above" energy policy—a policy that embraces both conventional and renewable energy—is essential for keeping energy prices affordable, ensuring the reliability of our Nation's energy supply, and keeping our Nation secure. If the President doesn't start encouraging conventional as well as renewable energy development, consumers and our country are going to pay a heavy price. The President has already ensured that he will be remembered for a historic inflation crisis. He should make sure he isn't also the instigator of a future energy crisis as well.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator PADILLA be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes, followed by Senator KENNEDY for up to 15 minutes, prior to the scheduled rollcall votes.

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

Mr. President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support President Biden's nominee to serve as Secretary of Labor, current Acting Secretary Julie Su.

Julie is a proud Californian and a champion for workers everywhere. She was a tireless advocate for workers in California. I was proud to introduce her before the HELP Committee 2 years ago when she was first nominated to serve as Deputy Secretary of Labor.

I should note that, that year, I was authorized to see Democratic Senator vote to confirm her nomination. In the time since, I think it is perfect to ask, what has happened? I will tell you what has happened. She has gained even more experience in defending workers nationwide and in managing a Federal Department.

As a highly effective Deputy Secretary of Labor and now as Acting Secretary, she has played a critical role in helping the administration add 12.6 million jobs to the American economy, where more jobs can any previous President has achieved in a 4-year term. It is further proof that job creation and strong labor protections are not mutually exclusive. In fact, they go hand in hand in building a strong, resilient economy.

Julie's service and track record come as no surprise, frankly, when you understand where she came from. She is the daughter of immigrants and a native of California. She knows personally the sacrifices that working families make to make ends meet. Her parents worked hard for decades in minimum wage jobs before establishing and growing their own small business. So, yes, colleagues, Julie Su and her family have seen both sides of a paycheck. They instilled in Julie a strong work ethic, which has led her to take on tough fights as a labor lawyer, as labor secretary for the State of California, as Deputy Secretary of the U.S. Department of Labor, and now as Acting Secretary.

I also have to note, as the secretary of the California Labor and Workforce Development Agency—the fifth largest economy in the world and the fourth largest economy in the world—she was a strong manager who led a number of major departments, boards, and panels at the State level. Her experience and qualifications are unmatched. As former Secretary Walsh has said, Julie Su is "a lifelong champion of America's workers."

I will end with this: If confirmed, she would be the first Asian American to serve as a Secretary in President Biden's Cabinet. Millions of Americans will see themselves represented at the highest levels of our government and take pride in her story as a daughter of working-class immigrants.

I was proud to hear her impressive recent testimony in the HELP Committee when I introduced her once again when she was successfully voted out of committee. She is exactly the type of labor champion we need at this critical time.
I urge my colleagues to join me in once again confirming her nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL WONG

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, today, for me, in one particular respect, it is both a day of sadness and a day of pride.

With me on the floor is Mr. Michael Wong and Miss Julia Rose Wong. Thomas is 7. Julia is 5. They are both whip-smart. They are both future leaders of this country and, I hope, of Louisiana. I wish them Godspeed. I thank Thomas, and thank Julia for their years of service to the people of Louisiana. That is the kind of guy he is—a guy who doesn’t think he has all the answers, but when he thinks he is right, by God, he will still go to option C. And they are both cool. They are both happy children.

Now back to their dad.

I say it is a sad day for me because Michael is stepping down from government. It is a happy day because he is going to pursue some very exciting opportunities in the private sector. Michael has been working for the American people and the people of Louisiana for 16 years. Before he worked with me, he worked with Senator David Vitter, and he worked with Congressman Steve Scalise.

Michael has been my State director every single day that I have been a U.S. Senator. Let me tell you, it is a tough job, and it is one of the most important jobs.

As the Presiding Officer knows, we are here in Washington, and our people are back home. A State director has to make sure that their needs are being addressed back home and that their concerns are heard. The State director has to manage our local representatives and make sure that they are representative in all of the different functions I need to do.

In Michael’s case, he is also a valuable source of policy advice. I am going to miss that every day.

Michael has one of the best—maybe, the best—political minds in Louisiana. And he is a nice guy, much nicer than me. I just can’t overstate how important he has been not just to me but to the people of Louisiana.

I said Michael has one of the best political minds. He has one of the best minds, period, not just in terms of policy and politics. But I want to mention the political mind in one respect.

Michael ran my reelection campaign. It was widely considered the best-run campaign I have ever been involved in. I stepped back. Of course, I was the candidate, but as you know, Mr. President, the candidate is only one small part of the campaign. Michael and his team—and I had a great team—they managed everything from the “get out the vote,” their work on the analytics and data—I still don’t understand how they did it—their vote targeting, and their TV commercials.

I had 13 different opponents, and I was expected to win in the first primary. Those weren’t my expectations, necessarily. The media back home would demand that that put pressure on us. It is hard to do when you have got 13 opponents. That was Michael’s responsibility.

I was just hoping to win, period. In the first primary, I was hoping just to get 50 percent plus 1. Michael managed the campaign that returned 62 percent. It was just breathtaking.

I have talked about Michael’s policy chops. I have talked about his policy expertise. I talked about his political acumen. I have talked about the fact that he cares about people. As an aside, a wise person once told me: People don’t care how much you know until they know how much you care.

Michael understood that.

I mentioned Michael’s beautiful family. He has also always made time for his kids and for Jamie, and I know there are times when it has been difficult. But you are a particular attribute, among many, with respect to which I most respect Michael.

He will do the right thing, and he will tell his colleagues in a very tactful way and say: Sir, I know I have told you before, but I am going to tell you again: This is a mistake. This is a mistake.

Michael did that. He avoided a lot of heartbreak—I don’t want to overstate the case, but a lot of heartbreak—for me, for our office, and for the people of Louisiana. That is the kind of guy he is—a guy who doesn’t think he has all the answers, but when he thinks he is right, by God, he will still go to option C.
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The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk reads as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of the XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 127, Wesley L. Hsu, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, John W. Hickenlooper, Margaret Wood Hassan, Gary C. Peters, Mark Kelly, Jack Reed, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Catherine Cortez Masto, Mazie K. Hirono, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeanne Shaheen, Tammy Baldwin, Angus S. King, Jr., Alex Padilla, Robert Menendez, Michael F. Bennet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Wesley L. Hsu, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 46, as follows:

(Rollcall Vote No. 107 Ex.)

YEAS—51

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Fetterman
Gillibrand
Hassan

NAYS—48

Barrasao
Blackburn
Boozman
Braun
Britt
Buck
Capito

WARNER—45

Wyden

YEAS—45

Barrasso
Blackburn
Boozman
Braun
Britt
Buck
Capito
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WARNER—45

Paul
Paul
Risch
Hagerty
Romney
Rounds
Risch
Romney

NAYS—48

Feinstein

Yeov

FEINSTEIN—48

Reed
Hickenlooper
Hirono
Keine
Kelly
King
Klobuchar
Markley
Menendez
Merkey
Murphy
Osbolt
Padilla
Peters

WESTON—48

Daines
Hickenlooper
Hirono
Schach
Schumer
Schumer
Schumer
Collins
Menneness
Merkey
Murphy
Osborn
Pershing
Risch
Sellers
Sellers

COTTON—48

Van Hollen

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk reads the nomination of Wesley L. Hsu, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

DISAPPROVING THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE RELATING TO “PROCEDURES COVERING SUSPENSION OF LIQUIDATION, DUTIES AND ESTIMATED DUTIES IN ACCORD WITH PRESIDENTIAL PROCLAMATION 10414”

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE RELATING TO “ENDANGERED AND THREATENED WILDLIFE AND PLANTS; LESSER PRAIRIE-CHICKEN; THREATENED STATUS WITH SECTION 4(D) RULE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTINCT POPULATION SEGMENT AND ENDANGERED STATUS FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTINCT POPULATION SEGMENT”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to legislative session.

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 9, and the Senate will proceed to the en bloc consideration of H.J. Res. 39, which was received from the House, and S.J. Res. 9, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk reads as follows:
A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 39) disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Commerce relating to “Procedures Governing Suspension of Liquidation, Duties and Duties in Accord With Presidential Proclamation 10414”. A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 9) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Lesser Prairie-Chicken; Threatened Status With Section 4(d) Rule for the Northern Distinct Population Segment and Endangered Status for the Southern Distinct Population Segment”.

Thereupon, the committee was discharged of S.J. Res. 9, and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolutions, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

PERMITTING REFORM

Mrs. CAPITO, Madam President, I rise today to talk on a subject that is of great importance to me and of great importance to employers, workers, consumers, and—really—everyone across this country; and that is, the need for substantive reform of our country’s Federal environmental review and permitting process.

Now, this is a subject I have talked about a lot. I have championed efforts to make sure that our environment and economy benefit from a functional Federal environmental review and permitting process, and I am new and done again leading environmental review and permitting reform efforts through the Environment and Public Works Committee, and I am working with my fellow Republican Senator, who is the ranking member over on Energy and Natural Resources, Senator BARRASSO from Wyoming, and we are working across the aisle with our counterparts.

Permitting reform is much more than just legislative text. It is more than just updates to laws that have been on the books for years or about replacing counterproductive measures implemented by the Biden administration. It is an essential element in giving our Nation what we need to be successful in the future.

Without permitting reform, American energy will continue to be stalled, jeopardizing our security here at home as well as for our allies abroad. Without permitting reform, communities across America will struggle as they are denied access to the good-paying jobs that they need and are capable of doing.

Without permitting reform, America will not build at all. The same country that mined the coal, that made the steel, and that built the democracy and led the way for industry across the world will be held back by endless review processes, continuous and continuing court challenges, and crippling regulations that limit our ability to be the world leader that we know we are.

In the state of West Virginia, which is synonymous with energy generation, we have long seen the negative effects created by a permitting process that is designed to stall rather than to produce or create. There are multiple real-world examples of how our broken environmental review and permitting process is holding up my State of West Virginia’s ability to move forward, and it is impacting multiple sectors important not only to the people of my State but also to our national economy.

In the transportation sector in West Virginia there is Corridor H. Corridor H is a critically important highway that West Virginia needs to help commerce flow and to jump-start the economy in the central part of our State and to encourage our growing tourism industry.

In the manufacturing sector, there is Nucor Steel, an innovative, cutting-edge steel and steel products company that can’t, as yet, build their plant as quickly as the Biden administration keeps creating new emissions guidelines.

And, in the energy sector, there is the Mountain Valley Pipeline, a 304-mile-long natural gas pipeline that is on the brink of completion—over 90 percent completed. Yet it is unable to deliver its contribution to American energy independence due to the regulatory burdens and endless legal challenges that have gone on longer than the actual construction of the pipeline itself.

These are just three examples in the State of West Virginia. Think about the national impact created by outdated permitting processes, the damage inflicted on our communities and our economy, and the opportunities we are losing because of an administration that champions red tape, feeds frivolous lawsuits, and whose Agencies seek to create uncertainty and confusion over permits.

It just doesn’t make sense, quite simply. Even the renewable energy projects and manufacturing efforts central to the Biden administration’s Agencies are being held up in permitting purgatory.

President Biden has long pledged that he will build our country back better. Well, news flash, Mr. President. You can’t “build back better” if you can’t build at all.

The fallout created by a broken environmental review and permitting process further strains our sputtering economy, drives up energy prices for consumers, negates good-paying jobs for hard-working Americans, and, really, jeopardizes our ability to build into the future.

Now, as my constituents in West Virginia would say, well, what are you going to do about it?

Well, from conversations we have already started in the EPW Committee, I will soon be introducing legislation, in tandem with my colleague Senator BARRASSO, that delivers on the environmental review and permitting process reform that our country needs. This legislation will benefit all projects—renewable, conventional, surface transportation, manufacturing, all of the above.

This legislation will mandate enforceable timelines with clear time limits and predictable schedules for environmental review and consequences when Agencies fail to reach these decisions in a timely fashion.

This legislation will fashion guidelines that process and resolve legal challenges to projects expeditiously, instead of creating a sea of endless litigation.

This legislation will actually amend the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and NEPA, and fix the obstacles holding our country back from the prosperity we deserve, while maintaining—of course, maintaining—environmental protections.

I will emphasize, as I have many times in the past, that any tangible, lasting environmental review and permitting solutions must be accomplished through regular order.

Backroom deals will not cut it. In fact, they will only lead to confusion among the American public and buyer’s remorse among the participants.

I have forged the blueprint for bipartisan compromise through the EPW Committee time and time again, and this process should be no different.

I encourage my colleagues in both Congress, on both sides of the aisle, as well as President Biden, to heed the calls from communities across the country on the urgent need for environmental review and permitting reform and to join in our efforts to deliver the modifications that America’s employers, workers, and consumers need.

I look forward to the continued debate on environmental review and permitting reform, while always maintaining our shared goal of moving America forward.

With that, I yield the floor, and I see my colleague—who has been very instrumental in all of this, as we worked together with our colleagues—Senator BARRASSO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BARRASSO?

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, it is a privilege to join my colleague from West Virginia, Senator CAPITO, on the floor today to talk about legislation that we will be introducing tomorrow.

It is about permitting, and I come to the floor to talk about ways to lower prices for American families and to restore our country to energy dominance. And, of course, the way to achieve this is by fixing our broken permitting process.

There is a lot of work to be done. There is bipartisan support to do it. She will be introducing, along with me, our legislation tomorrow, and this legislation is going to streamline a very complicated permitting process. It is going to speed up American infrastructure and energy, as well as mining projects. Taken together, this legislation will address fatal flaws in today’s Federal permitting process.

Now, the current system moves in very slow motion. Too often, as Senator CAPITO said, there is no motion at all.
all. Things are stopped in their tracks. Today's process forces project developers to endure a maze of regulations, mountains of paperwork, expensive studies, and bureaucratic foot-dragging.

It takes an average of 4½ years now just to complete an environmental impact statement for one single project. In some cases, it can take a decade or more to get final approval for a project. And even if a project makes it through the regulatory roadblocks to get a permit, it will inevitably be challenged in court. Project opponents are skilled at exploiting our broken permitting process to stop all progress. Litigation can drag on for years and cost millions and millions of dollars.

In my home State of Wyoming, activists are suing to cancel hundreds of Federal oil and gas permits. Now, these permits were issued after years of environmental reviews. They are frivolous—the lawsuits—but they are happening all across the country.

The longer it takes to get a permit, the more a project costs. The more it costs, the more likely a developer will either pull the plug or just give up before even starting.

The result of all of this is that energy prices go up. People feel the pain because when investments aren't made, jobs don't materialize and projects of national importance don't get built.

And I am talking about projects like oil and gas wells, pipelines, transmission lines, wind and solar farms, powerplants, roads, tunnels, bridges, and mines.

To see what I mean, take a look at this chart from the Economist, "Cancel culture." It shows that, for the past several years, more miles of interstate gas pipelines have been canceled than have been built.

Let me repeat that.

This shows that, for the past several years, more miles of interstate gas pipelines have been canceled than have been built.

You know, we used to be able to build things in this country—not anymore. It is not that we don't know how. It is that we are not being allowed.

It shouldn't take longer to permit a project than to actually build it. In too many cases, it does. The American people inevitably lose when that happens.

The permitting process must change so we can lower costs for families and unleash American energy. We can't keep today's broken process and expect to stay ahead of rivals like China.

Taken together, the legislation that Senator CAPRRO and I are introducing is going to streamline the permitting process while preserving environmental standards. This will put America back in the lead.

Projects developers need to expect a system that is predictable and delivers a timely answer. Our legislation will do that by sticking to four basic principles.

First, real reform must benefit the entire country, not a narrow range of special interests. Our bills are technology and fuel neutral. By that, we mean we don't put our thumb on the scale for politically favored technologies. This is going to trim projects from both conventional and alternative energy sources. We need all the energy here in America.

Second, our legislation includes enforceable timelines with specific time limits on environmental reviews.

Third, we place time limits on legal challenges to prevent endless litigation intended solely to kill new energy projects.

And finally, our legislation prevents the executive branch from hijacking the process to meet its own policy preferences.

The energy bill that I am going to introduce focuses on streamlining permitting to produce more of America's energy and more American mineral resources. It is going to lower costs for families. It is going to enhance America's energy security. It is going to reduce reliance on China, on Russia, and on other adversaries for energy, as well as key minerals.

A key aspect of my energy bill is to resume Federal onshore and offshore oil and gas leases. Now, the Biden administration has tried to block access to Federal lands and waters, regardless of the law. We cannot allow any administration to deny, delay, and disregard the law.

My bill will also speed up the production of critical minerals used in renewable and battery technologies. Our country is blessed with large mineral deposits. Some are in your home State, Madam President, and in my home State, in Wyoming, in particular.

We have uranium, rare earths, and other minerals. Yet it often takes over 10 years in the United States to get a mining permit. Our competitors in China move much faster, as do our northern neighbors in Canada.

Unlocking domestic mining means that we will no longer have to rely on China and Russia for critical minerals. Finally, my bill will ensure the afford ability and reliability of our electric grid. We will have American energy that is affordable, that is reliable, and that is available.
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years. How does that help the country? How does that help my State? How does that help workers? It doesn’t. The only people who like that are the far-left environmental groups and Xi Jinping and Putin, who want to make sure America can’t build its own infrastructure.

So what has happened is the National Environmental Policy Act—NEPA, as we call it—has been abused. It was a great idea when it was passed in the late 1960s. It required builders to engage with the public, consider the environmental impacts of important projects. But back then, it was usually a couple of hundred pages, a NEPA review that would take about a year. Now that is several thousand pages. It takes several years for the NEPA process to move forward.

We have, again, some of our great leaders in our building trades. This is James Callahan, general president of the International Operating Engineers. Here is what he said recently on a piece of legislation that I moved forward last year, a CRA on a permitting issues:

Since its modest beginning, NEPA has evolved into a massive edifice, capable of destroying project after project—

Destroying, not helping—

job after job, in virtually every sector of the economy.

Whether it is the permitting bill that Senator CAPITO and Senator BARRASSO have done such a great job in leading; whether it is my Rebuild America Now Act, which is a major reform of the NEPA process—by the way, the vast majority of the building trades in America, the men and women who build things, support my legislation.

We need permitting reform. It is that simple. When you talk to a Governor in pretty much any State, whether they are Democrat or Republican; when you talk to a mayor, Democrat or Republican—it doesn’t matter—they say: We have to fix our broken permitting system.

We had a hearing on airport infrastructure in the Commerce Committee several years ago. The head of the Seattle-Tacoma Airport was testifying. They had just built a new runway at Sea-Tac.

I asked him: How long did it take to build that runway?

In the hearing, he said: Three to four years.

I said: Well, that seems a little long, but I am not in construction, so I don’t know exactly, but it seems a little long to build a new runway. How long did it take you to get the permits from the Federal Government to build that runway?

I didn’t know the answer, but I am obsessed with this topic because it is killing our country. It is really hurting working men and women, like James Callahan, one of our great union leaders.

This witness looked at me—the head of the Sea-Tac Airport—when I asked him: How long did it take to get the permits?

He said: Senator SULLIVAN, 15 years.

Fifteen years to get a permit to build a new runway. You could hear the entire hearing room just kind of collectively groan because everybody knows it is bad for America.

Then he said: Senator, with the time it took to get the permits—15 years—and the time it took to get the permits—15 years—almost 20 years.

The ancient Egyptians would have built the Pyramids by then. This is killing us. Everybody knows it. This should be a bipartisan issue.

I will end with this: Last year, I was proud to lead the efforts on what is called a Congressional Review Act, CRA. What it was for was—we passed the bipartisan infrastructure bill. We got some OK permitting reform in there—not as much as I wanted, but it was not bad. So that was good. I voted for the bill. It wasn’t perfect. But then the Biden administration White House, at the behest of the far-left radical enviros, issued rules on permitting that were undermining its own bipartisan infrastructure bill. The CEQ put out rules that would make it much harder to build things in America—not just energy projects, all projects. It was crazy.

So I introduced a Congressional Review Act resolution to rescind the Biden rule driven by the far-left radical enviros. Here is the good news: My CRA passed in a bipartisan way on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Over 40 groups, including farmers, ranchers, people who build things, all the building trades in America, all the unions—this collective group of over 40 groups representing millions of Americans who build stuff, who farm things, who grow things, all came and said: We support the Sullivan Congressional Review Act.

That is what we should be doing now. The Barrasso-Capito bill; Senator MANCHIN introduced his permitting legislation—all we know is the right thing to do.

To my Democratic colleagues: Listen to the men and women who build stuff. Listen to the men and women who grow things. Don’t listen to the far-left radical enviros who don’t want any permitting reform because they love to crush projects. Be courageous. Vote with us on the permitting reform that everybody in America knows we need.

I yield the floor.

Mr. RICKETTS. Madam President, I rise today to join my colleagues in calling for the need for permitting reform for our Federal Agencies. The current system we have right now is in dire need of reform. It takes too long and costs taxpayers too much money.
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Offutt Air Force Base is very important. Not only does it house the 55th Wing, but it also is the home of Strategic Command, which controls our nuclear forces.

They went about the process of getting the levees raised. But the Army Corps of Engineers took 6 years—6 years—to grant the permit. The permit was granted, and construction was set to begin in March of 2019.

March 2019 was also the same month that Offutt Air Force Base was damaged. Floodwaters covered the runway and damaged over a dozen buildings. Ultimately, the cost to the U.S. taxpayers was nearly $1 billion. If the Army Corps of Engineers had only given the permit in 4 years—which, by the way, still would have been horrible service—those levees would have been built up, and we could have avoided nearly $1 billion in damage.

We need permitting reform. It is that simple. We have a crisis on our hands. And while these levees would have been built up, this is a longer-term crisis. It is the American taxpayers who are paying the price for the Biden administration White House, at the behest of the far-left radical enviros, issuing rules on permitting that were undermining the Sullivan bipartisan infrastructure bill. The CEQ put out rules that would make it much harder to build things in America—not just energy projects, all projects. It was crazy.

So I introduced a Congressional Review Act resolution to rescind the Biden rule driven by the far-left radical enviros. Here is the good news: My CRA passed in a bipartisan way on the floor of the U.S. Senate. Over 40 groups, including farmers, ranchers, people who build things, all the building trades in America, all the unions—this collective group of over 40 groups representing millions of Americans who build stuff, who farm things, who grow things, all came and said: We support the Sullivan Congressional Review Act.

That is what we should be doing now. The Barrasso-Capito bill; Senator MANCHIN introduced his permitting legislation—all we know is the right thing to do.
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Fifteen years to get a permit to build a new runway. You could hear the entire hearing room just kind of collectively groan because everybody knows it is bad for America.
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I will end with this: Last year, I was proud to lead the efforts on what is called a Congressional Review Act, CRA. What it was for was—we passed the bipartisan infrastructure bill. We got some OK permitting reform in there—not as much as I wanted, but it was not bad. So that was good. I voted for the bill. It wasn’t perfect. But then the Biden administration White House, at the behest of the far-left radical enviros, issued rules on permitting that were undermining its own bipartisan infrastructure bill. The CEQ put out rules that would make it much harder to build things in America—not just energy projects, all projects. It was crazy.
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takes to issue those green sheets by 51 percent, down to just 3 days. What that does is it then allows the contractor to get in the field and start building our roads faster, employing people faster.

When you have a regulatory environment where people know they can keep that certainty, it helps businesses. In fact, Yahoo said they invested $20 million in Nebraska because they knew they would have that regulatory certainty in our State because we focused on good customer service.

We are struggling to build the infrastructure we need to achieve energy dominance, to bridge the digital divide, and to bring good-paying, reliable manufacturing jobs back to our shores.

The problem is, right now, on average, it currently takes, on average, than it does to actually construct a project. This uncertainty not only drives up the cost of future projects, it is currently expected to take more than 55 Tribes, and completed a 1,261-page environmental assessment before it went into operation. Yet litigation continued following the Federal approval and completion of the pipeline.

For a quarter of projects, it can take 6 years or more to complete an environmental impact statement. That is beyond unacceptable. Increasing reliance on the Chinese Communist Party and supporting their malign actions is a nonstarter.

We need to have the same sort of permitting reform at the Federal Government. In the State of Nebraska, we use Lean Six Sigma, which is a process of proven methodology to be able to do our permitting reform. Our Federal Agencies can do something similar.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BUD. Madam President, I rise today to highlight the desperate need to cut red tape and to get America building again. When I go all around North Carolina and I meet with builders and contractors, I am told by them that it is too hard to build and to complete critical projects in the United States and in North Carolina right now.

We are struggling to build the infrastructure we need to achieve energy dominance, to bridge the digital divide, and to bring good-paying, reliable manufacturing jobs back to our shores.

The primary stumbling block in this effort is one of our government’s own making. Radical environmental groups are going well beyond what is necessary to ensure a clean environment. They are weaponizing the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, to indefinitely delay critical projects by filing frivolous lawsuits.

The military is one of our government’s own making. Radical environmental groups are going well beyond what is necessary to ensure a clean environment. They are weaponizing the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, to indefinitely delay critical projects by filing frivolous lawsuits.

Now, I hail from a State that cares deeply about the environment, clean air, clean water, a livable planet. I believe Americans of all political stripes share that goal. However, the changing dynamics of global commerce and the global threat environment require Congress to make it easier to secure our energy security, to export our vast energy resources to keep our allies’ energy safe, and to give our industries a chance to compete against China.

What Congress must do is to add a “stop clock,” if you will, to NEPA review, by giving opportunities for repetitious lawsuits that cause these very important projects to sit idle. We should follow the example of our House colleagues and pass legislation focused on unleashing American gas and oil production, expanding our capacity to export liquefied natural gas, and easing the path for other forms of energy like nuclear to come online and to keep America competitive in the 21st Century global economy.

I stand ready to work with all of my colleagues on solutions to get America back in the business of building large projects and selling large problems. I yield the floor.

Mr. BUDD. Madam President, the current permitting process in the United States is as outdated as that seventies’ shag carpet in your grandma’s house. It is true. A lot has changed since that old “rug,” known as the National Environmental Policy Act, was installed in 1970. Today, the Democrats like to preach that America is ready for the green energy revolution, but the facts just don’t line up. Case in point: More than 32 percent of projects currently backlogged in the permitting process are solar and wind projects.

Just last week in a Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, Secretary of Energy Jennifer Granholm promised that our DOD, Department of Defense, could make our entire military fleet electric vehicles by 2030—all of them electric by 2030, just a little under 7 years from now.

I pressed her on how in the world our Pentagon could accomplish this in that short timeframe and, frankly, why it is a top priority for our Nation’s military in the first place.

Folks, right now, China—China—controls the EV supply chain. The communist regime produces about 75 percent of all lithium-ion batteries that power those electric vehicles.

Over 70 percent of the cobalt mining occurs in the Democratic Republic of Congo, done by child labor. The remainder of the cobalt primarily comes from CCP-owned firms. To mine all of these minerals, China relies on slave labor.

This is absolutely unacceptable. Increasing reliance on the Chinese Communist Party and supporting their malign actions is a nonstarter.

In my exchange with Secretary Granholm in this Armed Services Committee meeting, she tried to tout the President’s “Invest in America” agenda, saying: 150 battery companies have announced they are coming or expanding to the United States to do business. That does sound great, right?

Well, these businesses are in for a real treat. The big hand of Washington, guided by the Biden administration, is ready and waiting to prevent these businesses from actually mining, procuring, and processing minerals needed for their batteries right here at home. The problem is, right now, on average, it takes 4½ years to simply get an environmental impact statement.

When the permitting process takes longer than the actual building process, that should raise a red flag. Let’s remove the red tape. The best strategy to confront our growing energy needs is to utilize the abundance of energy-producing natural resources that our country was blessed with and encourage alternative energy production methods. By increasing the use of renewable resources, like Iowa biofuel, and building on the advances in energy efficiency, we have the ability to pursue an energy strategy right here in America that creates jobs, lowers costs, and reduces our dependence on foreign enemies like China. New clean energy projects bring economic benefits and jobs to rural areas, including my home State of Iowa.

The Biden administration claims to “build back better,” but in today’s reality, we simply can’t build anything. It is time we pass commonsense permitting reform and get Washington bureaucrats out of the way.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I am asking unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I join my colleagues today to discuss the need to reform our Nation’s broken Federal permitting process.

Today, it often takes longer to navigate the Federal permitting process than it does to actually construct a project. It currently takes, on average, 4½ years or more to complete an environmental impact statement, or EIS. For a quarter of projects, it can take 6 years or more to complete an environmental impact statement. That is because some radical environmental groups have really weaponized the National Environmental Policy Act, NEPA, and they are exploiting what has become a more and more opaque and convoluted Federal permitting process. This uncertainty not only drives up the cost of future projects, it is being applied to projects currently permitted in good faith.

Take, for instance, the Dakota Access Pipeline, which has been operating safely for nearly 6 years in its transport of over a half a million barrels of crude oil per day from North Dakota—light sweet crude—and from the Fort Berthold Reservation and the Three Affiliated Tribes. It takes it to market, and it is used in our country to fuel our economy. The Army Corps held 389 meetings, conferred with more than 55 Tribes, and completed a 1,261-page environmental assessment before the pipeline went into operation. Yet litigation continued following the Federal approval and completion of the project. The Army Corps is currently expected to take more than 4 years to complete a full environmental impact statement for about
two-tenths of a mile, crossing under the Missouri River. Subjecting a completed $3.78 billion project to litigation without reasonable limits cannot be the new normal.

Delays and uncertainty drive up the costs of projects, and opponents are exploiting a more and more complicated permitting process so that delay becomes defeat. American consumers are paying the price for this regulatory uncertainty, particularly through higher energy costs.

Increasing the supply and lowering the cost of energy is key to attacking inflation because the cost of energy is built into every other good and service consumed across our economy. To accomplish this goal, the Biden administration needs to take the handcuffs off American energy producers and work with us on bipartisan permitting reform.

A good first start would be for the Senate to consider H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Costs Act, which recently passed the House on a bipartisan vote. H.R. 1 includes comprehensive permitting reforms that will unleash more American energy and make it more efficient and affordable to deliver energy to our Nation.

H.R. 1 also includes three pieces of legislation that I have introduced in the Senate.

First, the North American Energy Security Act brings certainty to the permitting process for cross-border energy pipelines and electric transmission line projects and prevents the President from taking unilateral action in canceling vital energy projects like he did with the Keystone XL Pipeline.

Second, the Promoting Interagency Coordination for Review of Natural Gas Projects Act streamlines the review process for interstate natural gas pipelines and LNG projects, helping to move more natural gas to areas that need it the most.

Third, the Bureau of Land Management Mineral Spacing Act improves the permitting process in States like North Dakota with a split mineral estate where the Federal Government owns no surface acreage—none of the surface acres—and has a minority interest in the minerals underneath.

The United States is fortunate to have abundant and affordable reserves of coal, oil, and gas, and U.S. energy companies are global leaders when it comes to producing more energy with less energy consumption.

Inflation Reduction Act

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Ms. LUMMIS. Madam President, our Federal permitting process is broken.

Back home in Wyoming, important infrastructure and energy projects are oftentimes delayed years due to mountains of regulation, redtape, bureaucracy, and even lawsuits. This is absolutely unacceptable. It is impossible for the small businesses and jobs to ever get off the ground thanks to these hurdles.

It is time to reform our Federal permitting process, and I am glad some of my colleagues from across the aisle are coming around to the idea of permitting reform. Some on the left are finally warming up to reform to try to push renewable energy projects.

Permitting reform needs to address all types of energy technologies, fuel, and electricity. We desperately need in this country so that we don’t need to import rare earth minerals we desperately need in this country so that we don’t have to rely on places like China and the Republic of the Congo. But this man is going to retire because he is ready to retire, and this process is still ongoing.

All that time, all that money, all that energy is being reduced to nothing because a process has taken the place of mining the rare earth minerals we desperately need in this country.

I applaud Senator SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO’s leadership in addressing meaningful permitting reform. Her legislation will provide regulatory certainty to States and stakeholders, codify environmental regulatory reforms, and expedite permitting and review processes.

I am especially excited about the idea of allowing States to take on more of the shared workload when it comes to permitting, particularly under the Endangered Species Act.

I look forward to the Senate taking up this bill and providing much-needed permitting reform.

I yield the floor. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, 8 months ago, we passed the Inflation Reduction Act. When a major bill is passed, its effects are not immediate, but that is not the case with this legislation.

Since the IRA was signed into law, more than 100 clean energy projects have been announced. These include solar, wind, hydrogen power, battery manufacturing, electric vehicle development, and clean tech investments. If it seems like I am excited, it is because I am. They are in rural areas, in major cities, and everywhere in between, and in more than 30 States, from Idaho to Louisiana, to Ohio, to Arizona. Collectively, these projects have created more than 100,000 new jobs for electric projecting a multiplier effect of 1.6 dollars in private sector investment for every dollar of public spending, even the most optimistic predictions about the IRA’s impact seem low now. A Credit Suisse report analyzing the bill estimates that we will see double the amount of clean energy that the bill was initially projected to accomplish—double the amount of clean energy. A new analysis from Goldman Sachs puts the impact even higher: triple the amount of clean energy that we were contemplating.

This shift is already happening in Colorado, where it is seeing a rapid expansion in clean energy development.

Dr. Richardson, who runs a business in electrifying homes with heat pumps and induction wiring, said about the change that “we are having a hard time keeping up with the demand. The Inflation Reduction Act has been a monumental windfall.”

In Michigan, the State’s manufacturing background and embrace of electric vehicles could lead to as many as 34,000 new clean energy jobs. According to researcher Aaron Brickman, “There’s a strategy, there’s a plan, and the benefits are already being seen. . . . Michigan is poised for an economic boom.”
In Texas, a massive $4 billion investment to create the country’s largest green hydrogen facility was recently announced. It will also generate 1.4 gigawatts of wind and solar, enough to power nearly 750,000 homes. In the world of Green, it is a win for President Biden, but what is behind the investment? “It will be competitive on a world scale while bringing significant tax, job, and energy security benefits to Texas.”

That is really what the IRA entails: new jobs, energy security, and a cleaner planet.

But there is an opponent to this progress. The opponent is the fossil fuel industry. They have gotten rich digging up oil and burning coal for generations, but now we are seeing the energy of the future that is not fossil fuels. They know that they have lost, so the industry and its supporters are attempting to stall this progress by throwing whatever they can find at it. They are pursuing litigation. They are pushing the idea—“not in my backyard.” They are trying to stop clean energy projects through the State public utility and public service commissions. They are attempting to hijack the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. Through this CRA, they are trying to grind solar manufacturing to a halt.

So, if you hear this debate around this particular Congressional Review Act resolution, which we are contemplating today, it is not actually about this. There is a bigger story here, and the story is this: We finally took climate action that wasn’t small. We finally took an action that was equal to the opportunity for the United States, the solar industry employs a quarter of a million workers. It is a big deal. These are well-paying jobs in an industry that saves families money on their electric bills and decreases our carbon footprint—decreases our carbon footprint. So, of course, fossil fuel forces oppose it, and that is what we are stuck with now.

This fossil fuel attack, through this CRA, if successful, would lead to more than a billion dollars in retroactive duties on American solar companies. It would cost us 30,000 jobs. It would cost us $1.2 billion in domestic investment. It would lead to the cancellation of 4 gigawatts of solar projects. And it would create an increase of 42 million metric tons of CO₂. So, of course, the fossil fuel industry is against all of that. It is for the duties. It is against the jobs. It is against the investment. It is against the solar projects. And it couldn’t care less about CO₂.

The problem that we have here is that we are in a race against time to solve the climate problem before it gets out of hand.

In this town and in this building, one of the most dangerous things that we face is groupthink. The current groupthink is that climate change is a manageable problem; it won’t get out of control. I deeply believe that to be true. I think climate change is extremely dangerous—dangerous to our economy, dangerous to our ecosystems, and dangerous to our well-being.

We are having hearings in the Budget Committee that would cause some of those dangers—the danger of a coastal property values crash that is going to be worse than the 2008 mortgage meltdown; the danger of a similar property values crash in the West, where wildfire risk will have the same effect on properties; the danger of an insurance meltdown because nature won’t let insurance companies predict things any longer safely, so they can’t ensure the risks any longer because they can’t predict, and you have a retraction of the insurance market and all of what that means.

Last of all, we have got a huge carbon bubble that we have been repeated and is going to pop whenever it does. U.S. fossil fuel assets will be stranded, their value will go to zero, and there will be an enormous global economic dislocation.

These are ideas so they line up been put forward by huge insurance company executives, by Freddie Mac, by people who study the risk in wildfire areas, by the major sovereign banks of the world. Serious grownups are warning of this.

Up against those serious grownups, we have got the creepy front groups of the fossil fuel industry denial machine continuing to put poison and nonsense out into our ecosystem, into our mental and political ecosystem. That has to stop.

Groupthink is dangerous enough. More dangerous, there is a subgroup in the House and in the Senate that has stopped thinking entirely and is just taking marching orders from the fossil fuel industry. The conflict of interest could not be more apparent. It is obvious and plain on its face. Yet the money is there. The political dark money pours in, so they will follow them right off the cliff like lemmings. That is even more dangerous than groupthink.

Last, this is not the only game that is being played by our fossil fuel industry. It is just taking marching orders from the fossil fuel industry. The conflict of interest could not be more apparent. It is obvious and plain on its face. Yet the money is there. The political dark money pours in, so they will follow them right off the cliff like lemmings. That is even more dangerous than groupthink.

More dangerous, there is a subgroup in the House and in the Senate that has stopped thinking entirely and is just taking marching orders from the fossil fuel industry. The conflict of interest could not be more apparent. It is obvious and plain on its face. Yet the money is there. The political dark money pours in, so they will follow them right off the cliff like lemmings. That is even more dangerous than groupthink.
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The fossil fuel industry can’t stand it, so they are trying to break the rules of the market. They are trying to undo ESG. They want the government to intervene in what corporations are doing to protect their shareholders and tell them the truth about market risk consistent with their fiduciary obligation. They want to break every step in that chain to protect their continued ability to pollute.

So watch this ESG nonsense. The anti-ESG, so-called woke corporatism, is a Broadway theatrical production, minus being on Broadway and being in a theater. But it has actors paid for by the fossil fuel industry. It has script writers who are telling them what to say. It has directors and producers who are driving the show behind the scenes. It is an operation. It is a fake. It is a piece of political theater, and we have to be willing to push back against that, because you can’t take these kinds of chances with the climate risks that are now facing us.

By the way, this objection to ESG, it is never about the “g.” It is never about the “e.” It is always about the “o.” It is always about carbon emissions. That is a telltale as to who is behind the anti-ESG political operation that is ongoing in America right now.

I hope we have a strong vote to knock this down. I am delighted that President Biden is going to veto this. This would be self-harm if we were to allow this to happen to our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I rise today to talk about the solar tariff CRA, which, unfortunately, is misguided and is going to have a devastating impact on States like Nevada, as you well know.

H.J. Res. 39 to end the pause on solar tariffs is really a misguided effort that will not only cripple our Nation’s solar industry but kill thousands of American jobs.

Our country is in a position to lead the rest of the world in clean energy production, including solar development. States like Nevada are building up our solar capabilities and creating thousands of new jobs that support working families and, yes, creating more solar jobs. We need to continue that process, but we need to expand our supply of solar panels and cells. Just having this vote this afternoon will have a negative impact on the solar industry—the solar energy industry. Listen, when the threat of these tariffs was originally looming—just the threat of them back then—75 percent of domestic solar projects experienced cancellations or delays because of that threat, as we heard it from the projects in the pipeline. That is a sign of what is to come if this misguided effort is successful. Nevada has the No. 1 solar economy in the country, which has created nearly 9,000 good-paying jobs, many of them union jobs. But if we lift the pause on our solar tariffs, those jobs will be in danger. And I won’t stand for it. I know the Presiding Officer won’t stand for it. And it is not just in Nevada. It is not just blue States or red States. These tariffs would risk the jobs of the 225,000 Americans who work in solar through the United States or, as my colleague on the other side of the aisle still want to go ahead with this resolution.

Let me just say, Texas, for example, has over 10,000 jobs that would be endangered by these tariffs. North Carolina could see its nearly 7,000 solar jobs be jeopardized. And there are close to 12,000 Floridians working in the solar industry whose jobs would be at risk.

There is no justifiable reason to move forward with this resolution that would hurt jobs in our own States. I agree that we need to stay competitive with the Chinese Government, but if we implement these tariffs, three-quarters of our solar deployment would stop. That would cede our leadership to the Chinese Government. It would hurt our domestic manufacturing. And our working families, most importantly, would pay the price. And we just can’t let that happen.

We need to support American leadership in the solar industry. We need to be protecting our working families and, yes, creating more solar jobs. That is why I am going to be urging my colleagues to vote no on this irresponsible and harmful resolution.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I am so delighted that the Presiding Officer is in the Chair—the Senator from Nevada—who has led this fight on the floor against this incredibly counterproductive measure that the Senator from Florida has brought here—incredibly, in the name, somehow, of being tough on China.

I have seen lots of things on this floor that didn’t make sense. I have seen lots of things where I have wondered about the judgment of people who were pursuing something allegedly in the interests of the American people, allegedly in the interests of American jobs, allegedly in the interests of manufacturing, allegedly because we want to be tough on China.

I have never seen something as counterproductive as this, and I want to thank the Presiding Officer for her leadership because she comes from Nevada and I come from Colorado, and we know the jobs that are at stake here—tens of thousands of jobs that could go away—a billion dollars of tariffs, of taxes that our solar industry would have to pay as they are going out of business because of what thebusterator from Florida is trying to do in the name of being tough on the Chinese.

So let’s talk about that for a second. Let’s think about who is actually being tough on the Chinese. One of the benefits of the way the Chinese are organized—well, they see it as a benefit; I don’t see it as a benefit, but they do—is that they don’t live in a democracy; they live in a totalitarian society. In that totalitarian society, they can make 10-year plans. Xi can say: This is what we are going to do for the next 5 years. This is what we are going to do for the next 10 years. And I would argue that, for the 20 years that we were spending fighting those two wars in the Middle East that we probably shouldn’t have been fighting for those 20 years, the Chinese were marching along and marching along and marching along, stealing our intellectual property and developing new industries and new technologies. We had our eye off the ball.

One of the things that is hard about democracy is that sometimes we can’t respond as much likley between two elections—or one election, if we are really being pathetic. But, recently, there has been a different approach here. Recently, there has been a different approach in the infrastructure that was passed a couple of years ago that was bipartisan. It was the first infrastructure bill of any significance since Eisenhower was our President.

We finally said: Do you know what? We need to start investing in our country again.

And all over Nevada, all over Colorado, Americans are working on our
roads and bridges—long overdue—as a result of bipartisan work. Republicans and Democrats working together.

There was another bill that we passed that was the semiconductor legislation, the so-called CHIPS Act. Some people remember—I certainly do—when I was in college, Ronald Reagan was the President of the United States. And back then, Madam President, for some reason, everybody thought that it was a good idea to ship everything to Southeast Asia to get it made there, that it would be a good idea to ship it to China and have it made there. That is kind of what Ronald Reagan’s view of the world was.

And I regret the fact that we went down that road for decades. Now that CHIPS bill—that semiconductor bill—that is the first piece of legislation since Ronald Reagan was President that said: Stop it. We are going to bring an industry back to the United States. We are going to bring the semiconductor industry back here.

And, by the way, I hope that is not the last. I hope that is only the first. But it sure made sense to start with semiconductors because 90 percent of the most important semiconductors in our fighter jets are made in Taiwan, 110 miles off the coast of China. Ninety percent of the semiconductors in our surface ships and in our submarines are made in Taiwan, 110 miles off the coast of China. What could possibly go wrong? Yet Democrats and Republicans working together said: We are going to bring that back.

Well, we had another bill, Madam President, that I regret didn’t get any Republican votes. I wish that it had. I really do wish that it had because that bill had two pieces. One was healthcare, and one was energy.

In the healthcare piece, we cut drug prices for seniors. We said we are going to cap them at $2,000. We said Medicare is going to negotiate drug prices on behalf of the American people for the first time. And in the meantime, we have got tens of thousands of people who are swinging hammers in Nevada and Colorado and all across this country, who are climbing ladders and getting up on roofs to install solar panels to make sure that we are driving away from our reliance on fossil fuels and into a world where we are relying on wind and the Sun.

And the minute that the Biden administration did this, companies in Colorado started to say: We are going to go out of business. Companies in Nevada and New Mexico said: We are going out of business. The capital that was investing in them went away.

This isn’t hypothetical. This was happening. This is what they were saying to me and I know they were saying to the Presiding Officer: We are going to go bankrupt as a result of this policy.

We are going bankrupt as a result of this policy. We can’t sell enough solar panels here in America. We can’t install enough solar panels. We can’t hire enough people. And now our own country is saying we are going to bring this to an end.

We went to the White House, and we said: We can’t do this to tens of thousands of people all across our country. We can’t do this if you are committed to fighting climate change. We can’t do this if you are committed to the union workers who are installing all of those panels all over the United States.

I remember a phone call with the Presiding Officer, with the White House, where I said: This is a matter of days, not months. To their credit, they came back, and they said: You guys were right. We need to put a moratorium in place. We need to have 2 years where we can have a transition to, you know, give us the chance to start manufacturing these panels here in America.

It is amazing to have people that are strategic in our democracy, to be able to say: You know what, we passed a law—the Inflation Reduction Act—that is going to put us in the position of being able to manufacture these solar panels here, which Ronald Reagan and all those people should never have sent to China to begin with. So we are going to bring them back, but it is going to take us a little time.

In the meantime, we are going to adopt a set of policies that are going to allow the small businesses that are installing solar all over Nevada, all over Colorado, all over this country—we are going to not just allow them, we are going to celebrate the fact that they are there, and we are going the support them and give them notice.

We are going to act strategically with respect to our competition with China. And that is what we did. The competition of the CHIPS Act and the Inflation Reduction Act—that is probably the most strategic we have been around here in decades—in decades. And now comes the Senator from Florida, who says: I am going to blow this up. I am going to compete with China by destroying the solar industry in the United States.

That doesn’t sound like competing to China. That sounds like surrender, to me. That sounds like waving the white flag, to me.

In all the history of self-inflicted wounds around here, that is just the latest example. And don’t get me started on that, although I will just say parenthetically, why anybody in this chamber or in that chamber would think this is the moment in American history to raise interest rates on the American people, on home buyers, and on people who have car loans and people who are paying student debt, I don’t know. But that is not the topic we are here for today. But it is almost nuts, especially when the status quo is going to be so great for America because the status quo is, we are going to spend the next 2 years continuing to install solar panels. We are going to spend the next 2 years standing up manufacturing all across the United States of America. I hope a bunch of that is going to be in Colorado so we are building and manufacturing these solar panels here.
So what I would say is, if you are voting with the Senator from Florida, don’t do it because you are competing somehow with the Chinese. You are surrendering to the Chinese. If you are doing it because you think that we got taken to the cleaners by the Chinese in terms of manufacturing of solar panels to begin with, I acknowledge that, but that wasn’t the Biden administration’s fault. They are the ones who are trying to bring it back. They are the ones who are bringing it back, just like the ones who brought the semiconductor industry back.

We have an incredible opportunity to go forward here, to grow the industry that we have, and to lead the world, as I said, in this transition from fossil fuels to clean energy.

There is no country in the world that is better situated than the United States of America to lead that transition because of who we are, because of the natural resources we have, and because of the work that we have done and the strategies we have put in place—the正面of the competition we are in with China; to vote down this bill in the name of working people in this country; to vote down this bill in the name of our kids and grandkids, who hopefully are going to benefit from our leadership and the strategy we have put in place—to make this transition. Let’s agree together that we can find much more constructive ways to compete with our adversaries around the world.

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you for your leadership on this issue, and thank you for giving me a few minutes to talk today.

I yield the floor. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. 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. CARPER. Madam President, I want to start off by thanking you for your good work on this subject—this important issue.

I rise today because our critical work to combat the harmful effects of climate change is at risk. I am particularly concerned about the efforts some of our colleagues are undertaking to make even more dire the situation that our planet already faces, make it worse.

Every day that goes by, we hear about the horrific scenes that are caused by natural disasters—wildfires in the West and in the Northeast; flooding and hurricanes in the South; tornadoes like the ones we had just last month in Sussex County, DE—the southern part of our State—that took a life; along with countless tornadoes across the Northwest. The list goes on and on and on.

These disasters are devastating families not just in my State, not just in your State, but also in States across our country, and wreaking havoc on our economy.

Over 3.3 million Americans were displaced due to natural disasters last year.

Let me say that again. Over 3.3 million Americans were displaced due to natural disasters.

On top of that, billions of dollars are spent every year—billions of dollars spent every year—in the aftermath of these disasters. That is double the number of people in Montana and Vermont combined.

Let me say that again. That is double the number of people in Montana and Vermont combined.

We cannot sit idly by, like some of our colleagues today would have us do, or allow for a reversal of the policies that are working to mitigate this devastation.

As we all know, the solar industry has been critical in helping us combat the effects of climate change. By deploying cleaner energy solutions, we are taking the necessary steps to reduce our impact—the human impact—on our warming planet.

The solar industry is not just good for our planet; it is good for American workers. Hundreds of thousands of jobs have been created right here on our own American soil to grow the solar energy and strengthen our supply chain.

The Inflation Reduction Act took these efforts one step further, allocating the largest investment we have ever made in the solar industry. The Inflation Reduction Act is already creating more jobs for more Americans across our country, while expanding our domestic solar manufacturing capacity.

With the commitment of the Biden administration, we are on track to increase domestic solar panel manufacturing capacity eightfold by the end of next year, generating up to $40 billion in new investments.

Let me say that again. We can increase our domestic solar panel manufacturing eightfold by the end of next year.

Why would we get in the way of that progress? We can only ensure that this outcome is possible if we overcome the significant challenge presented here today.

As you might remember, last year, the U.S. Department of Commerce’s investigation into solar tariffs imposed on countries in Southeast Asia paralyzed the industry and halted the supply chains of critical materials for American solar deployment. Rightly, the Biden administration stepped in to ban and annul these tariffs. This action saved tens of thousands of jobs, allowing our transition to cleaner energy solutions to continue as demand for solar products continues to increase exponentially.

Today, we are once again facing the same threats to American jobs that we faced a year ago. It is unimaginable. At least it is unimaginable to me that we would be willing to make an unforced error. That is double the error.

We shouldn’t be fighting the Biden administration’s work to preserve the trade balance. We simply can’t afford to make mistakes that would halt solar employment and cost us a whole ton of American jobs.

With current U.S. solar manufacturing, we are only able to meet one-third of domestic demand—one-third. It is imperative that we protect this industry and the tens of thousands of jobs it produces.

If the pause on solar tariffs were to end, the consequences would be devastating. Let’s take a minute just to walk through what Americans would face if we were to allow this to happen.

First of all, 30,000 good-paying jobs would be eliminated this year—not next year or the year after that; this year, 30,000. Of that 30,000, 4,000 are manufacturing jobs stemming from a $3.4 billion domestic investment in the solar industry from legislation like the bipartisan Infrastructure Act and the Inflation Reduction Act.

Second, CO₂ emissions would increase by 42 million metric tons. That is about the same amount of emissions generated by the electricity use of 8 million homes in a year. This would undermine our progress on solar deployment and starve the solar market of the critical panels and cells that cannot be obtained in the United States at this time.

Third, our efforts to strengthen the supply chain by developing our own manufacturing would be severely harmed. The retroactive solar tariffs on materials that are currently not available in the United States would directly undercut our own efforts and send the supply chain into a downward spiral.

Fourth, roughly 14 percent of the industry’s anticipated projects would be canceled.

I want to say that again. Roughly 14 percent of the industry’s anticipated projects would be canceled, significantly setting back our transition to a green energy economy.

We cannot afford to let this happen. We need to do everything in our power to lift up innovators in the solar industry, to boldly cut emissions from our power sector, and to attack this climate crisis head-on, all while continuing to create good-paying jobs.

Heaven forbid that the future generations look back and see that our own hand—our very own hand—forced this error.

I want to thank you, our Presiding Officer, Senator ROSEN, for your wonderful leadership on this issue.

I want to urge all of our colleagues to vote no on this resolution for the good
This tiny bird, which is now a threatened species due to climate change, migrates more than 18,000 miles. This tiny little bird migrates more than 18,000 miles on its roundtrip from the southern tip of South America to the tundra of the northern Arctic. Along the way, they stop for lunch, and they stop for lunch in Delaware. They stop for lunch along our beaches in Delaware. They stop and lunch on horseshoe crab eggs, often doubling their weight during this process. It is quite a feat.

Horseshoe crabs have been around for millions of years. Every year, during certain parts of the year, they lay their eggs and they lay them along the Delaware beaches, and the red knots come in and swoop them up and go to town, literally, doubling their weight before they head north or head south.

People come from all over the world to witness this. When they come from all over the world, they stay in our hotels for 50 days. We have no sales tax. They shop safe with no sales tax. For us, it is a pretty good thing, and it is an even better deal for the red knots. They benefit and, frankly, so do we in our economy.

So while some might suggest that providing Endangered Species Act protections for the lesser prairie-chicken would hinder economic development, given our experience in Delaware, I have a different perspective based on my own experience with threatened and endangered species in the First State.

Delaware is not the only State that pays homage to our Nation’s iconic birds. In fact, five National Football League teams use birds as their mascots, including the Seattle Seahawks, the Arizona Cardinals, the Atlanta Falcons, the Baltimore Ravens, and the Philadelphia Eagles. Go birds.

In addition, the great State of Louisiana is known as the Pelican State. The reasons for this are threefold, including the Pelican’s thriving along the Louisiana’s coast because of the Endangered Species Act. To the west, the well-loved California condor actually became extinct in the wild in the year 1987. But with the help of the Endangered Species Act, there are now more than 550 condors in the wild. Unfortunately, Endangered Species Act protections for the lesser prairie-chickens have been delayed for decades. Now the species is in serious peril, which is why we should not wait any longer.

Some of our colleagues who oppose this rule for the lesser prairie-chicken have claimed that the Fish and Wildlife Service did not properly account for longstanding voluntary conservation efforts. That is just not true. While I commend the voluntary actions to conserve the lesser prairie-chicken, science shows existing efforts are not nearly enough to protect and recover this species.

That said, even with the data clearly demonstrating the need for enhanced protection for this extraordinary bird, the Fish and Wildlife Service worked hard to create a flexible rule that would mitigate the negative impacts on impacted industries.

Specifically, the many years of volunteer conservation actions are not for naught. Under the Biden rule, those conservation actions remain the foundation for current habitat and conservation plans to protect lesser prairie-chickens, while allowing continued industry operations.

Under the rule, farmers, ranchers, and energy producers can continue to farm and continue their normal activities, as long as they adhere to reasonable conservation plans. That is true even if these activities have a small negative impact on this species. And this flexibility applies to the range for the entire northern population, including all known habitats in Kansas, in Colorado, and in Oklahoma, and about half of the State of Texas.

What is more, the Fish and Wildlife Service delayed the effective date of this rule for 90 days to allow more time to work with partners and to work with stakeholders. Doing so allowed impacted industries to create conservation plans and minimize disruption to activity in the region. The Service also continues to collaborate closely with States to ensure that all interested parties have the tools that they need in order to comply with the rule.

Despite this effort by the Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure a smooth implementation, this CRA resolution would take a sledgehammer to the rule. And this CRA is, indeed, a sledgehammer. If enacted, this resolution would not only invalidate the rule issued by the Fish and Wildlife Services, but it could also prevent the Service from ever issuing a listing for the lesser prairie-chicken in the future.

To put it simply, enacting this resolution could set this species on a path to continued decline and eventual extinction. This resolution violates the basic premise that the law should be applied based on science and not politics.

In 2019, an intergovernmental panel issued an alarming report. What did the report say? That report found that roughly 1 million species on our planet are endangered of extinction. Let me just say that again. In 2019—4 years ago—a leading intergovernmental panel issued an alarming report. How did it report? They found that roughly 1 million species on our planet are in danger of extinction.

We know that preserving our planet’s biodiversity is critical for innovation, it is critical for human health, and it is critical for our environment. And the Endangered Species Act is our best tool for protecting species and preserving environment.

I ask unanimous consent that the order be suspended in order to comply with the rule.
Overturning this listing may well mean the permanent loss of an iconic American species. That would harm our planet’s ability to continue producing energy and the communities and cultures that hold lesser prairie-chickens in high regard.

For all of these reasons, I oppose this resolution, and I strongly urge our colleagues to join me and others in voting no.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The junior Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Madam President, as you have heard from my colleagues before me, there are serious concerns about the job-killing resolution that we will be voting on this evening and the effects it will have on our solar industry and American workers.

For years, solar has been a growing source of clean, low-cost energy and economic development in States across our Nation. And it is a source of jobs—good-paying, union jobs—right here in the United States.

American domestic solar industry is made up of more than 10,000 businesses—large and small—located in every single State, employing over 250,000 Americans. I will repeat that: employing over 250,000 Americans. In fact, my State of Nevada has the most solar jobs per capita of any other State in this great Nation.

When we talk about the solar industry, we are talking about an industry that employs thousands of American workers, and at the same time helping us to transition to clean renewable energy.

Thanks to historic investments we secured in the bipartisan infrastructure law and the Inflation Reduction Act, the American solar industry is experiencing an unprecedented boom.

Last year, a new solar project was installed in the United States every 44 seconds. In fact, the demand is only expected to increase. This is only going to create more jobs and help make us more energy independent.

For example, the average solar installer in Reno, NV, makes about $80,000 a year. It is a good job. That is a job that lets a family pay their rent, buy groceries, put something away for their kids’ college and for their own retirement. These are the kinds of jobs we should be creating, and we are, thanks to the bipartisan investments.

That is why I have been a champion of our domestic solar industry and have been fighting back against attacks on it from my colleagues—well, frankly—on both sides of the aisle. That is why I led a bipartisan group of Senators last year to push President Biden to pause additional retroactive solar tariffs after a Commerce Department investigation. Well, they threatened to destroy our domestic solar industry and all tens of thousands of American jobs.

But at this moment—this moment—our American solar workers are at risk. My workers in Nevada are at risk. Those $80,000-a-year jobs are at risk. And all of the progress we have made to transition to clean energy, all the good-paying jobs that we have created, and all of the solar projects that are lowering energy costs for families—well, they are all at risk.

Last week, the House of Representatives passed a Congressional Review Act. This resolution rolls back the 2-year pause on these additional solar tariffs. If enacted, this resolution will decimate the American solar industry. So let me be crystal clear: Enacting additional retroactive tariffs on imported solar panels themselves will kill—will absolutely kill—the American solar industry, and it will kill any chance we have to meet our climate goals. It will kill the current American solar jobs.

I know that some of my colleagues have said that supporting this resolution is being pro-worker. Well, I am just going to say that that is wrong. No one can say they are pro-worker while at the same time voting to kill good-paying American jobs. And that is exactly what this resolution will do.

I don’t even know why this is on the table. Are we seriously going to tell our solar industry is out of a job? Are we going to put his family on unemployment just for politics?

I am going to repeat it: Supporting this resolution and killing American solar jobs, it hurts workers and their families. Period.

Opposing this resolution means being on the side of American workers. It means being on the side of unions like IBEW, the laborers, the operating engineers, the carpenters union, who are all urging a “no” vote today.

All of us here in this Chamber agree that we have to strengthen domestic manufacturing; we all agree we have to be competitive with China; and we all agree that we have to be energy independent.

That is what this current pause on additional tariffs—that is what this current pause helps us to do because, right now, solar panel manufacturers in the United States can only meet about 15 percent of the demand for American solar projects.

So thanks to the investments made by the Inflation Reduction Act, we are going to greatly ramp up our domestic solar manufacturing, creating jobs, making us more energy independent right here at home.

But it is going to take time. It will take time to ramp up domestic solar manufacturing so it can provide more than 15 percent of U.S. demand. Our current solar industry’s best success depends on the steady supply of solar panels to install. We can’t cut off supply of important solar panels by enacting massive retroactive tariffs that will just kill solar projects; it will kill American jobs; and it will hurt American workers.

So what can we do?

Well, what we can do is have a bridge that allows us to do both: keep our domestic solar industry alive while we invest and bolster our domestic manufacturing so that we can be competitive with China. That is exactly what this pause helps us to achieve.

Enacting retroactive tariffs will even damage our own U.S. manufacturing businesses by cutting off their major source of solar cells—a key component in the panels—making it that much harder for them and us to compete with China. That is why I am leading the effort to block this resolution and to keep the pause in place.

So I urge my fellow colleagues to join me and be on the side of workers by protecting good-paying American union jobs, to join me in fighting to meet our climate goals, and to join me in making our Nation more competitive with China by voting against this job-killing resolution and saving America’s solar future. Hundreds of thousands of American solar workers, their families, and our communities—well, they are counting on us.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

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

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

Mr. WARNOCK. Madam President, I rise today in shock and sorrow and in grief for my home State. And, if I am honest, I rise really with a deep sense of anger about what is happening in our country in the area of gun violence and death.

I stood here in March of 2021 after a gunman went on a rampage across Metro Atlanta and snatched eight precious souls—people with families and friends who loved them dearly. And here I am standing this time with the tragedy having occurred in midtown Atlanta, right in my own backyard.

While this is still a developing situation, according to media reports, so far, at least five people were shot—five—on a random afternoon. There has been one fatality. The others were taken to the hospital.

I want to take a moment and thank law enforcement officials for keeping us as safe as they can. I want to thank them for their work trying to apprehend this individual.

I am also thankful for local media who are keeping all of us informed, and I am grateful for our first responders, the people in healthcare, the people on the front lines. We count on them every day to care for those who are injured, to respond to people in peril. That is what makes this particular shooting ironic and deeply upsetting, because it underscores the fact that nowhere is safe no matter where we are. This happened in a medical facility where people are trying to find healing.
So I want to underscore that, because there have been so many mass shootings—in fact, about one every day in this country this year—that, tragically, we act as if this is routine. We behave as if this is normal. It is not normal. It is not right for us to live in a nation whereby our safety is no matter where they are.

We are not safe in our schools; we are not safe in our workplaces; we are not safe at the grocery store; we are not safe at movie theaters; we are not safe at sports; we are not safe in our houses of worship. There is no sanctuary in the sanctuary. We are not safe at concerts; we are not safe at banks; we are not safe at parades; we are not safe in our own yards and in our own homes. Now, today, we can add medical facilities to that list.

And, still, we have done so very little in this building to respond—and in the American political square at large. I think there is an unspoken assumption. I think that the unspoken assumption is that “This can’t happen to me. This won’t happen to me. It won’t happen to people that I know.” But, with a mass shooting every day, the truth is the chances are great.

Dr. King was right:

“We are tied in a single garment of destiny, caught up in an inescapable network of mutuality. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly.”

This is knocking on all of our doors, and I feel this this afternoon in a very real way. I feel it in my bones—because my own two children were on lockdown this afternoon.

I have two small children, and their schools are on lockdown in response to this tragedy. They are there. I am here. I am hoping and praying that they are safe, but the truth is none of us are safe.

As a pastor, I am praying for those who are affected by this tragedy, but I hasten to say that thoughts and prayers are not enough. In fact, it is a contradiction to say that you are thinking and praying and then doing nothing. It is to make a mockery of prayer. It is to trivialize faith. We pray not only with our lips; we pray with our legs. We pray by taking action.

Still, there are those who want to convince us that this is the cost of freedom. To them, we have to say no. This ongoing, slow-moving tragedy in our country—mass shootings as routine—does not become the cost of freedom; it is the cost of blind obstinance, a refusal to change course even when the evidence suggests we must do something different. It is the cost of demagoguery—those who want to convince us that commonsense gun reform is somehow a call to take everybody’s guns. This is not the cost of freedom. Dare I say it is the cost of greed—gun lobbyists wanting to line their pockets even at the expense of our children.

And so we must act.

I am proud of the fact that we did, after 30 years, pass some gun safety legislation here in the last Congress. It was a significant piece of legislation, but, obviously, it was not enough. There are 87 percent or more of Americans who believe that we ought to have universal background checks, and still we can’t get it. Think about that. In a country where everybody says we are divided—and there are deep divisions, to be sure. There is disagreement on this issue, to be sure. But in a country where there is 87-percent agreement on something, there is no movement on it in Congress, which means that that is a problem with democracy. The people’s voices have been squeezed out of their democracy, and there is a growing chasm between what the people actually want and what they can get from their government.

We saw it in a stark and ugly way a few weeks ago when we had two brave, young legislators stand up in Tennessee—three, in fact. The same legislature that refused to do anything on gun violence came down on them with all of their might and expelled them from the legislature.

We have to stand up against these anti-democratic forces at work in our country. They are the petrified, whose voices back. If we refuse to act while our children are dying and in a moment when no one is safe, then shame on us. Shame on us if we allow this to happen, and we do absolutely nothing.

Saint Augustine, the African bishop of the early church, said that hope has two beautiful daughters. He said they are both beautiful. Anger and Courage—anger with the way things are and courage to see that they do not remain as they are.

I am pleading; I am begging all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to remember the covenant that we have with one another as an American people. Stand up in this defining moment, and let’s do everything we can to protect all of us and, certainly, all of our children. We owe it to the people who have sent us here.

I know there are those who will look at this moment and say: Politically, do you really think we can get anything done here? They will ask if this is the time given the state of politics in our country right now.

I respond with the words of Dr. King, who said that the time is always right to do what is right, and that time is right now.

I yield the floor to the SPEAKING OFFICER, the senior Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I come before the Senate this afternoon to discuss the U.S. Navy’s ability to deter conflict in the Pacific. As China’s navy has grown, ours has shrunk, and we are running out of time to tilt the balance of power back toward the United States and ensure that deterrence does not fail in the Western Pacific.

For centuries, American naval power has proven the decisive factor in our security and prosperity. The U.S. Navy secured our victory in the American Revolution during the 18th century. It enabled our transformation into a world power in the 19th century. It defeated adversaries in two world wars in the 20th century, and it will decide our success or failure this century.

China’s rising strength on the seas is a direct threat to international peace and security. Their ability to exercise total control of the major sea lanes strikes at the heart of free and market-based economies in Asia and around the globe. For a few minutes today, I want to explain how the Navy’s latest shipbuilding plan is a guide, we would have only 290. Of course, the statutory requirement set by the Congress and signed by the President of the United States is 355.

A Chinese navy of the size I mentioned—400—and a strength relative to our own directly endangers our partner Taiwan, our allies in Japan and in the Philippines, and our military bases in the Pacific. More Chinese ships means more sea-based Chinese vertical launch cells—missile delivery systems, which are the primary offensive tool of any navy. A recent analysis found Beijing has more vertical launch cells than the United States and our allies combined. Those cells, in addition to China’s extensive sensing capabilities on the ground and in space, increase their advantage in the Western Pacific as our Navy plays an away game far from home.

These troubling facts demand a decisive response. Yet our Navy has failed to keep up. The Department of Defense released a five-year shipbuilding plan that fails to meet Congress’s requirement. Their plan contains three building options, only one of which would grow the fleet to...
the legally required battle force size of 355 ships. Even then, it would take two decades to get there.

This is not a blueprint for long-term American command of the sea. Instead, the administration is ceding control of the seas to China and its Communist leader, Xi Jinping and his Communist fleet. In fact, we are still living off the remains of the Reagan-era defense buildup, retiring ships we built at the end of the Cold War, without replacing them. Our shipbuilding pace has slowed. At the peak of the Reagan-era construction surge, we constructed four Los Angeles-class attack submarines every year. Today, we struggle to build just two advanced submarines annually.

Some put a positive spin on this policy, labeling it a “strategic pause” or saying this is a deliberate strategy of “divest to invest.” Whatever the catch phrase, it is dangerous. We are shrinking our fleet and leaving our sailors to fight a war without the tools to win.

In some cases, technicians are forced to repair destroyers by taking parts off of other destroyers just to meet deployment requirements. One of our most vital submarines in the Indo-Pacific, the USS Connecticut, sustained damage 2 years ago and will likely not be repaired for another 5 years—another 5 years. Congress has already appropriated $50 million to repair the Connecticut, and we will probably need to set aside more funds. The USS Boise, our fast-attack nuclear submarine—has spent 8 years in dry dock—8 years in dry dock—to receive rudimentary maintenance—8 years. This is absolutely unacceptable. It will cost over $350 million to repair the Boise on top of the costs associated with keeping it in port for nearly a decade.

A diminished fleet size is not just about numbers; it has other cascading negative effects, particularly on our sailors. We have fewer assets and yet ask our Navy to perform the same mission, we make sailors take longer deployments. That means a lower quality of life and higher stress on our ships and on our sailors, both of which impede our readiness efforts—and our recruitment and retention, I might add.

This diminished naval strength leaves us in a dangerous near-term situation with China, whose ambitions to dominate Asia loom large over the next decade.

First, we need to make a monumental investment in maritime infrastructure. Our shipbuilders are ready to build more, but they need the investments in machine tooling, workforce, and materials. As our Chief of Naval Operations recently testified, our Navy should get a second shipyard for Constellation-class frigate construction, and we should increase investments in our submarine industrial base. If we have any hope of implementing the AUKUS deal, the AUKUS deal is a 2022 agreement in which we promised to sell submarines to Australia as fast as we can build them.

Second, we must immediately give the Navy the capabilities they need to deter a conflict in the next 5 years. This means taking technologies and concepts that are already on the shelf and integrating them into our Western Pacific posture. We should be forging ahead with purchases of sea mines, unmanned platforms, and long-range munitions, which would all be relevant and capable in the near term.

We also need to shift our efforts to field maritime target cells to ensure our fleet is properly able to coordinate and target adversarial assets far from our shores.

Third, we should continue to boost the programs within the Navy that are already making major strides toward deterring China. Commandant of the Marine Corps David Berger’s Force Design 2030 has transformed the Marine Corps into the cutting edge of our deterrent posture in the Pacific, and General Beaudette’s amphibious ships to complete the job. Congress should step up and add funding for amphibious ships in this year’s NDAA.

Multiyear block buys would also signal demand to the shipbuilding industry. These programs will be difficult and will, of course, cost money, but failing to complete them will facilitate China’s advance and be much more difficult and much more expensive in the long run.

We are in our most dangerous national security moment since World War II. We are in our most dangerous seventy-two moment since World War II, and we must urgently restore our naval deterrent to meet the moment.

Others have recognized this throughout our history. Reflecting on the dark days of World War II in early 1942, Winston Churchill wrote:

"The foundation of all our hopes and dreams was the immense shipbuilding program of the United States.

Once again, the peace and security of the free world depends on our Navy. We need to rebuild it with haste.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Ohio.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.’S LETTER FROM BIRMINGHAM JAIL.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, it is an honor to join my colleagues of both parties on the floor today to read one of the greatest pieces of writing of the 20th century, Dr. King’s letter from the Birmingham jail.

I thank Senators WARNOCK, TILLIS, CASEY, CAPITTO, BOOZMAN, and ROSEN for joining me.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that after I speak briefly, you will recognize, in this order, Senators WARNOCK, TILLIS, CASEY, then me, then CAPITTO, then BOOZMAN, then ROSEN.

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

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, our former colleague, Doug Jones from Alabama, began this bipartisan tradition. It happened in his State, and it is an honor to carry it.

Today, we recommit to Dr. King’s mission—equal rights for all—to ensuring that every voice is heard and to the dignity of work.

On Friday, we marked Workers Memorial Day, when we honor workers killed on the job over the past year and throughout our history. People don’t talk enough about what Dr. King was doing when he was assassinated. He was killed in Memphis while fighting for sanitation workers, AFSCME Local 1633, some of the most exploited workers in our country.

Two worked there the following day of the two sanitation workers on the job. Not only was it a segregated neighborhood in Memphis, but, of course, even the garbage truck was segregated. Two White workers worked in the cab, and two Black workers wanted to work there. They were killed when the truck malfunctioned and crashed them.

Dr. King understood the deep connection between workers’ rights and civil rights. Speaking to those workers, he said:

[Whenever you are engaged in work that serves humanity and is for the building of]
humanity, it has dignity and it has worth. . . . All labor has dignity.

Until we have equal rights for all and dignity for all workers, our work here remains unfinished. We have a long road left to travel. It is up to us to push the country further along this road. That is why I ask you to look at Dr. King’s words in the letter we read today.

Just a quick preface of what this letter was about and then we will turn to Reverend Warnock. In April 1963, Dr. King was held in Birmingham’s City Jail for the supposed crime of leading a series of peaceful protests and boycotts. The goal was to pressure the business community to end discrimination in their hiring for local jobs.

Some White ministers from Alabama had taken issue with the boycotts. They told him: Dr. King, slow down. They told him: Dr. King, go to jail. Dr. King rejected that premise.

It is up to all of us—as citizens, as leaders, as members of our churches in our communities—to get to work to demand justice and equality now, not at some point in the future that never seems to get here.

Dr. King made that point more eloquently and persuasively than any of us ever could. So I will turn to my colleague, the Reverend Senator Warnock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. WARNOCK. Thank you so much.

I am deeply honored to participate in this great tradition started by Senator Doug Jones of Alabama during his tenure, and carried out by my colleague Senator Brown.

I am always honored to revisit these words from Dr. King from the letter from a Birmingham jail. So without delay.

MY DEAR FELLOW CLERGYMEN:

While confined here in the Birmingham city jail, I came across your recent statement calling my present activities "unnwise and untimely." Seldom do I pause to answer criticism of my working ideas. If I sought to answer all of the criticisms that cross my desk, my secretaries would have little time for anything other than this correspondence in the course of a day, and I would have no time for constructive work. But since I feel you are men of genuine good will and that your criticism is well meant, I will try to answer your statement in what I hope will be patient and reasonable terms.

I think I should indicate why I am here in Birmingham, and why I believe it is a good thing that I was placed here in Birmingham jail. I am here because I was invited here. I am here because I have organized a series of workshops on nonviolence, and we repeatedly asked ourselves: "Are you able to accept blows without retaliating?" "Are you able to endure the ordeal of jail?" We decided to schedule our direct action program for the Easter season, realizing that except for Christmas, this is the main shopping period of the year. Knowing that a strong economic-withdrawal program could be the by-product of direct action, we felt that this would be the best time to bring pressure to bear on the merchants for the needed change.

Then it occurred to us that Birmingham’s mayoral election was coming up in March, and the city council was scheduled to remove the notorious "outside agitator" Idea. We decided to postpone action until after election day. When we discovered that the Commissioner of Public Safety, Eugene "Bull" Connor, had piled up enough votes to win the runoff election, we again decided to postpone action until the day after the run off so that the demonstrations could not be used to cloud the issues. Like many others, we waited to see Mr. Connor defeated, and to this end we endured postponement after postponement. Having aided in this community need, we felt that our direct action program could be utilized.

The PRESIDENT PRO Tempore (Mr. Mur-

PHY). The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I will con-

fess you may well ask: "Why direct action? Why sit ins, marches and so forth? Isn’t nego-
tiation a better path?" You are quite right in calling for negotiation. Indeed, this is the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It is so that you dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must con-

fess that I am not afraid of the word “tension.” I have earnestly opposed violent tension, but there is a type of constructive, non-
vioent tension which is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was neces-
sary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of passivity, I have come to realize that the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It is so that you dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word “tension.” I have earnestly opposed violent tension, but there is a type of constructive, nonviolent tension which is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was neces-
sary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of passivity, I have come to realize that the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It is so that you dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word “tension.” I have earnestly opposed violent tension, but there is a type of constructive, nonviolent tension which is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was neces-
sary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of passivity, I have come to realize that the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It is so that you dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word “tension.” I have earnestly opposed violent tension, but there is a type of constructive, nonviolent tension which is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was neces-
sary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of passivity, I have come to realize that the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It is so that you dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word “tension.” I have earnestly opposed violent tension, but there is a type of constructive, nonviolent tension which is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was neces-
sary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of passivity, I have come to realize that the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It is so that you dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word “tension.” I have earnestly opposed violent tension, but there is a type of constructive, nonviolent tension which is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was neces-
sary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of passivity, I have come to realize that the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It is so that you dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word “tension.” I have earnestly opposed violent tension, but there is a type of constructive, nonviolent tension which is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was neces-
sary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of passivity, I have come to realize that the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It is so that you dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word “tension.” I have earnestly opposed violent tension, but there is a type of constructive, nonviolent tension which is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was neces-
sary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of passivity, I have come to realize that the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It is so that you dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word “tension.” I have earnestly opposed violent tension, but there is a type of constructive, nonviolent tension which is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was neces-
sary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of passivity, I have come to realize that the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It is so that you dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must confess that I am not afraid of the word “tension.” I have earnestly opposed violent tension, but there is a type of constructive, nonviolent tension which is necessary for growth. Just as Socrates felt that it was neces-
sary to create a tension in the mind so that individuals could rise from the bondage of passivity, I have come to realize that the very purpose of direct action. Nonviolent direct action seeks to create such a crisis and foster such a tension that a community which has constantly refused to negotiate is forced to confront the issue. It is so that you dramatize the issue that it can no longer be ignored. My citing the creation of tension as part of the work of the nonviolent resister may sound rather shocking. But I must confes
rights. My friends, I must say to you that we have not made a single gain in civil rights without determined legal and nonviolent pressure. Lamentably, it is an historical fact that for decades we have been hobbled by the opposition. Frankly, I have yet to engage in a direct action campaign that was "well timed" in the view of those who have not suffered from it. The ballot of democracy is slow and bumpy pace toward gaining a cup of coffee at a lunch counter. Perhaps it is easy for those who have never felt the sting of segregation to say, "Wait!" It rings in the ear of every Negro with piercing familiarity. This "Wait" has almost always meant "Never." We must come to see, with one of our distinguished jurists, that "justice too long delayed is justice denied."

We have waited for more than 340 years for our constitutional and God given rights. The nations of Asia and Africa are moving with jetlike speed toward gaining political independence. In the United States I舊 am compelled to use the terminology of the Jewish philosopher Martin Buber to say that "I thou" relationship and ends up relegating persons to the status of things. Hence, segregation is not only politically, economically, and sociologically unsound, it is morally wrong and sinful. Paul Tillich has said that sin is separation. Is not segregation an existential expression of man's tragic separation, his awful estrangement, his terrible sinfulness? Thus it is that I urge men to obey the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court, for it is morally right; and I can urge them to disobey segregation ordinances, for they are morally wrong.

Let us consider a more concrete example of just and unjust laws. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: An unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law. Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distorts the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority. Segregation, to use the terminology of the Jewish philosopher Martin Buber, is an "I it" relationship for an "I thou" relationship and ends up relegating persons to the status of things. Hence, segregation is not only politically, economically, and sociologically unsound, it is morally wrong and sinful. Paul Tillich has said that sin is separation. Is not segregation an existential expression of man's tragic separation, his awful estrangement, his terrible sinfulness? Thus it is that I urge men to obey the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court, for it is morally right; and I can urge them to disobey segregation ordinances, for they are morally wrong.

Let us consider a more concrete example of just and unjust laws. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: An unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law. Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distorts the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority. Segregation, to use the terminology of the Jewish philosopher Martin Buber, is an "I it" relationship for an "I thou" relationship and ends up relegating persons to the status of things. Hence, segregation is not only politically, economically, and sociologically unsound, it is morally wrong and sinful. Paul Tillich has said that sin is separation. Is not segregation an existential expression of man's tragic separation, his awful estrangement, his terrible sinfulness? Thus it is that I urge men to obey the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court, for it is morally right; and I can urge them to disobey segregation ordinances, for they are morally wrong.

Let us consider a more concrete example of just and unjust laws. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: An unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law. Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distorts the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority. Segregation, to use the terminology of the Jewish philosopher Martin Buber, is an "I it" relationship for an "I thou" relationship and ends up relegating persons to the status of things. Hence, segregation is not only politically, economically, and sociologically unsound, it is morally wrong and sinful. Paul Tillich has said that sin is separation. Is not segregation an existential expression of man's tragic separation, his awful estrangement, his terrible sinfulness? Thus it is that I urge men to obey the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court, for it is morally right; and I can urge them to disobey segregation ordinances, for they are morally wrong.

Let us consider a more concrete example of just and unjust laws. An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law. To put it in the terms of St. Thomas Aquinas: An unjust law is a human law that is not rooted in eternal law and natural law. Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust. All segregation statutes are unjust because segregation distorts the soul and damages the personality. It gives the segregator a false sense of superiority and the segregated a false sense of inferiority. Segregation, to use the terminology of the Jewish philosopher Martin Buber, is an "I it" relationship for an "I thou" relationship and ends up relegating persons to the status of things. Hence, segregation is not only politically, economically, and sociologically unsound, it is morally wrong and sinful. Paul Tillich has said that sin is separation. Is not segregation an existential expression of man's tragic separation, his awful estrangement, his terrible sinfulness? Thus it is that I urge men to obey the 1954 decision of the Supreme Court, for it is morally right; and I can urge them to disobey segregation ordinances, for they are morally wrong.
light, injustice must be exposed, with all the tension its exposure creates, to the light of human conscience and the air of national opinion before it can be cured.  

In your assertion that our actions, even though peaceful, must be condemned because they precipitate violence. But is this a logical assertion? Isn’t this like condemning a man because his possession of money precipitated the evil act of robbery? Isn’t this like condemning Socrates because he questioned, and his philosophical inquiries precipitated the act by the misguided populace in which they made him drink hemlock? Isn’t this like condemning Negroes because they refuse to accept this unique God consciousness and never ceasing devotion to God’s will precipitated the evil act of crucifixion? We must come to see that, as we stand in the middle of two opposing forces in history, it is wrong to urge an individual to cease his efforts to gain his basic constitutional rights because the quest may precipitate violence. Society must protect the robbed and punish the robber. I had also hoped that the white moderate would reject the myth concerning time in relation to the struggle for freedom. I have just received a letter from a white brother in Texas. He writes: “All Christians know that the colored people have no choice; they must either adjust themselves to the existing evil social and economic situation or face the possibility of organized resistance. There is no other choice. There is no time. There is only the present tense of a momentous present.” But is this not true of all colored people, of all oppressed people? It is true that there is something wrong with the way we live, but it is possible that you are in too great a hurry. It is true that Christ is the light, but it is possible that you are in too great a hurry. It is true that the teachings of Christ apply to all people, but it is possible that you are in too great a hurry. It is true that the teachings of Christ apply to all people, but it is possible that you are in too great a hurry. It is true that the teachings of Christ apply to all people, but it is possible that you are in too great a hurry. It is true that the teachings of Christ are applicable to all people, but it is possible that you are in too great a hurry. It is true that the teachings of Christ apply to all people, but it is possible that you are in too great a hurry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO.

Oppressed people cannot remain oppressed forever. The yearning for freedom eventually manifests itself, and that is what has happened in the Negro. This movement within has reminded him of his birthright of freedom, and something without has reminded him of his human dignity. Consciously or unconsciously, he has been caught up by the Zeitgeist, and with his black brothers of Africa and his brown and yellow brothers of Asia, South America and the Caribbean, the United States Negro is thinking with blood. And I am further convinced that our white brothers dismiss as “rabble-rousers” or “agitators” the case of those who employ nonviolent direct action, and if they refuse to support our nonviolent efforts, millions of Negroes will, out of frustration and despair, seek solace and security in black nationalist ideologies—a development that would inevitably lead to a frightening racial nightmare.

Mr. BOOZMAN.

When I was suddenly catapulted into the leadership of the bus protest in Montgomery, Alabama, a few years ago, I felt we would be supported by the white church. I felt that the white ministers, priests and rabbis of the South would be among our strongest allies. Instead, some have been outright opponents, refusing to understand the freedom movement and misrepresenting its leaders; all too many have lacked the courage and have remained silent behind the anesthetizing security of stained glass windows.

In spite of my shattered dreams, I came to Birmingham with the hope that the white religious leadership of this community would see this need. Perhaps I was too optimistic; perhaps I expected too much. I suppose I was naive to think that a movement for love, truth and goodness, and thereby rose above his environment. Perhaps the South, the nation and the world are in dire need of creative leadership.

I had hoped that the white moderate would see this need. Perhaps I was too optimistic; perhaps I expected too much. I suppose I was naive to think that a movement for love, truth and goodness, and thereby rose above his environment. Perhaps the South, the nation and the world are in dire need of creative leadership.
integration is morally right and because the Negro is your brother." In the midst of blatant injustices inflicted upon the Negro, I have watched white churchmen stand on the sideline and pp. 90-91.

sanctimonious trivialities. In the midst of a mighty struggle to rid our nation of racial and economic injustice, I have heard many ministers say: "Those are social issues, with which the gospel has no real concern." And I have watched many churches commit themselves to other worldly goals, which makes a strange, un-Biblical distinction between body and soul, between the sacred and the secular.

I have traveled the length and breadth of Alabama, Mississippi and all the other southern states. On sweltering summer days and dangerous winter nights, I have traveled those highways of the South on tortuous rides for freedom. Yes, there is deep disappointment among my people. Some have been dismissed from their churches, have lost the support of their old congregations and have been repudiated in the faith that right defeated is stronger than evil triumphant. Their witness has been the spiritual salt that has preserved them from being true troublessome times. They have carved a tunnel of hope through the dark mountains of disappointment. I hope the church as a whole will meet the challenge of this decisive hour.

But even if the church does not come to the aid of justice, I have no despair about the future. I have no fear about the outcome of our struggle. The situation itself suggests that the longer the South resists, the surer is our victory. I am convinced that the time will come when the South will recognize its real heroes. They will be the James Merediths, with the noble sense of purpose that enables them to face jeering and hostile mobs, and with the agonies of the soul that enable them to bear and carry the legacy of the pioneer. They will be old, oppressed, battered Negro women, symbolized in a seventy-two year old woman in Montgomery, Alabama, who rose up with a sense of dignity and with her people decided not to ride segregated buses, and who responded with ungrammatical profundity to one who inquired about her weariness: "My feet are tired, but my soul is at rest." They will be the young high school and college students, the ministers and the white host of their elders, courageously and nonviolently sitting in at lunch counters and willingly going to jail for conscience' sake. Only the South can discover, when these disinherited children of God sit down at lunch counters, that they were in reality standing up for what is best in the American dream and for the most sacred values in our Judeo-Christian heritage, thereby bringing our nation back to those great wells of democracy which were dug deep by the Founding Fathers in their striving for a more perfect union and the Declaration of Independence.

I have had my long thoughts and prayed long prayers. Perhaps more than anything else can one do when he is alone in a narrow cell, other than write long letters, think long thoughts and pray long prayers?

If I have said anything in this letter that offense has been given about the truth of the truth, about the reasonable impatience, I beg you to forgive me. If I have said anything that understates the truth of the nonviolent science that allows me to settle for anything less than brotherhood, I beg God to forgive me. I hope this letter finds you strong in the faith. I also hope that the year will soon make it possible for me to meet each of you, not as an integrationist or a civil-rights leader but as a fellow clergyman and a Christian brother. Let us all hope that the dark clouds of racial prejudice will soon pass away and the deep fog of misunderstanding will be lifted from our fear-drenched communities, and in some not too distant tomorrow the radiant stars of love and brotherhood will shine over our great nation with all their scintillating beauty.

For the cause of Peace and Brotherhood.

MARTIN LUTHER KING, Jr.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Thank you, Senator ROSEN.

Thank you to my colleagues who joined us today to read these powerful words. To Senators CASEY, CAPITO, BOOZMAN, and ROSEN.

This is a diverse group on the floor today whose States reflect the vibrant
and wonderful diversity of our great Nation, from the Deep South to the Mountain West, to the Industrial Midwest. We represent different places. We may disagree on many things, but we love this country. We know we can do better for the people who make it work.

Dr. King and the civil rights leaders of his generation did more than just about anyone to push this country to live up to our founding ideals and to make the dream of America real for everyone. Protesting, fighting for change, organizing, demanding our country do better—those are some of the most patriotic things all of us can do. That is Dr. King’s charge in this letter.

My favorite single line certainly in this letter and maybe in all of Dr. King’s preachings and teachings and writings: “Progress never rolls in on [the] wheels of inevitability.”

“Progress never rolls in on [the] wheels of inevitability.” It rolls in because we make it so. That is our charge.

Think about that campaign Dr. King was waging when he was martyred in Memphis. Think about who he was talking to—a union. Sanitation Workers Local 1613, AFSCME. Think of the circumstances. This was a very segregated Memphis. He was in a segregated, White neighborhood. Even the sanitation trucks where these workers were working were segregated. The cab of the truck was two White workers; the back of the truck was doing the actual lifting and picking up garbage—two Black workers.

In February, before Dr. King first visited the garbage truck—there was a torrential downpour in this White, segregated neighborhood. There was nowhere for these Black sanitation workers to go. They crawled in the back of the truck. It malfunctioned and crushed these two workers. That is why Dr. King was in Memphis the first time and the second time.

As he wove together worker rights and civil rights and labor rights, he told these workers:

What does it profit a man to be able to eat at an integrated lunch counter if he doesn’t earn enough money to buy a hamburger and a cup of coffee?

Those workers were vital to their community. They worked hard to provide for their families. They were denied fair pay, denied political rights, denied basic safety on the job.

Now, the Presiding Officer today is Senator Cortez Masto from Nevada, who has joined in so many efforts on the Senate side for workers, to fight for the dignity of work, to fight for safety and civil rights and worker rights. It is not a coincidence that the workers who are so often the most exploited are low-income workers, especially Black workers.

Until he has the dignity they have earned, Dr. King’s work will remain unfinished. It means paying all workers a living wage. It means giving them power over their schedules. It means providing good benefits and safety on the job. It means letting them, if they so choose, organize a union. It is about the dignity of work. All workers get a fair share of the wealth they create. When we empower workers, we bring us closer to the society Dr. King envisioned where all labor has dignity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. Cortez Masto). The Senator from Ohio.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 152 and S. Res. 185 and that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions: S. Res. 152, S. Res. 185, S. Res. 192, S. Res. 193, and S. Res. 194.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged from further consideration of the resolutions, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. BROWN. I know of no further debate on the resolutions. The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolutions S. Res. 152, designating April 2023 as “National Native Plant Month”; S. Res. 185, designating April 2023 as “Financial Literacy Month”; S. Res. 192, recognizing April 30, 2023, as “El Dia de los Ninos—Celebrating Young Americans”; S. Res. 193, designating April 2023 as “Second Chance Month”; and S. Res. 194, designating May 5, 2023, as the “National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls” en bloc.

The resolutions (S. Res. 152, S. Res. 185, S. Res. 192, S. Res. 193, and S. Res. 194) were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the preambles be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The preambles were agreed to.

(Provisions of S. Res. 152, with its preamble, are printed in the Record of March 30, 2023, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

(Provisions of S. Res. 185, with its preamble, are printed in the Record of April 27, 2023, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

(Provisions of S. Res. 192, S. Res. 193, and S. Res. 194, with their preambles, are printed in today’s Record under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I will speak briefly. I know we are expecting a vote at 5:30. I will not speak nearly that long, but I know we are about to vote on the Congressional Review Act on an issue that I happen to disagree with the President on.

My whole career has been standing up for workers. My whole career has been standing up for, sometimes, the Presidents—the Presidents of both parties.

I think, if you look at the history of trade in this country and what we have done, we have seen, frankly, that this House of Representatives and the White House have historically not stood up for workers.

I grew up in Mansfield, OH, in a small, industrial city of about 50,000 people. It was a very industrial city, less so now. I went to Johnny Appleseed Junior High School, and I remember walking the halls with the sons and daughters of machinists who worked at Tappan Stove and rubberworkers who worked for Mansfield Tire and steelworkers at Empire in Detroit. “Empire-Reeves,” I believe, was the company’s name then. I remember the autoworkers who worked at General Motors, a number of electrical workers at Westinghouse, and all those who were working in the trades, who were electricians and carpenters, insulators and pipefitters, plumbers and operating engineers and laborers—people highly skilled who built America.

Companies and corporations—particularly in my part of the country but also in Nevada and everywhere—began to shut down plants in the industrial Midwest. They moved those plants to lower-wage areas—Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, North and South Carolina especially. Because those wages weren’t quite low enough to satisfy the greed—I think there is no other word other than the “greed” of corporate America—then those same companies began to lobby Congress.

One of my first votes as a Member of Congress many years ago was in opposition to the North American Free Trade Agreement. Those of us who opposed NAFTA predicted with almost certainty what was almost certainly and inevitably going to happen. Once you pass a trade agreement giving these companies the opportunity to go to Mexico and then to China with no tariffs and to go for very low wages to exploit workers in those countries, which is what they did, you begin to see plants shut down.

We know what happened. We know that far too many of our colleagues in the House and Senate were willing to pass these free-trade agreements, like NAFTA. We also know that, down the hall, the House of Representatives did the same thing; the Senate did it; and, frankly, we had Presidents of both parties who sold out American workers. The lobbyists were here, pushing for NAFTA and pushing later for the PNTR with China, weakening the rules there so that these companies were up and gone. They left. They left Ohio. They left Indiana. They left Illinois. They left so much that the industrial heartland became the Congressional and the Presidents of both parties, from Trump all the way back to Clinton—I would include Obama and both Bushes and
Clinton and Trump—were willing to sell out American workers to the lobbyists who pushed for these trade agreements as they could seek cheaper wages in China.

There is another thing that happened with NAFTA that we didn't realize until we moved all of these jobs to China was we built up the Chinese military because we provided the technology and the wealth to the Chinese Communist Party that then was able to build up a high-tech military—not quite rivaling ours, but certainly dangerous enough that we paid attention.

My vote against NAFTA was one of my proudest votes and my vote against the PNTR with China, the most favored nation status with China. So we are seeing what that has yielded.

In the end, it is a simple choice: Whose side are you on? Are you on the side of the Chinese Communist Party or are you on the side of American workers? That, to me, is what this vote is about. It is not just CHIPS legislation is all about, and that is what the CHIPS legislation is all about, and that is what the CHIPS legislation is all about, and that is what the CHIPS legislation is all about.

Mr. MORAÑEZ. Madam President, today I am proud to introduce a measure that the Senate will act in an effort to protect farmers, ranchers, and producers from the unnecessary consequences of listing the lesser prairie-chicken.

Even as I say the words, it brings back so many instances in which we have had this conversation on the Senate floor, going back to my earliest days in the Senate. This issue has been with us now for a long number of years.

Range-wide studies over the last decade have shown that conservation efforts are helping bird populations in the five habitat States, including Kansas. So the lesser prairie-chicken is a native bird to five States in our part of the country, and its populations are important to the economy of Kansas and to those other States and to the country.

What strikes me is that this administration is claiming that American agriculture is at the heart of needing to list the lesser prairie-chicken as either an endangered species or as a threatened species because agriculture is causing harm to the populations.

A quote from the rule states:

Grazing by domestic livestock is not inherently detrimental to lesser prairie-chicken management, and many cases, it is needed to maintain appropriate vegetative structure.

That is a pretty good paragraph to indicate the value of production agriculture when it comes to the well-being of the lesser prairie-chicken.

In other words, what that is saying is that agricultural management practices and voluntary conservation practices of grasslands, including grazing by ranchers, improve—improve—their habitat.

Listing the bird as a threatened or endangered species is not the answer. Plain and simple, we need more rainfall. We need moisture in Kansas and in other States in the West. We need more rainfall, not more regulations.

I conclude here by saying that farmers and ranchers have always been and will always be the original conservationists. Their livelihoods depend on the continued conservation efforts of the soil and water they use to produce crops and raise livestock. I am confident there are ways to conserve the species without hampering economic opportunity in rural communities, and I will continue to push for what Kansans have been pursuing for years now—voluntary solutions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, I want to take a moment to address some of what we have heard here on the Senate floor today.

There have been a lot of accusations made about what this CRA does, and I will clear that up in a minute, but first I would like to set the record straight on what this measure does not do.

My colleagues often talk about their work to protect human rights. I would ask this simple question: What could possibly be a greater threat to human rights than the United States of America's turning a blind eye to child slave labor? What message does it send to the world?

I have heard today that this measure will force American companies to pay for these tariffs. Not true. What this measure does do is rightfully punish foreign companies that are actively working to get around U.S. trade law and help import products made with slave and child labor into the United States. The only entities that will pay tariffs are Chinese-affiliated manufacturers.

If you are doing the right thing, this measure doesn't change a darned thing about how you do business, but if you are working with people who believe slavery has a role in supply chains, you are darned right I have a problem with that and will do whatever I can to stop it.

I have also heard today that the rule that this CRA would eliminate was negotiated by the solar panel industry. We have heard that the solar panel industry agrees we need this exemption and therefore it is good. Of course, the solar panel industry that supports the rule is the Chinese solar panel industry. American manufacturers do not.

Thanks to the Biden administration's willingness that we are actually going to repeal here today, Chinese companies have been given everything they need to dominate the solar market, just like how Russia has dominated cheap gas supply to Europe.

I also have heard some of my colleagues say that this CRA is unnecessary because we have already passed a law that says products made with slave labor cannot be sold in the United States. We have passed a good bill that prevents products made with slave labor from being sold here, and I thank God we did that. But since when has U.S. law meant anything to communist China?

We know companies controlled by the CCP lie, cheat, and steal. We know that companies in communist China are moving solar panels made with slave and child labor to other countries to circumvent our laws, and they aren't being caught.

President Biden's own Commerce Department has proven that to be true. When half the world's solar panels are coming from a region with well-documented child and slave labor, are we really expected to believe that the companies making these panels aren't using slave labor? No, we know that is not reality.

Finally, I have heard the claim that this CRA would be a great threat to American jobs. This one actually surprised me. Here is how that logic goes: Letting communist China dominate a market by using slave and child
labor is better than supporting Ameri-
can manufacturing and American jobs
here at home. Let me know if you can
figure that one out, see how that makes
sense.

Some of my colleagues on the left
claim that 30,000 jobs will be lost. That
is not the case, let’s be clear. No one
who gave them that information? The
Chinese-dominated solar lobby group.

That is the same group that is per-
fectly happy to keep things the way
they are so they can make a buck on
the slave and child labor.

When I went to look at this report
today, I couldn’t find it. It is not on
their website. This is what you get
when you try to look at their so-called
analysis: “Sorry, we couldn’t find that
page.”

Honestly, I think our colleague from
Pennsylvania got it exactly right when
he told a news outlet this week:

Too often, China gets away with under-
mining our markets, undermining our com-
panies. Now it is their cheat, we lose
jobs in Pennsylvania.

Senator CASEY is right. It is not just
true in Pennsylvania; it is true in
ey every State across our great coun-
try.

Senator WYDEN is right too. Dis-
cussing the solar industry, he said:

Red, white and blue manufacturing, par-
ticularly now, when people see we’re seri-
sous about it, that’s the key time in this two
classroom window when the Chinese can hit
us.

To be honest, I am shocked by ex-
cuses from some of my colleagues. I note
that it is only some because this
CRA is actually a bipartisan bill.

The excuses for inaction by some on
the left don’t make sense to me. What
the what they are doing, we lose jobs in
Pennsylvania.
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consideration, then this administration wouldn’t be listing the lesser prairie-chicken whose population is considered stable in my home State of Kansas.

I ask you, was the ESA made for the good of human kind or was human kind made for the good of the ESA?

Make no mistake about it, the listing of any species adds more rules, more hoops to jump through, more time and costs from everyone, from our farmers and ranchers, our oilfield workers, and our utility workers who are building out new power poles and electric lines to get wind-generated electricity out to more populated States.

The ESA is just another weaponized tool that this President uses to attack rural America. This move is not surprising, considering the President recently vetoed the bipartisan resolution to strike down the WOTUS rule. This White House continues to push policies and resurrect taxes that disproportionately hurt rural America.

For over 26 years now, Federal, State, and private landowners have voluntarily collaborated with Fish and Wildlife Services to conserve the lesser prairie-chicken and its habitat.

These partnerships have already resulted in conservation agreements covering roughly 15 million acres of potential habitat for species. To list the bird now, after all the conservation effort, sends a message to stakeholders that no matter how much good work you do, the heavily-handed government will still step in and list species under the ESA and attempt to regulate your industry out of existence, all in the name of climate.

The Federal Government thinks it knows what’s best when it comes to conservation, but this law continues to fail its main mission: recovering and delisting species. Despite billions of dollars spent in the name of the ESA, less than 2 percent of all listed species have successfully recovered 2 percent of the species that it has listed.

No, thanks. The local communities have and will continue to do what is best for the bird and, more importantly, for the environment through ongoing, proven conservation efforts—conservation efforts passed on from one generation of farmers and ranchers to the next.

This administration ignores the impact that overregulation has on American industries. And I hear this from everyone who visits my office. The costs of this administration’s rules and regulations already outpace the last two administrations combined, with $363 billion in rules so far. Since January 1 of this year alone, that number is $148 billion.

Under this administration, the annual paperwork burden on businesses has increased to over 220 million hours. Since January 1, that number is approaching 50 million hours—indeed, a redtape of nightmare for businesses.

This resolution is one of many vital steps the Senate GOP is taking to un burdensome laws and regulations already in place. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENTIAL OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to yield back all time and the vote begin immediately.

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

Under the previous order, the joint resolutions are considered read a third time.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 9) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

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

The PRESIDENTIAL OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 109 Leg.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEA</th>
<th>NAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ND</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 9) was passed.
Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows: [Rollcall Vote No. 110 Leg.]

**YEAS—50**

Barrasso
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cassidy
Collins
Coryn
Cotton
Cramer
Crato
Cruz
Daines
Ernst
Fischer
Graham
Blackburn
Boozman
Broun
Braun
Budd
Capito
Collins
Cox
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Fetterman
Graham
Hassan

**NAYS—48**

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Boozer
Brown
Cassidy
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Cortez Masto
Daines
Durbin
Fetterman
Gillibrand
Hassan

**NOT VOTING—2**

Feinstein
Shaheen

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 9) was passed, as follows:

**S.J. RES. 9**

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Lesser Prairie-Chicken; Threatened Status With Section 4(d) Rule for the Northern Distinct Population Segment and Endangered Status for the Southern Distinct Population Segment" (87 Fed. Reg. 72674 (November 25, 2022)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session.

VOTE ON HU NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Hagerty).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. Hagerty) would have voted "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 43, as follows: [Rollcall Vote No. 111 Ex.]

**YEAS—53**

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cassidy
Casey
Collins
Coons
Cortez Masto
Duckworth
Durbin
Fetterman
Gillibrand
Hassan

**NAYS—43**

Barrasso
Blumenthal
Boozer
Brown
Cassidy
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Cortez Masto
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Daines
Ernst
Fischer
Graham
Hunt

**NOT VOTING—4**

Cramer
Feinstein
Shaheen

The nomination was confirmed.

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

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 bill 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. 125, LaShonda A. Hunt, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, John W. Hickenlooper, Margaret Wood Hassan, Gary C. Peters, Mark Kelly, Jack Reed, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Catherine Cortez Masto, Mazie K. Hirono, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeanne Shaheen, Tammy Baldwin, Angus S. King, Jr., Alex Padilla, Robert Menendez, Michael F. Bennet, the PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of LaShonda A. Hunt, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, shall be brought to a close?

The yea and nay votes are as follows: [Rollcall Vote No. 112 Ex.]

**YEAS—54**

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Boozer
Brown
Cassidy
Cardin
Casey
Collins
Coons
Cortez Masto
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Daines
Ernst
Fischer
Graham
Hunt

**NAYS—42**

Barrasso
Blumenthal
Boozer
Brown
Cassidy
Cardin
Carper
Casey
Coons
Cortez Masto
Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Ernst
Fischer
Graham
Hassan

**NOT VOTING—4**

Cramer
Feinstein
Shaheen

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 42. The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of LaShonda A. Hunt, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business,
with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYEES IN OREGON

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, as the second week of May is Public Service Recognition Week, I wish to recognize the honorable public employees who work tirelessly to provide outstanding service to Oregonians. These men and women, who serve our Nation as Federal, State, Tribal, county, and local government employees work hard to support Oregonians and make our State and our country a great place to live. I would like to acknowledge the important work that public servants do, and I will give just a few examples to illustrate how valuable public service work is.

The Oregon Farm Service Agency is dedicated to helping local Oregon farmers with assistance when they face financial risk or a natural disaster, as well as providing funding for conservation programs. Thanks to the efforts of employees at the Oregon Farm Service Agency, Oregon farmers and their families have been able to sustain their livelihoods through hard times. Oregonians are fortunate to have such committed public servants in the Oregon Farm Service Agency.

I would also like to honor the many public service employees that work at the Oregon Social Security offices. Their professionalism and courtesy in serving Oregonians is commendable. Without this work, numerous families could miss out on vital benefits. My staff and I also appreciate these offices’ assistance in answering our inquiries on behalf of constituents. The replies we receive have helped me help hundreds of people across Oregon.

Turning to another Agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—NOAA—Office for Coastal Management is making a difference in Oregon in countless ways. For example, NOAA’s program on Oregon coastal and estuarine land, conservation is vital for the preservation of Oregon’s famous beaches. NOAA also helps with research on environmental challenges that Oregon communities might soon face and has partnerships with Oregon’s Confederated Tribes to create opportunities for environmental education.

Public employees at the NOAA Fisheries office in Oregon also work tirelessly to ensure the conservation of fishery resources, eliminate overfishing, and maintain healthy commercial and recreational fisheries. For Oregon, the NOAA Fisheries office is vital to keeping ecosystems like the Willamette River healthy.

To give one more example, for over 100 years, public employees have worked for the National Park Service in order to maintain national parks, like the beautiful Crater Lake in Oregon, and to preserve local history and celebrate local heritage. National Park Service employees also work to provide funding for conservation projects throughout Oregon, making sure that Oregonians and people from all over the country are able to enjoy our State’s natural beauty.

It is an honor during Public Service Recognition Week to recognize the wonderful public employees that work day in and day out to help Oregonians. Again, I thank public service employees for their dedication and their service.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING MR. K-STATE

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I rise today to honor and celebrate the life and legacy of Mr. Ernie Barrett, synonymously known as Mr. K-State. Ernie was born in Pratt, KS, on August 27, 1929. He is a proud graduate of Wellington High School, where he led his basketball team to their first State championship in 1947. He was recruited by the likes of Kansas, Oklahoma, and Arkansas, but chose to attend Kansas State University in Manhattan, KS, beginning a lifelong affiliation with the school and town. During his 3-year collegiate career, K-State won two Big Seven Conference titles in 1950 and 1951. As a First Team All-American for the 1951 season, Ernie led the team to the school’s first and only NCAA National Championship game appearance. Ernie earned two degrees from K-State, a bachelor’s in physical education and a master’s degree in journalism.

He would go on to be selected by the Boston Celtics with the seventh overall pick in the 1951 NBA draft. However, he would not join the Celtics for another 2 years, as he proudly served his Nation in the U.S. Air Force from 1951–53. Despite a yearlong hiatus from professional basketball, Ernie played under the legendary head coach Red Auerbach for the 1953–54 and 1955–56 seasons. He was a key contributor to two Celtics teams that reached the Eastern Division finals in both of his professional seasons.

Following his professional basketball career, Ernie came back to K-State as an assistant coach where he helped lead the school to five Big Eight regular season titles in his 6 years as a coach. His service to K-State was not limited to the basketball court, as he would go on to serve as assistant athletic director, director of athletics, university consultant, and director of development throughout his career as a university administrator. A legendary fundraiser and promoter for K-State, his efforts contributed to the development of Bill Snyder Family Stadium, R.V. Christian Track and Field Complex, Bramlage Coliseum, Tointon Family Stadium, Colbert Hills Golf Course, as well as many other projects that have greatly impacted the students of K-State and the residents of Manhattan, KS.

After 75 years of service to K-State, Ernie passed away on April 21, 2023. His list of accomplishments is endless, and his impact on K-State, and Manhattan, KS, is timeless. There will certainly never be another Mr. K-State.

I now ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Mr. Ernie Barrett, as well as celebrate his tremendous impact on Kansas State University.

TRIBUTE TO SATOURI ROBINS

Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, today I recognize Satouri Robins, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all the hard work she has done on behalf of my office and the state of South Dakota.

Ms. Robins is a graduate of Mission Viejo High School in Mission Viejo, CA. Currently, she is attending New York University, where she studies international relations and French. Ms. Robins has been a dedication to the individual who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience. Ms. Robins has been a true asset to my office.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Ms. Robins for all of the work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.

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–1149. A communication from the Biologist of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Risk Management, Financial Assurance, and Loss Prevention—Decommissioning Activities and Obligations" (RIN1050-AA02) (Docket ID BSEE–2020–0016) received in the Office of the President on April 25, 2023; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–1150. A communication from the Biologist of the Branch of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status With Section 4(d) Rule for Bristle Twistflower and Designation of Critical Habitat for Pearl Darter" (RIN1018–BE44) received in the Office of the President on April 25, 2023; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.
Amendments to Supplement No. 1 to part 126 in Support of Allies’ (RIN1400–AF55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2023; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1179. A communication from the President and CEO, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Foundation’s annual performance plan (APP); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1180. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Federal Coordinated Health Care Office’s fiscal year 2022 report; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1181. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Open cozy C. 112d, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2023–0023 - 2023–0028); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1182. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Report of the Attorney General to the Congress of the United States on the Administration of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, for the six-months ending June 30, 2021” to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1183. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “U.S. Compliance with the Authorization for Use of Military Force in Iraq” received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1185. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Observer Status for Taiwan at the Summit of the World Health Organization” received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1186. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Cuban Compliance with the Migration Accords” received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1187. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Millennium Challenge Corporation Annual Report for FY 2022” received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–1188. A communication from the Chief Diversity Officer and Director, Office of Minority and Women Inclusion, Corporation, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on loan repayments as a strategic tool for the purposes of recruitment and retention during calendar year 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1189. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Secretariat Division, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); Federal Supply Schedule Clauses; Case 2022-5934” received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1190. A communication from the Director, Office of Civil Rights, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department’s fiscal year 2022 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1191. A communication from the Chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s fiscal year 2022 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1192. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission’s fiscal year 2022 report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1193. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Postal Service Reform Act; Establishment of the Postal Service Health Benefits Program” (RIN3206–AO43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1194. A communication from the Chairman, Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board’s fiscal year 2022 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1195. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, the President’s Pay Agent, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report to Congress on agencies’ use of student loan repayments as a strategic tool for the purposes of recruitment and retention during calendar year 2021; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–1196. A communication from the Director, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on agency performance and the Federal Rules of Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1197. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1198. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1200. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–1201. A communication from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, the amendments to the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure that have been adopted by the Supreme Court of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment and with a preamble:

S. Res. 119. A resolution recognizing the 202nd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

S. Res. 157. A resolution commemorating the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Good Friday Agreement, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Nico D. Theriot, of Louisiana, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Co-operative Republic of Guyana.

Nominee: Nicole Dawn Theriot.

Post: Co-Operative Republic of Guyana.

By Mr. MENENDEZ for the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Pamela M. Tremont, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zimbabwe.

Nominee: Pamela M. Tremont.

Post: Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Zimbabwe.

(There follows a list of members of my immediate family. I have neither knowledge of these persons to inform me of the pertinent contributions made by them. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained in this report is complete and accurate.) Contributions, amount, date, and donee: None.

Vivek Hallegere Murthy, of Florida, to be Representative of the United States on the
Executive Board of the World Health Organization.

Elizabeth Allen, of New York, to be Under Secretary of State for Public Diplomacy.

Elizabith Shortino, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of two years.

Katherine Cunningham Matthews, of Maryland, to be a Member of the International Broadcasting Advisory Board for a term expiring January 1, 2027.

Jeffrey G. Greenfield, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the International Broadcasting Advisory Board for a term expiring January 1, 2027.

Kenneth M. Jarin, of Pennsylvania, to be Chair of the International Broadcasting Advisory Board.

Kenneth M. Jarin, of Pennsylvania, to be a Member of the International Broadcasting Advisory Board for a term expiring January 1, 2027.

Luís Manuel Botello, of Maryland, to be a Member of the International Broadcasting Advisory Board for a term expiring January 1, 2027.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for the Committee on Foreign Relations, I report favorably the following nomination list which was printed in the RECORD on the date indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that this nomination lie at the Secretary’s desk for the information of Senators.

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

Foreign Service nominations beginning with Kara Miriam Abramson and ending with Faris Y. Asad, which nominations were sent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLINS):
S. 1504. A bill to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. CRUZ):
S. 1432. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act and the Natural Gas Act with respect to the enforcement of certain provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ERNST:
S. 1411. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for collegiate housing and infrastructure grants; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. VANCE, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. BROWN):
S. 1421. A bill to authorize grants for the collection, use, and disclosure of personal information of children and teens, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. SCHUTZ (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):
S. 1422. A bill to authorize grants for public health services for incarcerated victims of sexual abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. BROWN):
S. 1423. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize a scholarship and loan repayment program to incentivize physicians to enter the field of sickle cell disease research, treatment, and patient care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. CRAZIE):
S. 1424. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve health care coverage under vision and dental plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):
S. 1425. A bill to require a report on Federal support to the cybersecurity of commercial satellite systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, and Ms. MURKOWSKY):
S. 1426. A bill to improve the identification and support of children and families who experience trauma; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAZIE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. WICKER):
S. 1427. A bill to exempt certain entities from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 with respect to releases of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ:
S. 1428. A bill to require a report on efforts by Venezuelan state actors and transnational criminal organizations to capture and detain United States citizens as hostages; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAZIE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. WICKER):
S. 1429. A bill to exempt certain entities from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 with respect to releases of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAZIE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. WICKER):
S. 1430. A bill to exempt certain entities from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 with respect to releases of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEVIN:
S. 1431. A bill to require agencies to publish a reference to the specific provision of law, including any relevant statutory language, under which agency rules are proposed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAZIE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. WICKER):
S. 1432. A bill to exempt certain entities from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 for the release of certain perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARMER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LUMMIS, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. WICKER):
S. 1433. A bill to exempt certain entities from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 for the release of certain perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. WICKER):
S. 1434. A bill to exempt certain entities from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 for the release of certain perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CRAZIE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. WICKER):
S. 1435. A bill to require certain businesses to disclose and eradicate the use of unlawful child labor in their supply chain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.
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By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Horvon, Mr. Lee, Ms. Lummis, Mr. Risch, Mr. Romney, Mr. Sullivan, and Mrs. Fischer):
S. 1435. A bill to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw a rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to conservation of landscape health; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Ms. Murkowski):
S. 1436. A bill to expand and extend benefits available to veterans in response to the COVID–19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:
S. 1437. A bill to establish a partnership program to assist the military forces of partner countries in developing and maintaining military-wide transformational strategies for operational energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. Tester (for himself and Mr. Moran):
S. 1438. A bill to make improvements to the small community air service development program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. Menendez (for himself, Mr. Booker, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Menendez, and Mr. Van Hollen):
S. Res. 191. A resolution recognizing widening threats to freedom of the press and free expression around the world, reaffirming the vital role that a free and independent press plays in combating the growing threats of authoritarianism, misinformation, and disinformation, and reaffirming freedom of the press as a priority of the United States Government in promoting democracy, human rights, and good governance in commerce, and for other purposes.

By Mr. Menendez (for himself and Mr. Crapo):
S. Res. 192. A resolution recognizing April 30, 2023, as “El Dia de los Ninos-Celebrating Young Americans”; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. Klobuchar (for herself and Mr. Cramer):
S. Res. 193. A resolution designating April 2023 as “Second Chance Month”; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. Daines (for himself, Mr. Tester, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Cramer, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Ricketts, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Moran, Mr. Schatz, Mr. Heinrich, Mr. Padilla, Ms. Sinema, Ms. Caskill, Ms. Cortez Masto, Mr. Lujan, Ms. Smith, Ms. Hirono, Mr. Fetterman, Mr. Wyden, Ms. Murkowski, Mrs. Murray, and Mr. Sullivan):
S. Res. 194. A resolution designating May 5, 2023, as the “National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls”; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 120
At the request of Mr. Cassidy, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Vance) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio) were added as cosponsors of S. 120, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students.

S. 130
At the request of Mr. Thune, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Hickenlooper) was added as a cosponsor of S. 130, a bill to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to reauthorize and improve the ReConnect loan and grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 131
At the request of Ms. Collins, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer) was added as a cosponsor of S. 131, a bill to extend the National Alzheimer’s Project.

S. 134
At the request of Ms. Collins, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Cramer) was added as a cosponsor of S. 134, a bill to require an annual budget estimate for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to reports and recommendations made under the National Alzheimer’s Project Act.

S. 173
At the request of Mr. Blumenthal, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. Van Hollen) was added as a cosponsor of S. 173, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 189
At the request of Mr. Barrasso, the names of the Senators from Nevada (Ms. Rosen) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio) were added as cosponsors of S. 189, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modernize provisions relating to rural health clinics under Medicare.

S. 230
At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Daines) was added as a cosponsor of S. 230, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to support rural residency training funding that is equitable for all States, and for other purposes.

S. 344
At the request of Mr. Tester, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 344, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for concurrent receipt of veterans’ disability compensation and retired pay for disability retirees with fewer than 20 years of service and a combat-related disability, and for other purposes.

S. 413
At the request of Mr. Brown, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Markey) was added as a cosponsor of S. 413, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the rate of the excise tax on the repurchase of corporate stock, and for other purposes.

S. 448
At the request of Mr. Padilla, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Welch) was added as a cosponsor of S. 448, a bill to codify the existing Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Program of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 479
At the request of Mr. Padilla, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Heinrich) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to modify the fire management assistance cost share, and for other purposes.

S. 485
At the request of Mr. Padilla, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Heinrich) was added as a cosponsor of S. 485, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize the President to provide hazard mitigation assistance for mitigating and preventing post-wildfire flooding and debris flow, and for other purposes.

S. 547
At the request of Mr. Whitehouse, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. Stabenow) was added as a cosponsor of S. 547, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the First Rhode Island Regiment, in recognition of their dedicated service during the Revolutionary War.

S. 596
At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Fetterman) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, 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. 630
At the request of Ms. Sinema, the names of the Senators from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Warner), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. Grassley) were added as cosponsors of S. 610, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 628
At the request of Ms. Stabenow, the names of the Senators from Arkansas (Mr. Boozman) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. Cotton) were added as cosponsors of S. 628, a bill to recommend that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation test the effect of a dementia care management model, and for other purposes.

S. 668
At the request of Mr. Boozman, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Tillis), the Senator from Tennessee (Ms. Blackburn), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. Tester) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. Cornyn) were added as cosponsors of S. 668, a
bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins to honor and memorialize the tragedy of the Sultana steamboat explosion of 1865.

At the request of Ms. Rosen, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. Wyden) was added as a cosponsor of S. 704, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for interest-free deferment on student loans for borrowers serving in a medical or dental internship or residency program.

At the request of Mr. Casey, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Fetterman) was added as a cosponsor of S. 760, a bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to authorize mandatory funding for the Healthy Food Financing Initiative.

At the request of Mr. Thune, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Paul) was added as a cosponsor of S. 786, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care.

At the request of Mr. Scott of Florida, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BlumentHAL) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Braun) were added as cosponsors of S. 915, a bill to require Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of the Inspector General of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.

At the request of Ms. Duckworth, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. Casey) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 919, a bill to restore, reaffirm, and reconcile environmental justice and civil rights, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. van Hollen, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 977, a bill to provide grants for fire station construction through the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Welch, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. Capito) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1038, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to improve transparency and prevent the use of abusive spread pricing and related practices in the Medicaid program.

At the request of Mr. Markey, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Welch) were added as cosponsors of S. 1138, a bill to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 and the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to require a reduction of financed emissions to protect financial stability, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Baldwin, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. Klobuchar) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1176, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Brown, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. Bennet) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1205, a bill to modify market development programs under the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Murphy, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. Duckworth) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1211, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to authorize payments to individuals serving as caregivers of dependent relatives with deemed wages for up to five years of such service.

At the request of Mr. Cramer, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. Hoeven) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1212, a bill to authorize notaries public to perform, and to establish minimum standards for, electronic notarizations and remote notarizations that occur in or affect interstate commerce, to require any Federal court to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any State, to require any State to recognize notarizations performed by a notarial officer of any other State when the notarization was performed under or relates to a public Act, record, or judicial proceeding of notarial officer’s State or when the notarization occurs in or affects interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. Klobuchar, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. Sanders) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1246, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen the drug pricing reforms in the Inflation Reduction Act.

At the request of Mrs. Murray, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. Shaheen) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1297, a bill to ensure the right to provide reproductive health care services, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. Duckworth) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1298, a bill to award grants for the creation, recruitment, training and education, retention, and advancement of the direct care workforce and to award grants to support family caregivers.

At the request of Mr. Moran, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. Rounds) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1315, a bill to improve the provision of care and services under the Veterans Community Care Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Risch, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. Rubio) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1325, a bill to establish a partnership with nations in the Western Hemisphere to promote economic competitiveness, democratic governance, and security, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mrs. Gillibrand, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. Padilla) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1336, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to require that supplemental nutrition assistance program benefits be calculated using the value of the low-cost food plan, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Padilla, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. Whitehouse) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1343, a bill to prohibit the Immigration and Nationality Act to alter the definition of “conviction”, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. Warren) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1375, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to apply additional payments, discounts, and other financial assistance towards the cost-sharing requirements of health insurance plans, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. Cotton, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. Capito) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1384, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

At the request of Mr. Padilla, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. Murray) was added as a co-sponsor of S. 1392, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the adjustment of status of essential workers, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 25
At the request of Mr. Scott of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Johnson) was added as a co-sponsor of S. J. Res. 25, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to “Adverse Effect Wage Rate
Methodology for the Temporary Employment of H-2A Nonimmigrants in Non-Range Occupations in the United States’. 

S. 93

At the request of Mr. Van Hollen, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. Daines), the Senator from Nevada (Mrs. Cortez Masto) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. Budd) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 91, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the value of a tax agreement with Taiwan.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SCHMITT (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. Hawley, and Mr. Scott of Florida):

S. 1419. A bill to require each agency to repeal 3 existing regulations before issuing a new regulation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. SCHMITT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1419

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Expediting Reform and Stopping Excess Regulations Act” or the “ERASER Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) AGENCY; RULE.—The terms “agency” and “rule” have the meanings given those terms in section 551 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) MAJOR RULE.—The term “major rule” has the meaning given the term in section 804 of title 5, United States Code.

(3) The term “State” means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, each territory or possession of the United States, and each federally recognized Indian tribe.

SEC. 3. REPEAL OF REGULATIONS REQUIRED BEFORE ISSUANCE OF A NEW RULE.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR RULE.—An agency may not issue a new rule unless the agency has repealed 3 or more rules described in subsection (c) that, to the extent practicable, are related to the rule.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR MAJOR RULE.—

(1) REPEAL REQUIRED.—An agency may not issue a major rule unless—

(A) the agency has repealed 3 or more rules described in subsection (c) that, to the extent practicable, are related to the major rule; and

(B) the cost of the new major rule is less than or equal to the cost of the rules repealed.

(2) CERTIFIED COST.—For any rule issued in accordance with paragraph (1), the Administrator of the Food and Drug Administration, in coordination with the Office of Management and Budget shall certify that the cost of the new major rule is equal to or less than the cost of the rules repealed.

(c) REPEALED RULES DESCRIBED.—A rule described in this section—

(1) does not include an interpretative rule, general statement of policy, or rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice; and

(2) was issued through the notice and comment rule making process under section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) PUBLICATION REQUIRED.—Any rule repealed under subsection (a) or (b) shall be published in the Federal Register.

(e) APPLICABILITY.—This section—

(1) applies to any rule or major rule that imposes a cost or responsibility on a non-regulatory governmental person or a State or local government; and

(2) shall not apply to any rule or major rule that relates to the management, organization, or personnel of an agency or procurement by the agency.

SEC. 4. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 5 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit to Congress a report that includes, as of the date on which the report is submitted—

(1) the number of rules that are in effect; and

(2) the total estimated economic cost imposed by the rules described in paragraphs (1) and (2).

By Mr. DURBIN. (for himself, Mrs. Capito, Ms. Duckworth, and Ms. Murkowski):

S. 1426. A bill to improve the identification and support of children and families who experience trauma; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1426

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Resilience, Investment, Support, and Expansion from Trauma Act” or the “RISE from Trauma Act”.

TITLE I—COMMUNITY PROGRAMMING

SEC. 101. TRAUMA AND RESILIENCE-RELATED GRANTS TO ENTITIES.

Title V of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after section 520C (42 U.S.C. 266b-3) the following:

SEC. 520D. LOCAL COORDINATING BODIES TO ADVANCE COMMUNITY TRAUMA PREVENTION, AND RESILIENCE.

(a) GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Assistant Secretary, shall award grants to State, county, local, or Indian tribe or tribal organizations (as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination Act and Education Assistance Act) or nonprofit entities for demonstration projects to enable such entities to act as coordinating bodies to prevent or mitigate the impact of trauma and toxic stress in a community, or promote resilience by fostering protective factors.

(2) AMOUNT.—The Secretary shall award such grants in amounts of not more than $50,000.

(3) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award such grants for periods of 4 years.

(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall include 1 or more representatives from at least 5 of the categories described in paragraph (2).

(2) COMPOSITION.—The categories referred to in paragraph (1) are—

(A) governmental agencies, such as public health, mental health, human service, or child welfare agencies, that provide training related to covered services or conduct activities to screen, assess, provide services or recommendations, or provide support for support infants, children, youth, and their families as appropriate, that have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma;

(B) faculty or qualified staff at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965) or representatives of a local member of the National Child Traumatic Stress Network, in an area related to screening, assessment, service provision or referral, prevention, or treatment to support infants, children, youth, and their families as appropriate, that have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma;

(C) hospitals, health care clinics, or other health care institutions, such as mental health and substance use disorder treatment facilities;

(D) criminal justice representatives related to adults and juveniles, which may include law enforcement or judicial or court employees;

(E) local educational agencies (as defined in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801)) or agencies responsible for early childhood education programs, may include Head Start and Early Head Start agencies;

(F) workforce development, job training, or business associations;

(G) nonprofit, community-based faith, human services, civic, or social service organizations, including participants in a national or community service program (as described in section 122 of the National and Community Service Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12572)), providers of after-school programs, home visiting programs, family resource centers, agencies that serve victims of domestic and family violence or child abuse, or programs to prevent or address the impact of violence and addiction; and

(H) general public, including individuals who have experienced trauma who can appropriately represent populations and activities relevant to the community that will be served by the entity.

(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—In order for an entity to be eligible to receive the grant under this section, the representatives included in the entity shall, collectively, have training and expertise concerning childhood trauma, resilience, and covered services.

(d) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(e) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall give priority to entities proposing to serve communities or populations that have faced or currently face high rates of community trauma, including from intergenerational poverty, homelessness, child abuse, domestic violence, sexual violence, or untreated mental or substance use disorders, or civil unrest, discrimination, or oppression, which may include an evaluation of—

(1) an age-adjusted rate of drug overdose death that is above the national age-adjusted mortality rate, as determined by the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention;

(2) an age-adjusted rate of violence-related (or intentional) injury deaths that is above the national average, as determined by
the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and

(3) a rate of involvement in the child welfare or juvenile justice systems that is above the national average, as determined by the Secretary.

(e) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity that receives a grant under this section to act as a coordinating body may use the grant funds to—

(1) bring together stakeholders who provide or use services in, or have expertise concerning, covered settings to identify community needs and resources related to covered services, and to build on any needs assessment conducted by organizations or groups represented on the coordinating body;

(2) (A) collect data, on indicators to reflect local priority issues, including across multiple covered settings and disaggregated by age, race, and any other appropriate metrics; and

(B) use the data to identify unique community challenges and barriers, community strengths and assets, gaps in services, and high-need areas, related to covered services;

(3) build awareness, skills, and leadership (including trauma-informed and resilience-focused training and public outreach campaigns) on covered services in covered settings;

(4) develop a strategic plan, in partnership with members of the served community or population, that identifies—

(A) policy goals and coordination opportunities, community needs and local priority issues (including coordination in applying for or utilizing existing grants, insurance coverage, or other government programs), including for communities of color and relating to delivering and implementing covered services; and

(B) a comprehensive, integrated approach for the members to prevent and mitigate the impact of exposure to trauma or toxic stress in the community, and to assist the community in healing from existing and prior exposure to trauma through promotion of resilience and fostering protective factors;

(5) implement such strategic plans in the local community, including through the delivery of covered services in covered settings; and

(6) identify funding sources and partner with other stakeholders to support continuation of activities after the end of the grant period.

(f) SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.—Amounts made available under this section shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local public funds and private funds expended to provide trauma-related coordination activities.

(g) EVALUATION.—At the end of the period for which grants are awarded under this section, the Secretary shall conduct an evaluation of the activities carried out under each grant under this section. In conducting the evaluation, the Secretary shall assess the outcomes of the activities carried out by each grant recipient, including outcomes related to health, education, child welfare, criminal justice involvement, or other measurable outcomes pertaining to wellbeing and societal impact.

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are appropriated to carry out this section $600,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2031.

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) COVERED SETTINGS.—The term ‘covered settings’ means culturally responsive services, programs, models, or interventions that are evidence-based, evidence-informed, or promising models to support the well-being of children, youth, and their families as appropriate by preventing or mitigating the impact of trauma and toxic stress or promoting resilience by fostering protective factors, which may include the best practices developed under section 712(b) of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (Public Law 115–271).

(2) COVERED SETTING.—The term ‘covered setting’ means the settings in which individuals are provided with infants, children, youth, and their families, as appropriate, who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma, including schools, hospital settings where health care providers are, including primary care and pediatric providers, provide services, early childhood education and care settings, home visiting settings, adoption settings, child welfare agency facilities, public health agency facilities, mental health treatment facilities, substance use disorder treatment facilities, faith-based institutions, domestic violence agencies, violence intervention organizations, child advocacy centers, homeless services system facilities, refugee services system facilities, juvenile justice system facilities, law enforcement agency facilities, Healthy Marriage Promotion or Responsible Fatherhood service settings, child support service settings, settings focused on individuals eligible for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families; and

SEC. 102. EXPANSION OF PERFORMANCE PART-NERSHIP PILOT FOR CHILDREN WHO HAVE EXPERIENCED OR ARE AT RISK OF EXPERIENCING TRAUMA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 526 of the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2014 (42 U.S.C. 12301 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

(4) To improve outcomes for infants, children, youth, and their families as appropriate who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma means to increase the rate at which individuals who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma, including those who are low-income, home- less, involved with the child welfare system, involved in the juvenile justice system, have been victims of violence (including community violence), unemployed, or not enrolled in or at risk of dropping out of an educational institution and live in a community that has faced acute or long-term adversity, discrimination, historical oppression, intergenerational poverty, civil unrest, a high rate of violence or drug overdose deaths, achieve success in employment, health, developmental, community reentry, permanency from foster care, or other key goals;”;

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ‘‘FISCAL YEAR 2014’’ and inserting ‘‘FISCAL YEARS 2024 THROUGH 2030’’;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, and by moving such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, 2 ems to the right;

(C) by striking ‘‘Federal agencies’’ and inserting the following:

‘‘(1) DISCONNECTED YOUTH PILOTS.—Federal agencies; and

(2) TRAUMA-INFORMED CARE PILOTS.—Federal agencies may use Federal discretionary funds that are made available in this Act or any other appropriation, including the terms of such appropriation, to support the implementation of trauma-informed care pilots for any of fiscal years 2024 through 2030 to carry out up to 10 Performance Partnership Pilots. Such Pilots shall may be designed to improve outcomes for infants, children, youth, and their families as appropriate, who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma; and

‘‘(B) involve Federal programs targeted on infants, children, and youth, and their families, as appropriate, who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma;’’;

(3) in subsection (c), by inserting after the semicolon ‘‘, including the age range for such population’’; and

(4) in subsection (e), by striking ‘‘2018’’ and inserting ‘‘2027’’;

(b) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, working with the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary of Education, and Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, and any other appropriate agency representative, shall, with respect to the section—

(1) explore authorities to enable the issuance of appropriate start-up funding;

(2) issue guidance documents, template waivers and performance measurements, best practices and lessons learned from prior programs, recommendations for how to sustain projects after award periods, and other technical assistance documents as needed;

(3) align application timing periods to provide maximum flexibility, which may include the availability of initial planning periods for awardees.

SEC. 103. HOSPITAL-BASED INTERVENTIONS TO REDUCE READMISSIONS.

Section 393 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(O) HOSPITAL-BASED INTERVENTIONS TO REDUCE READMISSIONS.

(1) GRANTS.—The Secretary shall award grants to eligible entities to deliver and evaluate hospital-based interventions to improve outcomes and reduce subsequent re-injury or readmissions of patients that present at a hospital after over-dosing, attempting suicide, or suffering violent injury or death.

(2) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection and entity shall—

(A) be a hospital or health system (including health systems operated by Indian tribes or tribal organizations as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act); and

(B) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, which shall include demonstrated experience furnishing successful hospital-based trauma interventions to improve outcomes and prevent re-injury or re-admission for patients presenting after over-dosing, attempting suicide, or suffering violent injury or death.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—An entity shall use amounts received under a grant under this subsection to deliver, test, and evaluate hospital-based trauma-informed interventions for patients who present at hospitals with drug overdoses, suicide attempts, or violent injuries (such as domestic violence or intentional penetrating wounds, including gunshot wounds), who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing symptoms associated with exposure to trauma, violence, substance misuse, or suicidal ideation, to provide comprehensive education, screening, care planning, skills building, and long-term case management services to such individuals,
and their guardians or caregivers as appropriate, to prevent hospital readmission, injury, and improve health, wellness, and safety outcomes. Such interventions may be furnished through or in partnership with qualified community-based organizations and may include or incorporate the best practices developed under section 7132(d) of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (Public Law 115–271).

“(4) QUALITY MEASURES.—An entity that receive a grant under this section shall submit to the Administrator a report on data and outcomes developed under the grant, including any quality measures developed, evaluated and validated to prevent hospital readmissions for the patients served under the program involved.

“(5) SUSTAINABLE COVERAGE.—The Secretary, through the Administrator for the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, shall evaluate existing authorities, flexibilities, and policies and disseminate appropriate and relevant information to eligible entities on the opportunities for health insurance coverage and reimbursement for the activities described in paragraph (3).”.

SEC. 203. FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL HEALTH SERVICE CORPS.

Section 1605(b)(2) of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 254b–2(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (G), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in subparagraph (H), by striking the period and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(1) in addition to the amounts provided for under subparagraph (H) for fiscal year 2025, $50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2026 through 2028, to be allocated in each such fiscal year for awards to eligible individuals whose obligated service locations are in schools or community-based settings as described in section 338N of the Public Health Service Act.”.

SEC. 204. INFANT AND EARLY CHILDHOOD CLINICAL WORKFORCE.

Part P of title III of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 399V–8. INFANT AND EARLY CHILDHOOD CLINICAL WORKFORCE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Associate Administrator of the Maternal and Child Health Bureau, shall establish an Infant and Early Childhood Mental Health Clinical Leadership Program to award grants to eligible entities to establish a national network of training institutes for infant and early childhood clinical mental health.

“(b) ELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this section, an entity shall—

“(1) be—

“(A) an institution of higher education as defined in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, including historically Black colleges and universities (as defined for purposes of section 322 of the Higher Education Act of 2013), and Tribal colleges (as defined for purposes of section 316(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c)); or

“(B) a hospital with affiliation with such an institution of higher education, or a State professional medical society or association of infant mental health professionals, or a collaborator or partnership with such an institution of higher education;

“(2) submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

“(c) USE OF GRANT.—An entity shall use amounts received under a grant under this section to establish or support one of the following:

“(1) equip aspiring and current mental health professionals, including clinical social workers, professional counselors, marriage and family therapists, clinical psychologists, child psychiatrists, school psychologists, school counselors, school social workers, nurses, home visitors, community health workers, and developmental and behavioral pediatricians with specialization in infant and early childhood clinical mental health, and those pursuing certification or licensure in such professions; and

“(2) emphasize equipping trainees with culturally responsive skills in prevention, mental health consultation, screening, assessment, and treatment, development of infants, children, and their parents as appropriate, who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma, including from inter-generational poverty, civil unrest, discrimination, or oppression, exposure to violence or overdose, as well as prevention of secondary trauma, through—

“(A) the provision of community-based training and supervision in evidence-based assessment, diagnosis, and treatment, which may be conducted through partnerships with qualified community-based organizations;

“(B) the development of graduate education training tracks;

“(C) the provision of scholarships, stipends, and trainee supports, including to enhance recruitment, retention, and career placement of students from populations under-represented populations in the mental health workforce; and

“(D) the provision of mid-career training to develop the capacity of existing health practitioners.

“(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section, $25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2028.”.

SEC. 205. TRAUMA-INFORMED TEACHING AND SCHOOL LEADERSHIP.

(a) PARTNERSHIP GRANTS.—Section 202 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1022a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(6)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (H) through (K) as subparagraphs (I) through (L), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (G) the following:

“(J) provide training and supervision in evidence-based approaches for—

“(aa) improving behavior (such as positive behavior interventions and supports and restorative justice practices);

“(bb) supporting social and emotional learning;

“(cc) mitigating the effects of trauma;

“(dd) improving the learning environment in the school;

“(ee) preventing secondary trauma, compassion fatigue, and burnout; and

“(ff) alternatives to punitive discipline practices, including suspensions, expulsions, corporal punishment, referrals to law enforcement, and other actions that remove students from the learning environment;

“and

“(2) in subsection (d)(1)(A)(ii)—

(A) in subclause (II), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(B) by redesignating subclause (III) as subclause (IV); and

(C) by inserting after subclause (II) the following:

“and—

“(aa) such teachers and, as applicable, early childhood educators, to adopt evidence-based approaches for—

“(bb) improving behavior (such as positive behavior interventions and supports and restorative justice practices); and

“(cc) supporting social and emotional learning;

“(dd) mitigating the effects of trauma;

“(ee) improving the learning environment in the school;

“(ff) preventing secondary trauma, compassion fatigue, and burnout; and

“(gg) alternatives to punitive discipline practices, including suspensions, expulsions, corporal punishment, referrals to law enforcement, and other actions that remove students from the learning environment.”.

“and

“(3) in subsection (d), by adding at the end the following:

“(T) TRAUMA-INFORMED AND RESILIENCE-FOCUSED PRACTICE AND WORK IN ALTERNATIVE EDUCATION SETTINGs.—Developing the teaching and learning experiences of prospective teachers through innovative partnerships with new, early childhood educators and elementary school and secondary school teachers to...”
adopt evidence-based trauma-informed and resilience-focused teaching strategies—

“(A) to—

(i) recognize the signs of trauma and its impact on learning and behavior;

(ii) maximize student engagement and promote the social and emotional development of students;

(iii) implement alternative practices to suspension and expulsion that do not remove students from the learning environment; and

(iv) engage with other school personnel, including administrators and nonteaching staff, to foster a shared understanding of the items described in clauses (i), (ii), and (iii); and

(B) including programs training teachers and, as applicable, early childhood educators to work with students—

(i) with exposure to traumatic events (including students involved in the foster care system or juvenile justice system or runaway and homeless youth); and

(ii) in alternative academic settings for youth unable to participate in a traditional public school program in which high populations of students with trauma exposure may learn (such as students involved in the foster care system, pregnant, expecting, and parenting students, runaway and homeless students, exposed to family violence or trafficking, and other youth who have re-entered school after a period of absence due to dropping out).”

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—Section 203(b)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1023c(b)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following—

“(C) to eligible partnerships that have a high-quality proposal for trauma-informed and resiliency-focused teaching practices for general education and special education teachers and, as applicable, early childhood educators;”

(c) GRANTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS.—Section 202(f)(1)(B) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1022a(c)(1)(B)) is amended—

(1) in clause (v), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in clause (vi), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following—

“(vii) identify students who have experienced trauma and connect those students with appropriate school-based or community-based services and programs;”

SEC. 206. TOOLS FOR FRONT-LINE PROVIDERS.

Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, in coordination with appropriate stakeholders with subject matter expertise which may include the National Child Traumatic Stress Network or other centers funded by the Department of Health and Human Services, shall carry out activities to develop accessible and easily understandable toolkits for use by front-line service providers (including teachers, early childhood educators, school and out-of-school program leaders, paraeducators and school support staff, home visitors, mentors, social workers, counselors, health care providers, child welfare agency staff, individuals in juvenile justice settings, faith leaders, first responders, kinship caregivers, domestic violence, child advocacy centers, homeless services personnel, and youth development and community-based organization personnel) for appropriately identifying, assessing, and supporting infants, children, and youth, and their families, as appropriate, who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing trauma or toxic stress. Such toolkits shall incorporate best practices developed under section 7132(d) of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (Public Law 115–271), and include action plans to build a safe, stable, and nurturing environment for the infants, children, and youth served in those settings, capacity building, and strategies to mitigate the impact of secondary trauma, compassion fatigue, and burnout among such front-line service providers and other caregivers.

SEC. 207. CHILDREN EXPOSED TO VIOLENCE Initiative.

Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (31 U.S.C. 10101) is amended by adding at the end the following—

“PART PP—CHILDREN EXPOSED TO VIOLENCE AND ADDICTION INITIATIVE

SEC. 3061. GRANTS TO SUPPORT CHILDREN EXPOSED TO VIOLENCE AND SUBSTANCE USE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may make grants to States, units of local government, Indian tribes and tribal organizations (as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination Act and Education Assistance Act), and nonprofit organizations to reduce violence and substance use by providing trauma-informed (from exposure to violence or substance use and supporting infants, children, and youth, and their families, who have been harmed by violence, trauma, and substance use to healing.

“(b) USE OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A grant under subsection (a) may be used to implement trauma-informed policies and practices that support infants, children, youth, and their families, as appropriate, by—

(A) building public awareness and education about the Importance of addressing childhood trauma as a means to reduce violence and substance use and improve educational, economic, developmental, and societal outcomes for infants, children, and youth;

(B) providing training, tools, and resources to develop the skills and capacity of parents (including foster parents), adult guardians, and professionals who interact directly with infants, children, and youth, in an organized or professional setting, to recognize and respond to the needs of infants, children, and youth; and

(C) supporting community collaborations and partnerships and assistance to communities, organizations, and public agencies on how they can coordinate to prevent and mitigate the impact of trauma from exposure to violence and substance use on children in their homes, schools, and communities.

“(2) PRIORITIZATION.—Priority in awarding grants under this subsection shall be given to communities that seek to address multiple types of violence and serve children who have experienced poly-victimization.

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in coordination with the Civil Rights Division, shall establish a National Law Enforcement Child and Youth Trauma Coordinating Center (referred to in this section as the “Center”) to provide assistance to adult- and juvenile-serving State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies (including those operated by Indian tribes and tribal organizations as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination Act and Education Assistance Act) in interacting with infants, children, and youth who have been exposed to violence or other trauma, and their families, as appropriate.

(RANGE) The Center shall determine the age range of infants, children, and youth to be covered by the activities of the Center.

(b) DUTIES.—The Center shall provide assistance to adult- and juvenile-serving State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies by—

(1) disseminating information on the best practices for law enforcement officers, which may include best practices based on evidence-based and evidence-informed models from programs of the Department of Justice and the Office of Justice Services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the best practices developed under section 7132(d) of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (Public Law 115–271), such as—

(A) models developed in partnership with national law enforcement organizations, Indian tribes, or clinical researchers; and

(B) models that include trauma-informed approaches to conflict resolution, information gathering, forensic interviewing, de-escalation, and crisis intervention training;

(iii) preventing and supporting officers who experience secondary trauma;

(2) providing professional training and technical assistance; and

(3) awarding grants under subsection (c).

(c) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, acting through the Center, may award grants to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies or to multi-disciplinary consortia to—

(A) enhance the awareness of best practices for trauma-informed responses to infants, children, and youth who have been exposed to violence or other trauma, and their families, as appropriate; and

(B) provide comprehensive training and technical assistance in implementing the best practices described in subparagraph (A).

(2) APPLICATION.—Any State, local, or tribal law enforcement agency seeking a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Attorney General at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may require.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—A grant awarded under this subsection may be used to—

(A) provide training to law enforcement officers on best practices, including how to identify and appropriately respond to early signs of trauma and violence exposure when interacting with infants, children, and youth, and their families, as appropriate; and

(B) establish, operate, and evaluate a referral and partnership program with trauma-informed clinical mental health, substance use, health care, or social service professionals in the community in which the law enforcement agency serves.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General—

(1) $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2026 to award grants under subsection (c); and

(2) $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2026 for other activities of the Center.

SEC. 208. ESTABLISHMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT CHILD AND YOUTH TRAUMA COORDINATING CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF CENTER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, in coordination with the Civil Rights Division, shall establish a National Law Enforcement Child and Youth Trauma Coordinating Center (referred to in this section as the “Center”) to provide assistance to adult- and juvenile-serving State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies (including those operated by Indian tribes and tribal organizations as such terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination Act and Education Assistance Act) in interacting with infants, children, and youth who have been exposed to violence or other trauma, and their families, as appropriate.

(RANGE) The Center shall determine the age range of infants, children, and youth to be covered by the activities of the Center.

(b) DUTIES.—The Center shall provide assistance to adult- and juvenile-serving State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies by—

(1) disseminating information on the best practices for law enforcement officers, which may include best practices based on evidence-based and evidence-informed models from programs of the Department of Justice and the Office of Justice Services of the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the best practices developed under section 7132(d) of the SUPPORT for Patients and Communities Act (Public Law 115–271), such as—

(A) models developed in partnership with national law enforcement organizations, Indian tribes, or clinical researchers; and

(B) models that include trauma-informed approaches to conflict resolution, information gathering, forensic interviewing, de-escalation, and crisis intervention training;

(iii) preventing and supporting officers who experience secondary trauma;

(2) providing professional training and technical assistance; and

(3) awarding grants under subsection (c).

(c) GRANT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General, acting through the Center, may award grants to State, local, and tribal law enforcement agencies or to multi-disciplinary consortia to—

(A) enhance the awareness of best practices for trauma-informed responses to infants, children, and youth who have been exposed to violence or other trauma, and their families, as appropriate; and

(B) provide comprehensive training and technical assistance in implementing the best practices described in subparagraph (A).

(2) APPLICATION.—Any State, local, or tribal law enforcement agency seeking a grant under this subsection shall submit an application to the Attorney General at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Attorney General may require.

(3) USE OF FUNDS.—A grant awarded under this subsection may be used to—

(A) provide training to law enforcement officers on best practices, including how to identify and appropriately respond to early signs of trauma and violence exposure when interacting with infants, children, and youth, and their families, as appropriate; and

(B) establish, operate, and evaluate a referral and partnership program with trauma-informed clinical mental health, substance use, health care, or social service professionals in the community in which the law enforcement agency serves.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Attorney General—

(1) $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2026 to award grants under subsection (c); and

(2) $6,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2024 through 2026 for other activities of the Center.

May 3, 2023
SENATE RESOLUTION 191—RECOGNIZING WIDENING THREATS TO FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AND FREE EXPRESSION AROUND THE WORLD; REAFFIRMING THE VITAL ROLE THAT A FREE AND INDEPENDENT PRESS PLAYS IN COMBATING THE GROWING THREATS OF AUTHORITARIANISM, MISINFORMATION, AND DISINFORMATION, AND REAFFIRMING FREEDOM OF THE PRESS AS A PRIORITY OF THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT IN PROMOTING DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS, AND GOOD GOVERNANCE IN COMMEMORATION OF WORLD PRESS FREEDOM DAY ON MAY 3, 2023

MR. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. Kaine, Mr. Cardin, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Res. 191

Whereas the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and various State constitutions protect freedom of the press in the United States;

Whereas Thomas Jefferson, who championed the necessity of a free press for a thriving democratic society, wisely declared, “Our liberty depends on the freedom of the press, and that cannot be limited without being lost.”;

Whereas Article 19 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted in Paris on December 10, 1948, states, “Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom of the press and of other media of expression, and freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers;”

Whereas, in 1993, the United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the third day of May of each year to be “World Press Freedom Day”;

Whereas the Daniel Pearl Freedom of the Press Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-166) expanded the examination of the freedom of the press around the world in the annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices published by the Department of State;

Whereas, on December 18, 2013, and December 18, 2019, the United Nations General Assembly adopted Resolution 68/163 and Resolution 74/157, respectively, on the safety of journalists and the problem of impunity by unequivocally condemning all attacks on, and violence against, journalists and media workers, including torture, extrajudicial killings, enforced disappearances, arbitrary detention, and intimidation and harassment in conflict and non-conflict situations;

Whereas the United States Government has enacted the Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114-328) to place targeted economic and sanctions on individuals, including for their roles in the targeted killings of journalists;

Whereas, in an effort to combat attacks against journalists, Secretary of State Antony J. Blinken in February 2021, announced the Khoshoggi Ban, a new policy allowing the Department of State to impose visa restrictions on individuals or groups acting on behalf of a foreign government, are believed to have been directly engaged in serious, extraterritorial counter-dissent activities, which include harassment, surveil, threaten, or harm journalists, activists, or other persons perceived to be disdissidents for their work;

Whereas Reporters Without Borders, in their compiled data from 2022, provide alarming indications about growing divisions resulting from the spread of disinformation with the potential to weaken democratic societies;

Whereas, according to Reporters Without Borders, a record total of 333 journalists were in prison as of December 1, 2022, and the annual number of women journalists in prison rose has recently risen by nearly 30 percent;

Whereas Freedom House’s Freedom of the Press report marked the 17th consecutive year of decline in global freedom, with an estimated 39 percent of the global population living in countries deemed “Not Free”;

Whereas worsening media freedom has been one of the key drivers of declines in global freedom, including attacks and prosecutions against journalists, pressure on media outlets, repressive regulatory and legal frameworks, internet shutdowns, and blocks on online sources of information;

Whereas journalists and media staff are being murdered, attacked, harassed and imprisoned around the world and the Committee to Protect Journalists has reported that—

(1) at least 67 journalists and media workers were killed around the world in 2022, representing a rise compared to the previous year of almost 50 percent;

(2) the vast majority of murders of journalists occur with impunity, with nearly 80 percent of the perpetrators of 263 murders of journalists from September 1, 2012 to August 31, 2022 facing no punishment;

(3) Iran, China, and Belarus were responsible for nearly 60 percent of all imprisoned journalists; and

(4) journalists around the world have been targeted by government actors with sophisticated spyware products that pose a severe risk to their security and the security of their sources and families;

Whereas, according to PEN America, at least 311 writers and public intellectuals, including columnists and editors, journalists, were imprisoned across 36 different countries during 2022;

Whereas, since the start of Russia’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine in February 2022, Reporters Without Borders has documented attacks directly targeting journalists, including—

(1) the killing of 8 journalists and media workers;

(2) the torture by electric shock, beatings, and mock executions of journalists working for the internet-based outlet Meduza;

(3) targeted kidnappings of journalists and their families in occupied regions of Ukraine to put pressure on their reporting; and

(4) the deliberate attacks targeting media facilities;

Whereas, in the Ukrainian territory of Crimea, 13 journalists have repeatedly been threatened, arbitrarily arrested, and tortured for resisting Russian occupation, such as the detentions of Vladyslav Yeyenko, Iryna Danylovych, Ameet Suleimanov, Asan Akhmetov, Marlen Asanov, Nariman Celal, Oleksiy Bessarabov, Oleg Sviridov, Egor Dukhov, Meduza, Rustem Sheikhaliev, Server Mustafayev, Seyran Saliiev, Timur Ibragimov, and Vilen Temeryanov;

(5) Honduras has enacted a law allowing the president to grant amnesty to politicians, while four journalists were murdered in January and February 2023;

(6) according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, the Government of the People’s Republic of China had detained at least 43 journalists, as of December 1, 2022, and imposed 128 restrictions, and by censoring protest-related keywords on social media platforms;

(7) attacks on press freedom in Hong Kong, including the passage of the National Security Law, which poses a potential threat to the city’s tradition of press freedom, and the arrest and subsequent conviction of Jimmy Lai, owner of Hong Kong’s largest media outlet, Apple Daily, are an outspoken democracy advocate;

(8) arrests or other repressive actions against independent media workers and others in mainland China attempting to share uncensored news or opinion about current affairs, including Sophia Huang Xueqin, who has been detained about since 2021 and the protests in Hong Kong, and has been arbitrarily detained for more than 500 days;

(9) detentions of journalists, including members of the Government of China, such as Ruan Xiaohuan, who, after blogging about political and economic policies, was sentenced to a 7-year prison sentence for spreading false information about the Russian military in February 2023;

(10) Sergey Mikhailov, publisher of independent newspaper Listok, who was arrested for spreading false information about the Russian military in April 2022;

(11) Mikhail Afanasyev, editor-in-chief of the online magazine Meduza, who was arrested and charged with spreading false information about the Russian military in April 2022;

(12) Nenaja Gazeta, a landmark independent newspaper founded in 1993, which—

(A) suspended operations in Russia September 2022 after responding to the authorities citing the country’s foreign agents law; and

(B) was stripped of its print and online media licenses in September 2022; and

(7) Meduza, a leading independent bilingual news website based outside of Russia, which—

(A) was designated by Russian authorities in January 2023 as an “undesirable organization” under the 2015 Undesirable Organizations Law; and

(B) was banned from operating in the Russian Federation;

Whereas according to the Committee to Protect Journalists, the Government of the People’s Republic of China had detained at least 43 journalists, as of December 1, 2022, and imposed 128 restrictions, and by censoring protest-related keywords on social media platforms;

(7) attacks on press freedom in Hong Kong, including the passage of the National Security Law, which poses a potential threat to the city’s tradition of press freedom, and the arrest and subsequent conviction of Jimmy Lai, owner of Hong Kong’s largest media outlet, Apple Daily, are an outspoken democracy advocate;

(8) arrests or other repressive actions against independent media workers and others in mainland China attempting to share uncensored news or opinion about current affairs, including Sophia Huang Xueqin, who has been detained about since 2021 and the protests in Hong Kong, and has been arbitrarily detained for more than 500 days;

(9) detentions of journalists, including members of the Government of China, such as Ruan Xiaohuan, who, after blogging about political and economic policies, was sentenced to a 7-year prison sentence for spreading false information about the Russian military in February 2023;
Whereas Belarus has witnessed sweeping restrictions on press freedom since former President Lukashenko’s fraudulent election in August 2020, with journalists and media workers harassed, assaulted, imprisoned, or otherwise retaliated against for their work,

(1) Katsiaryna Andreyeva, a correspondent with Poland-based independent broadcaster Belsat TV, who, while serving a 2-year prison term for filming live footage of the violent dispersal of a protest against Lukashenko in November 2020, was sentenced to 8 additional years in prison on treason charges in August 2022; and

(2) Ksenia Lutskina, a former correspondent for the state broadcaster BelTA, detained on charges of spying on police, in prison on charges of conspiring to seize state power in September 2022, and who is not receiving appropriate medical care despite having brain tumor that has grown during her detention;

(3) Maryna Zolatava, chief editor of independent news website Tut.by, who was sentenced to 12 years in prison on charges of incitement to hatred and distributing materials calling for actions aimed at harming national security in March 2023;

(4) T.K., a journalist who, while working for Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, was detained in November 2021, and sentenced in June 2022 to 6 years in prison on charges of forming an extremist group; and

(5) Ihar Losik, another Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty journalist who was arrested in June 2020, and sentenced in December 2021 to 15 years in jail on bogus charges of preparation of actions that violate public order, who attempted suicide in March 2023, and whose wife, Iryna, was detained in January 2022, and sentenced in February 2022 to 2 years in prison on a charge of facilitating extremist activity;

Whereas Reporters Without Borders asserts that most journalists in the country’s interior are forced to hide in order to avoid possible imprisonment or death; and

Whereas Cuba remains a highly restricted environment for independent media, marked by internet restrictions and constant harassment of journalists and news outlets, including journalist Lázaro Yuri Valle Roca, who was sentenced to 5 years in prison for “enemy propaganda and resistance” in July 2022, and who was released in January 2023, and whose brother Arturo Valle Roca was detained in July 2022, on charges of libel, and who was sentenced to 2 years in prison on charges of conspiring to seize state power in September 2022; and

Whereas, in India, government authorities frequently impose internet and communication blockouts in certain areas, and have recently detained and charged journalists covering political demonstrations, called for the temporary blockage of journalists and media accounts on Twitter, and subjected journalists to searches and arrests, including:

(1) the February 2023 raid on the British Broadcasting Company offices in Delhi and Mumbai, during which tax authorities seized employees’ laptops and mobile phones, following an Income Tax Department order the previous month, widely viewed as an attempt to intimidate local journalists;

(2) the release blackouts in certain areas, and have recently detained and charged journalists covering political demonstrations, called for the temporary blockage of journalists and media accounts on Twitter, and subjected journalists to searches and arrests, including:

(1) the February 2023 raid on the British Broadcasting Company offices in Delhi and Mumbai, during which tax authorities seized employees’ laptops and mobile phones, following an Income Tax Department order the previous month, widely viewed as an attempt to intimidate local journalists;

(2) the release of a documentary on key political figures in India; and

(3) the house arrest of Gantam Navikaha, a journalist and activist, who has been awaiting trial since April 2020 on charges of “instigating caste violence”;

Whereas Pakistan maintains high levels of media censorship and impunity persists in cases of killings and physical attacks on journalists who criticize the military and state institutions, including:

(1) the arrest of journalists Imran Riaz Khan, in July 2022, under sedition charges for his criticism of the military; and

(2) the assassination of journalist Agrin Rozh, a human rights activist, and an employee of Dunya News, on July 1, 2022, days after he had made comments criticizing former Prime Minister Imran Khan and the military;

Whereas Iran was the leading jailer of journalists and the most prolific jailer of female journalists in 2022, subjecting media workers to aggressive tactics that included summons, arrests, travel bans, conditional releases, torture, inhumane treatment, and unjustified and unproven charges, including:

(1) Niloofar Hamedi, correspondent of the daily newspaper Sharq, who was imprisoned in 2020 for reporting on the death of Mahsa Amini on charges that could result in the death penalty;

(2) Elahe Mohammadi, journalist for the daily Hamihan, who was also imprisoned in 2022 for the same action and on the same charges;

(3) Yalda Monayeri, a prominent female photographer, who was arrested in 2022 for “espionage against the state” and “inciting hatred and distributing material against the Islamic order”;

(4) Behnaz Ghasr, a journalist for the newspaper Payam-e-Noori, who was sentenced in May 2022 to 15 years in prison on charges of forming an extremist group; and

(5) Mahmoud Mahmoudi, the editor of the weekly newspaper Agrin Roze, who was arrested by agents of the Ministry of Intelligence in Sanandaj after issuing an open letter calling for the release of detained Kurdish activists;

(6) Russian photojournalist Nooshin Jafari, who was arrested in 2021, and sentenced to 4-year prison term for “spreading anti-state propaganda” and “insulting sanctions”;

(7) Iranian journalist Navid Seyyed-Mohammadi, a Kurdish reporter for the state-run Islamic Republic Radio and Television, who was arrested in May 2020 and is serving a 7-year prison sentence for “espionage hostile state”;

Whereas Mexico continues to be one of the world’s deadliest countries for journalists, where 25 journalists are currently being missing, and reporting covers stories on political corruption and organized crime are frequently assaulted and murdered, including:

(1) Gustavo Sánchez Cabrera, a reporter who covered crime and politics and who was murdered in front of his son;

(2) Ricardo Domínguez López, the founder and editor of news website InfoGuayasmas, who was murdered in Veracruz in January 2022;

(3) Juan Carlos Muñiz, a reporter who covered crime and politics and who was murdered in front of his son;

(4) Ricardo Domínguez López, the founder and editor of news website InfoGuayasmas, who was murdered in Veracruz in January 2022;

(5) Miguel Mendoza, who along with 6 other journalists and media workers, was arrested in February 2023, and who was later charged with “inciting violence” and “inciting sedition”;

(6) the group of 222 political prisoners released by Nicaraguan authorities in February 2023, sent to the United States, and subsequently stopped on their return to Nicaragua; and

(7) journalist Victor Ticay, who was arrested in April 2023, in connection to his April 5 reporting about a Catholic Easter celebration.

Whereas Honduras remains one of the Western Hemisphere’s most dangerous countries for journalists, where those working for independent media or whose work criticizes the government are subjected to harassment, intimidation, and death threats by the country’s security forces and its affiliates;

Whereas criminal defamation lawsuits and legislation have been used in Peru to harass...
and silence investigative journalists who write about prominent political figures and the violent repression of protestors has also increased the risk to journalists covering on-going civil unrest in Peru.

Whereas the Office of the Director of National Intelligence has concluded that the 2018 murder of Washington Post journalist Jamal Khashoggi, in Istanbul was approved by Saudi Crown Prince Mohamed bin Salman and impunity continues for the Saudi officials involved in this crime;

Whereas the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia maintains an especially hostile environment towards journalists through systematic and arbitrary arrests and indefinite detention; and/or degrading treatment, lengthy pre-trial detentions, political persecution, and conditional release restrictions, which inhibit reporters and editors from returning to their professional work post-detention, including—

(1) Maha Al-Rafidi Al-Qahtani, a journalist and writer arrested in September 2019, held in solitary confinement and physically abused while in prison;
(2) Afnan Abulrahim Farhana, a columnist detained in February 2019, charged with membership in a terrorist organization; (3) Zuhair Kutbi, a journalist jailed in January 2019 and reportedly subjected to torture, malnourishment, and denial of cancer treatment in prison; and (4) Mawat Al-Qadhi, who recently completed a 10-year prison sentence on blasphemy and apostasy charges, and who remains subjected to a further 10-year travel ban, which prevents him from reuniting with his family who received asylum in Canada;

Whereas the battle for a free press continues to be fought in South Asia and Southeast Asia as well;

(1) Bangladeshi journalists are subjected to arbitrary arrests and charges under the Digital Security Act, and suffer killings and physical attacks with a near-total impunity;
(2) journalist, Nobel Prize laureate, and United States citizen Maria Ressa, despite rulings in her favor, continues to face repeated arrests and convictions for her reporting on President Duterte’s “war on drugs”, among other topics;
(3) Vietnamese journalists Pham Chùm Dung, Nguyen Tuong Thuy, and Le Huu Minh Tuan were each sentenced to more than 10 years in prison; and (4) Pham Doan Trang, a Vietnamese journalist and writer, following a year in detention, was sentenced to 9 years in prison for “anti-state activities” in a journaling, which prevents her from reuniting with his family who received asylum in Canada; Wherein the sale of a free press continues to be fought in South Asia and Southeast Asia as well;

(1) Ulfatkhonim Mamadshoeva, a 66-year-old ethnic Pamiri journalist and human rights defender, who was sentenced to 20 years in prison; and (2) journalists Daler Imomali, Abdullo Ghurbatli, Zavqiyele Saidamini, and Abduzakirov Pirmuhammadzoda, who were arrested in June 2022, but were never tried for free press, who was detained in December 2020 for 3 months on specious national security charges related to his journalism and is serving a 15-year prison sentence;

(3) Soulaimane Raissouni, a columnist and editor-in-chief Akhbar al-Youm, who was arrested in February 2018 on retaliatory charges related to his journalism and is serving a 5-year prison sentence;
(4) Ali Anouzla, a journalist and editor of the news website Lakom, who has been repeatedly arrested on retaliatory charges related to his journalism including “apologism for terrorism”, “material aid for terrorism”, and “incitement to terrorism”;

(5) Omar Radi, a journalist who was sentenced in April 2023 to 3 years in prison for free press, who was detained in December 2020 for 3 months on specious national security and fraud charges and remains subject to arbitrary travel bans and surveillance.

Whereas the Government of Morocco has imposed severe crackdowns on freedom of expression and supporters of a free press and is currently detain 13 journalists, including—

(1) Nadir Kerri, who was arrested in January 2023 for his objection to government plans to censor the country’s relative press freedom since Morocco has taken worrying steps to undermine press freedom by introducing further curbs on its already restricted media landscape, including—

(2) Soulaimane Raissouni, a columnist and editor-in-chief Akhbar al-Youm, who succeeeded journalist Taousfik Bouachrine, who was arrested in 2021, and is serving on retaliatory charges related to his journalism and is serving a 5-year prison sentence; and (3) Ali Anouzla, journalist and editor of the news website Lakom, who has been repeatedly arrested on retaliatory charges related to his journalism including “apologism for terrorism”, “material aid for terrorism”, and “incitement to terrorism”;

(5) Sultan MT, a journalist who was sentenced in May 2023 to 3 years in prison for free press, who was detained in December 2020 for 3 months on specious national security and fraud charges and remains subject to arbitrary travel bans and surveillance.

Whereas freedom of the press continues to be a challenge in sub-Saharan Africa, including—

(1) Ethiopia, where a crackdown on the press has included—
(A) the arbitrary arrests of journalists, which was exacerbated during the civil war and has continued even after the signing of a peace agreement in November 2022; (B) internet disruptions deployed during times of political tension, including as recent as in June 2022; and (C) the January 2023 suspension of 15 media outlets, including the BBC’s Somali service, for their “anti-government” reporting; (2) journalists Daler Imomali, Abdullo Ghurbatli, Zavqiyele Saidamini, and Abduzakirov Pirmuhammadzoda, who were arrested in June 2022, but were never publicly charged;

Whereas Hatice Duman, the longest imprisoned journalist in Turkey, who has been serving a life sentence on terrorism charges since April 9, 2003, told the Committee to Protect Journalists in November that she had little hope for freedom in her current trial;

Whereas, in Georgia, the free press is increasingly threatened, as evidenced by the recent imprisonment of government minister and journalist Nika Gvaramia to a 42 month prison sentence on May 16, 2022, on charges widely denounced as politically motivated, in a vague law modeled after the Russian Federation’s infamous “foreign agents” law, and insufficient prosecution of frequent physical attacks on members of the press; and (1) Ulfatkhonim Mamadshoeva, a 66-year-old ethnic Pamiri journalist and human rights defender, who was sentenced to 20 years in prison; and (2) journalists Daler Imomali, Abdullo Ghurbatli, Zavqiyele Saidamini, and Abduzakirov Pirmuhammadzoda, who were sentenced to terms of imprisonment ranging from 10 to 16 years on spurious charges of extremism;

Whereas, in Kyrgyzstan, where the government has taken worrying steps to undermine press freedom since the start of 2022, including by—

(1) blocking news websites under an arbitrary new “false information” law, including online platforms of Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty; and (2) imposing spurious charges of illegal drug manufacture on investigative journalist Bolot Temirov and deporting him to the Russian Federation in retaliation for his report on corruption in the government’s procurement processes;

Whereas the Office of the Director of National Intelligence has concluded that the 2018 murder of Washington Post journalist Jamal Khashoggi, in Istanbul was approved by Saudi Crown Prince Mohamed bin Salman and impunity continues for the Saudi officials involved in this crime;

Whereas the Office of the Director of National Intelligence has concluded that the 2018 murder of Washington Post journalist Jamal Khashoggi, in Istanbul was approved by Saudi Crown Prince Mohamed bin Salman and impunity continues for the Saudi officials involved in this crime;
Whereas the Maduro regime of Venezuela continues to target independent media outlets, restrict the exercise of freedom of expression, and severely limit Venezuelan access to information,

Whereas American journalists have been victimized while reporting abroad, including:

(1) Christopher Allen, who was killed while covering the conflict in South Sudan on August 26, 2017, and whose killing has yet to be investigated by authorities after nearly 6 years;

(2) Austin Tice, who was kidnapped in Syria and has been held in captivity since August 12, 2012; and

(3) Brent Renaud, who was killed by Russian forces while covering the war in Ukraine on March 13, 2022; and

(4) Evan Gershkovich, who was arrested in Russia on charges of espionage on March 29, 2023;

Whereas, under the auspices of the United States Agency for Global Media, the United States Government provides financial assistance to several editorially independent media outlets, including Voice of America, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, Radio Free Asia, the Office of Cuba Broadcasting, and the Middle East Broadcasting Network;

(1) which report and broadcast news, information, and analysis in critical regions around the world; and

(2) whose journalists regularly face harassment, fines, and imprisonment for their work; and

Whereas press freedom—

(1) is a key component of democratic governance, activism in civil society, and socioeconomic development; and

(2) enhances public accountability, transparency, and participation in civil society and democratic governance; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) declares that a free press—

(A) is a central component of free societies and democratic governance;

(B) contributes to an informed civil society and government accountability;

(C) helps to expose corruption;

(D) enhances public accountability and transparency of governments at all levels; and

(E) disseminates information that is essential to improving public health and safety;

(2) recognizes and commends journalism’s role in providing trusted, accurate, and timely information and in holding governments and leaders accountable to citizens;

(4) is dismayed that, under cover of the COVID-19 pandemic, many governments have restricted the work of journalists reporting on the public health crisis and on peaceful protests on a variety of issues;

(5) recognizes that journalists made tremendous sacrifices, including the loss of their lives, in the pursuit of truth and justice;

(6) condemns all actions around the world that suppress press freedom;

(7) calls for the unconditional and immediate release of all wrongfully detained journalists; and

(8) reaffirms the centrality of press freedom to efforts of the United States Government to support democracy, mitigate conflict, and promote good governance domestically and around the world; and

(9) calls upon the President and the Secretary of State—

(A) to stand and build upon the leadership of the United States on issues relating to press freedom, on the basis of the protections for freedom of the press afforded the American people under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

(B) to transparently investigate and bring to justice the perpetrators of attacks against journalists; and

(C) to promote the respect and protection of press freedom around the world.

SENATE RESOLUTION 192—RECOGNIZING APRIL 30, 2023, AS “EL DÍA DE LOS NIÑOS–CELEBRATING YOUNG AMERICANS”

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted the following resolution, which was considered and agreed to:

S. Res. 192

Whereas, each year in the United States, El Día de los Niños–Celebrating Young Americans is recognized as a day to affirm and recognize the importance of young children and adolescents in the United States;

Whereas children and adolescents represent the hopes and dreams of the people of the United States, and the well-being of children and adolescents is emphasized as a top priority in the United States;

Whereas, according to data of the Bureau of the Census, the Hispanic population in the United States is the youngest major racial or ethnic group in the United States, as—

(1) more than 18,800,000 Hispanics in the United States, a group that represents nearly 1/3 of the Hispanic population in the United States, are younger than 18 years of age; and

(2) in 2019, nearly 16,600,000 Hispanics in the United States, a group that represents more than 1/3 of the Hispanic population in the United States, were individuals between 18 and 34 years of age;

Whereas the Hispanic population of the United States continues to grow and is a significant part of the workforce in the United States, and children in the Hispanic population will be consumers, taxpayers, and voters in the future;

Whereas, as the United States becomes more culturally and ethnically diverse, the people of the United States must strive to bring about cultural understanding and celebrate a tradition that honors all children and adolescents on El Día de los Niños–Celebrating Young Americans, a day that acknowledges and shares traditions and customs with all people in the United States;

Whereas parents are at the center of teaching children about family values, morality, life preparation, health, survival, and culture;

Whereas the designation of a day of special recognition to honor children and adolescents in the United States—

(1) will help affirm the significance of family, education, health, and community among the people of the United States; and

(2) will provide an opportunity for those children and adolescents to reflect on their futures, to articulate their aspirations, to find a path to their futures by allowing children to voice their hopes and dreams;

Whereas, each year in the United States, El Día de los Niños–Celebrating Young Americans with Ninós–Celebrating Young Americans with

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes April 30, 2023, as “El Día de los Niños–Celebrating Young Americans”;

(2) encourages the people of the United States—

(A) to nurture and invest in children and adolescents in order to preserve and enhance economic prosperity, democracy, and the free and open exchange of ideas, which are concepts that are essential to the spirit of the United States; and

(B) to celebrate the gifts of children and adolescents and help children and adolescents take their rightful place in the future of the United States; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States to join with children, families, communities, schools, churches, cities, and States across the United States to observe El Día de los Niños–Celebrating Young Americans with appropriate ceremonies, including activities that—

(A) center on children and are free of or minimal cost so as to facilitate full participation by all people;

(B) uplift and help children positively envision a path to their futures by allowing children to voice their hopes and dreams; and

(C) offer opportunities for children of diverse backgrounds to learn about the cultures of one another and to share ideas;

(D) include family members, especially extended and elderly family members, so as to—

(i) promote understanding and communication among generations; and

(ii) enable young people to learn from, and respect and benefit from the experiences of, their family elders; and

(E) enable diverse communities to build relationships of understanding; and

(F) provide children with safe schools, homes, and communities that give them the tools to support their dreams, learn, develop, and become confident young adults who are ready and eager to believe in and contribute to the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 193—DESIGNATING APRIL 2023 AS “SECOND CHANCE MONTH”

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. CRAMER) submitted the following resolution, which was considered and agreed to:

S. Res. 193

Whereas many individuals returning from Federal and State prisons have paid their debt for committing crimes but still face significant legal and societal barriers (referred to in this preamble as “collateral consequences”);

Whereas collateral consequences for an individual returning from a Federal or State prison are often mandatory and take effect automatically, regardless of:

(1) whether there is a nexus between the crime and public safety;

(2) the seriousness of the crime;

(3) the time that has passed since the individual committed the crime; or

(4) the efforts of the individual to make amends or earn back the trust of the public; and

Whereas, for individuals returning to their communities from Federal and State prisons, gaining meaningful employment is one of the most significant predictors of successful reentry and has been shown to reduce future criminal activity;

Whereas many individuals who have been incarcerated struggle to find employment and access capital to start a small business because of collateral consequences, which
SENATE RESOLUTION 194—DESIGNATING MAY 5, 2023, AS THE “NATIONAL DAY OF AWARENESS FOR MISSING AND MURDERED NATIVE WOMEN AND GIRLS”

Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. MURRAY, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 2023 as “Second Chance Month”; and

(2) honors the work of communities, governmental institutions, nonprofit organizations, congregations, employers, and individuals to remove unnecessary legal and societal barriers that prevent individuals with criminal records from becoming productive members of the community; and

(3) calls upon the people of the United States to observe “Second Chance Month” through actions and programs that—

(A) promote awareness of those unnecessary legal and social barriers; and

(B) provide closure for individuals with criminal records who have paid their debts to the community.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, I have seven requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

COMMITTEE ON STATE DEPARTMENT AND USAID MANAGEMENT, INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS, AND BILATERAL INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Subcommittee on State Department and USAID Management, International Operations, and Bilateral International Development of the Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 3, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. LUMMIS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Jake Newton and Casey Foss—in my office—he granted floor privileges until May 4, 2023.

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

Mr. WICKER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Hubert Couch and James Causey—in their
my office—be granted floor privileges until May 4, 2023.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2023

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m., Thursday, May 4; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be printed, to the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Senate nomination postcloture and that all time be considered expired at 11:30 a.m.; further, that following the cloture vote on the Shogun nomination, notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate resume consideration of the Gupta nomination, with the time until 1:45 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and at 1:45 p.m. the Senate vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination; further, that if any nominations are confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. For the information of the Senate, there will be two rollcall votes at 11:30 a.m. and one at 1:45 p.m.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the very, very learned remarks of Senator SULLIVAN.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I thank the majority leader for his fine compliment to me on the Senate floor about learned remarks. I appreciate that.

Mr. SCHUMER. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SULLIVAN. I appreciate that very much.

Not if you are going to take away your compliment—if you are going to keep it, I will yield.

Mr. SCHUMER. I just want to reserve the right to read the remarks before closing debate.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Actually, I think you will appreciate these remarks.

Mr. SCHUMER. I thank the Senator. I yield the floor and am looking forward to the Senator’s remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

U.S. NAVY

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, recently, there have been numerous articles in the media about the U.S. Navy’s lack of amphibious ships—one that I would like to submit for the RECORD, headlined “Grounding of U.S. Marine Unit Spotlights Lack of Ships in Asia-Pacific,” can be found online at https://www.wsj.com/articles/grounding-of-us-marine-unit-spotlights-lack-of-ships-in-asia-pacific-757315b4. (Mr. WHITEHOUSE assumed the Chair.)

In this piece, the writer leads with how the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit, a rapid response force of the Marine Corps designed for quick deployment on three Navy ships—what we call an “amphibious ready group”—how they were forced to abandon a training exercise because the amphibious warships that they are supposed to train on were not available due to maintenance problems.

Here is what the article said in part:

The Marine unit’s grounded status illustrate the United States is facing as it tries to pivot its military to handle the challenges from China. Overall, defense officials said the Navy doesn’t have enough amphibious ships to transport the Marines, and a central part of the Marine Corps’ mission is to hop from island to island in the Asia-Pacific and harry Chinese forces in the event of a conflict.

By the way, Mr. President, the Marines are really good at this. They have been doing it for decades. But they need ships.

Another article from Defense News is also a recent one about the lack of amphibious ships and the problem that poses. This one is from another part of the world but very recent. The article starts with how hundreds of American citizens were stranded in war-torn Sudan.

It says:

Hundreds of Americans in war-torn Sudan last month needed a way out of the country, but the U.S. Marine Corps, the go-to service for such rescues [of American citizens] couldn’t help.

The article continued:

Typically, this kind of mission would be standard for the Navy and Marine Corps’ amphibious ready group.

A Marine expeditionary unit, or what we call in the Marine Corps a MEU, a MEU-R, a Marine expeditionary unit, an amphibious ready group—three ships, super well-trained, special operations capable, can go anywhere in the world, kick the door in, save American citizens.

The article continues:

For the Americans who fled to the coast [in Sudan] the Pentagon sent an auxiliary transport ship—

that they contracted out, I believe, from another country—

to shuttle them safely to . . . Saudi Arabia.

It was, in essence, a self-evacuation of U.S. citizens.

Mr. President, NPR reported that the buses actually took hundreds of Americans to the Port of Sudan. Imagine—imagine—my colleagues, what would have happened had those Americans, traveling in contract buses in the midst of a civil war, got caught in the crossfire.

The article that I just quoted was entitled “Marines want 31 amphibious ships. The Pentagon disagrees. Now what?” I ask unanimous consent to that article printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Finally, Mr. President, there was another recent article from Defense One. Its title was “Navy On Path To Violate 31-Amphibious-Ship Requirement in 2024.”

Now, Mr. President, this is what I wanted to get to. Last year, in the Armed Services Committee, we held a number of hearings with the Navy and the Marine Corps saying: What is the minimum number of amphibious ships that would enable the Marine Corps to do its global force response mission—the minimum number? After many hearings, after much discussion with the Marines and Navy, we came up, in a bill of mine, with a minimum of 31 ships.

This bill in the Armed Services Committee last year passed unanimously. Every Democrat and every Republican voted for it.

The law now reads as follows. I know this is a little small, but here is the new U.S. Code that has the new language. It says:

The naval combat forces of the Navy shall include not less than 11 operational aircraft carriers and not less than 31 operational amphibious warfare ships, of which not less than 10 shall be amphibious assault ships.

What we call in the Marine Corps “big-deck assault ships” that can carry helicopters and Ospreys and Harriers and now F-35 Bravos. That was the law. That passed. The President signed it.

Here is the problem. The U.S. Navy is violating the law. The larger obstacles the Navy is treating that law—31 amphibis, a minimum—as a suggestion from the Congress, as an option from the Congress.

How do I know? Because we had a hearing 2 weeks ago on the Armed Services Committee, and the Secretary of the Navy essentially said: We are looking at different options for the President’s budget on how many amphibis that the Navy is going to have.

And, currently, the Navy presented a budget that doesn’t have 31 amphibis.

I had some cross words with the Secretary of the Navy, the CNO of the Navy, because they are violating the law. And I will tell you, my Democratic and Republican colleagues on the Armed Services Committee were supportive of what I was saying. We had a hearing on the Armed Services Readiness Subcommittee yesterday. The Vice Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Franchetti, said that the Navy was “studying the issue.”

The Navy can’t study the issue anymore. The Navy needs to follow the
But guess what they can't do it with—cue American citizens—a lot of them—launch helos, launch support craft, hel- 
Well, let me end where I began, with a building plan. It never hits 31 ships.
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Allow for enough ready ships—those not tied up in maintenance—that some would be available for training Marines in exercises likely to be held this summer.

The requirement is specifically divided up into 10 amphibious assault ships (made up of the America-class LHA and Wasp-class LSDs that host fixed-wing jets like the F-35B), 12 amphibious assault ships (either the aging Whidbey Island-class LSDs or the newer San Antonio-class LPDs). An amphibious ready group includes one amphibious assault ship and two medium-sized ships.

Brodie told Defense News this 31-ship requirement is backed by studies undertaken from fiscal year 2014 on, which reflects ship maintenance readiness rates, which hover around 40%.

That rate means in a fleet of 31 ships, 12 or 13 might be available at any given time. If six are supposed to be deployed, and another six are getting ready to deploy next, that leaves little to no additional capacity for training or surging in response to natural disasters or conflicts.

This low readiness rate has complicated the discussion and is a key reason the Marine Corps considers 31 ships the bare minimum.

Pilots with the 13th Marine Expeditionary Unit and helicopters and various transport dock Anchorage on Dec. 8, 2022. (Sgt. Brendan Cus- ter/U.S. Marine Corps)

Bryan Clark, director of the Center for Defense Concepts and Technology at the Hudson Institute think tank, said 31 ships is the right number, but noted “presence is now the driver, rather than warfighting lift requirement.”

While the amphibious ready group and Marine expeditionary unit, or ARG/MEU, team still can storm an island and take it from enemy, for instance, it is most often used to train alongside partners and allies, respond to friendly nations after a natural disaster, or rescue American citizens trapped in dangerous countries.

Eaglen said this emphasis on presence as a means of deterrence has contributed to the disagreement with the Pentagon over the 31-ship requirement.

“The rub as I see it between the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the Marine Corps is over amphib ship requirements for operations in the American area of responsibility—this is all about readiness rates and maintenance readiness rates and the way that are doing business,” he said. “None of that is new. None of that is new.”

Heckl, speaking at the annual Sea-Air-Space conference in April, said the Marines had in 2014 worked with the Navy to scale down the LPD design to the Flight II design, now under construction at Ingalls Shipbuilding. “We drove out cost. We’re done.”

Berger, who was part of that 2014 effort, made the same point in an April 18 Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, saying that “every bit of efficiency [was] squeezed out” of the LPD design.

“If there’s another effort to reduce that further, I know that we went to the mini- mums in 2014,” the commandant added.

When Navy ships first rolled out the plan to nix future LPDs, Chief of Naval Operations Adm. Mike Gilday said that as the service prepares for a potential fight against China, it must assess programs most relevant to that conflict.

But more recently, top Navy officials said they would like to continue buying LPDs. Gilday told reporters in early April: “We agree on the 31 requirement, we agree on leveraging the multiyear procurement in terms of doing a bundle buy, and hopefully this study that ends in June informs these next steps.”

Sherwood, when asked about the Penta- gon’s plan to pull the plug on LPDs in FY23 and to use multiyear procurement author- ity, said the Office of the Secretary of Defense plans to “address the next purchase in our FY23 budget.”

Lawmakers last year included a provision in the FY23 National Defense Authorization Act giving the commandant of the Marine Corps the authority to set the requirement for amphibious ships. That effectively makes the congressionalmandated requirement 31.

**TODAY’S PLAN**

The Navy’s FY24 long-range shipbuilding plan, released April 17, envisions a dwindling amphibious fleet unless a compromise can be reached on building a new LPD.

Until the amphibious ship study determines the future of the San Antonio program—whether to continue or truncate it; whether to buy ships at one or two a year; or commit to a multi-ship buy; whether to keep the Flight II design or pare it down further—the Navy’s existing long-range plan does not in- clude any medium amphibious vessels.

It continues retiring the aging Whidbey Island LSDs, though, calling for six of the 10 remaining ships to be retired from FY24 to FY26.

**FLEET UNDER FIRE**

Though the Marine Corps maintains it needs 31 ships, the Pentagon has not committed to that requirement.

DoD officials have not spoken publicly on the matter. Asked by Defense News whether the Office of the Secretary of Defense backs the 31-ship requirement, Pentagon spokesman Chris Sherwood said the requirement can’t be considered in isolation and the de-
a China fight, and therefore [they are] not worth the money.”

Eaglen added that the Office of the Secretary of Defense “is concerned some amphibious ships are too slow and therefore easy targets after the shooting starts” with China, despite the Marine Corps seeing amphibious ships and the surface connectors they haul as “critical to fighting inside the First Island Chain using Marines as a stand-in force.” (The first island chain stretches from Japan’s East China Sea islands through the Philippines.)

“Ultimately, Congress will be the adjudicator, and they will again side with the commandant,” she predicted.

THE COST OF FALLING SHORT OF A 31-SHIP FLEET

Berger told the Senate committee that not having enough ships puts at risk Marines’ ability to deter or win a war, plus their ability to respond to global crises.

“You have to be there with allies and partners because they have to believe that the United States is not running away from them, is going to be there even when things get tough,” he said.

The commandant added that “if you still believe . . . three amphibious ships loaded up with 2,300 Marines, if they have a deterrent value, and I think they do, then you want them right in the adversary’s grill, right in their face where they can see them all the time . . . Can we afford conventional deterrence? Absolutely yes, because the alternative is a lot worse.”

U.S. Marines sit in formation in combat rubber raiding crafts during a launch and recovery exercise with the amphibious transport dock New Orleans in the Philippine Sea on Aug. 6, 2022. (Lance Cpl. Yvonne Iwae/U.S. Marine Corps)

Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps Gen. Eric Smith during a panel discussion at Sea-Air-Space said the service is providing as much airlift as possible for its forces in the Pacific, allowing Marines to get to exercises and respond to problems. But there are still gaps when no ARG/MEUs are patrolling the Pacific, and Smith warned those would increase if the fleet size decreases.

If Americans traveling or working abroad find themselves in the middle of a violent uprising, “you better hope it’s in the months that we have an ARG/MEU ready to come get you. If you’re a combatant commander and somebody tries to close down a SLOC, a sea line of communication, you’re going to want to hope that’s during the months that we’re there.”

Calling the ARG/MEU the “crown jewel of our expeditionary crisis response capability,” Turner said “with the minimum of 31 ships that has been established and the readiness challenges that we’re facing that we discussed, really the confluence between capacity and readiness has pinched that capability in ways that are really not helpful.”

If the Navy continues down its path of decommissioning the old LSDs and not replacing them with new LPDs, “trying to maintain even a minimal ARG/MEU presence is going to be really difficult.”

“At a time that we should be adding capability, we’re actually reducing capability,” Turner said.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow. Thereupon, the Senate, at 8:46 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, May 4, 2023, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 3, 2023:

THE JUDICIARY

ORELIA ELETA MERCHANT, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

WESLEY L. HSU, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.
EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS
Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for inclusion in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, May 4, 2023 may be found in the Daily Digest of today’s RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

MAY 9
4:45 p.m.
Committee on Armed Services
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces
To hold hearings to examine Department of Defense missile defense activities in review of the Defense Authorization Request for Fiscal Year 2024 and the Future Years Defense Program.
SR–222

MAY 10
10 a.m.
Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Xochitl Torres Small, of New Mexico, to be Deputy Secretary of Agriculture.
SR–328A
Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies
To hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2024 for Indian country.
SD–124
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Business meeting to consider S. 229, to require that the Federal Government coordinate with State-level economic development organizations to increase foreign direct investment in semiconductor-related manufacturing and production, S. 376, to enhance safety requirements for trains transporting hazardous materials, S. 1280, to require coordinated National Institute of Standards and Technology science and research activities regarding illicit drugs containing xylazine, novel synthetic opioids, and other substances of concern, S. 1294, to improve forecasting and understanding of tornadoes and other hazardous weather, S. 1414, to improve the instant messaging service used by the National Weather Service, S. 1416, to provide guidance for and investment in the upgrade and modernization of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Weather Radio All Hazards Network, and promotions in the Coast Guard.
SR–253
Committee on Energy and Natural Resources
Subcommittee on National Parks
To hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2024 for the National ParkService.
SD–366
Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
SD–406

MAY 11
10 a.m.
Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
Business meeting to consider S. 1067, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to citizen petitions, S. 1114, to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to the 180-day exclusivity period, S. 1339, to provide for increased oversight of entities that provide pharmacy benefit management services on behalf of group health plans and health insurance coverage, and other pending calendar business.
SD–430

MAY 16
2 p.m.
Committee on Appropriations
To hold hearings to examine the President’s proposed budget request for fiscal year 2024, focusing on investing in U.S. security, competitiveness, and the path ahead for the U.S. China relationship.
SD–106

MAY 31
2:30 p.m.
Committee on Environment and Public Works
Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure
To hold hearings to examine the perspectives of new and existing US Army Corps of Engineers authorities to respond to water management issues including drought and water conservation.
SD–406

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

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1471–S1519

Measures Introduced: Twenty-nine bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1410–1438, and S. Res. 191–194. Pages S1504–05

Measures Reported:

S. Res. 119, recognizing the 202nd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States.

S. Res. 157, commemorating the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Good Friday Agreement.

Measures Passed:

National Native Plant Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 152, designating April 2023 as “National Native Plant Month”, and the resolution was then agreed to.

Financial Literacy Month: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 185, designating April 2023 as “Financial Literacy Month”, and the resolution was then agreed to.

El Dia de los Ninos-Celebrating Young Americans: Senate agreed to S. Res. 192, recognizing April 30, 2023, as “El Dia de los Ninos-Celebrating Young Americans”.

Second Chance Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 193, designating April 2023 as “Second Chance Month”.

National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls: Senate agreed to S. Res. 194, designating May 5, 2023, as the “National Day of Awareness for Missing and Murdered Native Women and Girls”.

Procedures Covering Suspension of Liquidation, Duties and Estimated Duties in Accord With Presidential Proclamation 10414:

Lesser Prairie-Chicken Rule: By 50 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 110), Senate passed S.J. Res. 9, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Lesser Prairie-Chicken; Threatened Status with Section 4(d) Rule for the Northern Distinct Population Segment and Endangered Status for the Southern Distinct Population Segment”.

Procedures Covering Suspension of Liquidation, Duties and Estimated Duties in Accord With Presidential Proclamation 10414:

Lesser Prairie-Chicken Rule: By 50 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. 110), Senate passed S.J. Res. 9, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service relating to “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Lesser Prairie-Chicken; Threatened Status with Section 4(d) Rule for the Northern Distinct Population Segment and Endangered Status for the Southern Distinct Population Segment”.

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nominations:
By 51 yeas to 48 nays (Vote No. EX. 107), Orelia Eleta Merchant, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

By 53 yeas to 43 nays (Vote No. EX. 111), Wesley L. Hsu, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 54 yeas to 45 nays (Vote No. EX. 108), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination.

Executive Communications:

Executive Reports of Committees:
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S. 396, to require the Secretary of State to submit an annual report to Congress regarding the ties between criminal gangs and political and economic elites in Haiti and impose sanctions on political and economic elites involved in such criminal activities, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 682, to provide for the treatment of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) as an international organization for purposes of the International Organizations Immunities Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1240, to modify the requirements for candidate countries under the Millennium Challenge Act of 2003;

S. 1325, to establish a partnership with nations in the Western Hemisphere to promote economic competitiveness, democratic governance, and security, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 841, to authorize the Caribbean Basin Security Initiative, to enhance the United States-Caribbean security partnership, to prioritize natural disaster resilience, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 797, to establish and implement a multi-year Legal Gold and Mining Partnership Strategy to reduce the negative environmental and social impacts of illicit gold mining in the Western Hemisphere, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. Res. 119, recognizing the 202nd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States;

S. Res. 157, commemorating the 25th anniversary of the signing of the Good Friday Agreement;

S. Res. 106, condemning Beijing’s destruction of Hong Kong’s democracy and rule of law, with amendments;

S. Res. 99, supporting the goals of International Women’s Day, with an amendment;

S. Con. Res. 7, condemning Russia’s unjust and arbitrary detention of Russian opposition leader Vladimir Kara-Murza who has stood up in defense of democracy, the rule of law, and free and fair elections in Russia, with amendments;

S. Res. 115, supporting the goals and ideals of “Countering International Parental Child Abduction Month” and expressing the sense of the Senate that Congress should raise awareness of the harm caused by international parental child abduction;

S. Res. 23, demanding that the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Communist Party of China immediately release Mark Swidan; and

The nominations of Elizabeth Allen, of New York, to be Under Secretary for Public Diplomacy, Vivek Hallegere Murthy, of Florida, to be Representative of the United States on the Executive Board of the World Health Organization, Pamela M. Tremont, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Zimbabwe, and Nicole D. Theriot, of Louisiana, to be Ambassador to the Co-operative Republic of Guyana, all of the Department of State, Elizabeth Shortino, of the District of Columbia, to be United States Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund, Kenneth M. Jarin, of Pennsylvania, to be Chair, and to be a Member, and Jeffrey Gedmin, of the District of Columbia, Kathleen Cunningham Matthews, of Maryland, Luis Manuel Botello, of Maryland, and Michelle Mai Selesky Giuda, of Virginia, each to be a Member, all of the International Broadcasting Advisory Board, and routine lists in the Foreign Service.

GLOBAL INFORMATION WARS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on State Department and USAID Management, International Operations, and Bilateral International Development concluded a hearing to examine the global information wars, after receiving testimony from Amanda Bennett, Chief Executive Officer, Agency for Global Media; David Stilwell, Air Force Academy Institute for Future Conflict, former Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs; Christopher Walker, National Endowment for Democracy, and Jessica Brandt, Brookings Institution, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported to consider S. 1308, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to extend the deadline for the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate regulations implementing title IV of that Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

LEGISLATION

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 195, to provide compensation to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community for the taking without just compensation of land by the United States inside the exterior boundaries of the L’Anse Indian Reservation that were guaranteed to the Community under a treaty signed in 1854, S. 382, to take certain land in the State of Washington into trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation, and S. 1322, to amend the National Organizations Immunities Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.
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Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported to consider S. 1308, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to extend the deadline for the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate regulations implementing title IV of that Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.
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Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on State Department and USAID Management, International Operations, and Bilateral International Development concluded a hearing to examine the global information wars, after receiving testimony from Amanda Bennett, Chief Executive Officer, Agency for Global Media; David Stilwell, Air Force Academy Institute for Future Conflict, former Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of East Asian and Pacific Affairs; Christopher Walker, National Endowment for Democracy, and Jessica Brandt, Brookings Institution, all of Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported to consider S. 1308, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to extend the deadline for the Secretary of the Interior to promulgate regulations implementing title IV of that Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

LEGISLATION

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine S. 195, to provide compensation to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Community for the taking without just compensation of land by the United States inside the exterior boundaries of the L’Anse Indian Reservation that were guaranteed to the Community under a treaty signed in 1854, S. 382, to take certain land in the State of Washington into trust for the benefit of the Puyallup Tribe of the Puyallup Reservation, and S. 1322, to amend the National Organizations Immunities Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.
DIGITAL ADVERTISING


INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. The House will meet at 11 a.m. on Friday, May 5, 2023.

Committee Meetings

No hearings were held.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 4, 2023

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: Subcommittee on Commodities, Risk Management, and Trade, to hold hearings to examine commodity programs, credit, and crop insurance, focusing on industry perspectives on risk management and access to credit, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies, to hold hearings to examine proposed budget estimates and justification for fiscal year 2024 for the National Institutes of Health, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine worldwide threats; to be immediately followed by a closed session in SVC–217, 9:30 a.m., SD–G50.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine holding executives accountable after recent bank failures, 10 a.m., SD–538.

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine The Default on America Act, 10 a.m., SD–608.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold an oversight hearing to examine the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Stephanie Syptak-Ramnath, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Peru, Arthur W. Brown, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Ecuador, Yael Lempert, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, and Roger F. Nyhus, of Washington, to be Ambassador to Barbados, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Federation of Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Antigua and Barbuda, the Commonwealth of Dominica, Grenada, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, all of the Department of State, 10:15 a.m., SD–419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine preparing for the next public health emergency, focusing on reauthorizing the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Act, 1 p.m., SD–430.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Michael Arthur Delaney, of New Hampshire, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit, Charnelle Bjelkengren, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Washington, S. Kato Crews, to be United States District Judge for the District of Colorado, Jeremy C. Daniel, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, Marian F. Gaston, to be United States District Judge for the Southern District of California, Brendan Abell Hurson, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland, Darrel James Papillion, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Molly R. Silfen, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years, Eric G. Olshan, to be United States Attorney for the Western District of Pennsylvania for the term of four years, Craig J. Anderson, to be United States Marshal for the District of Montana for the term of four years, S. 1207, to establish a National Commission on Online Child Sexual Exploitation Prevention, S. 1199, to combat the sexual exploitation of children by supporting victims and promoting accountability and transparency by the tech industry, S. 1080, to amend the
Controlled Substances Act to require electronic communication service providers and remote computing services to report to the Attorney General certain controlled substances violations, S. 412, to provide that it is unlawful to knowingly distribute private intimate visual depictions with reckless disregard for the individual’s lack of consent to the distribution, and S. 1170, to reauthorize and update the Project Safe Childhood program, 9 a.m., SH–216.

House

No hearings are scheduled.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Thursday, May 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of LaShonda A. Hunt, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation thereon at 11:30 a.m. Following consideration of the nomination of LaShonda A. Hunt, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Colleen Joy Shogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Archivist of the United States. Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Geeta Rao Gupta, of Virginia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women’s Issues at 1:45 p.m.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
11 a.m., Friday, May 5

House Chamber

Program for Friday: House will meet in Pro Forma session at 11 a.m.