



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 2023

No. 79

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray. Eternal God, known to us in countless ways and times without number, we turn to You, that in Your light we might see light. Lord, illuminate the minds of our lawmakers regarding how to solve the difficult problems of our Nation and world.

As our Senators become aware of Your presence, may their lives experience the splendor and strength that You alone can give. Help them to remember that You are still their best help in the time of trouble. Send them forth to face this day armed with a faith that will not shrink though pressed by many a foe.

We pray in Your powerful 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,
Washington, DC, May 10, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, a Senator from the State of Connecticut, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL 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 L. Felice Gorordo, of Florida, to be United States Alternate Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of two years.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first thing this morning, on a happy note, I join my fellow Senators in welcoming back our dear friend and esteemed colleague DIANNE FEINSTEIN. It is so good to see her back here at the Senate, ready to get back to work.

I have been in touch with Senator FEINSTEIN over the past few weeks, and I can report she is exactly where she wants to be, ready to do the thing she loves most: serving the people of California.

So, Senator FEINSTEIN, we are so happy to see you. Welcome back.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. President, now, on default, yesterday afternoon, I met with President Biden, Speaker MCCARTHY, Leader MCCONNELL, and Leader JEFFRIES at the White House to discuss how we can take default off the table while making separate progress on an annual budget.

There was bad news and good news coming out of yesterday's White House meeting. The bad news: Speaker MCCARTHY refused—absolutely refused—to take default off the table. He was the only holdout during yesterday's meeting.

President Biden said that, no matter what, default should be taken off the table. Leader JEFFRIES said default is off the table. I committed to taking default off the table. Even Leader MCCONNELL said unequivocally that, no matter what, the United States will not default.

But Speaker MCCARTHY—Speaker MCCARTHY alone—refused to take the threat of catastrophic default off the table. I asked him pointedly if he would join us, but, during yesterday's meeting, he was the sole holdout.

Instead of taking default off the table, Speaker MCCARTHY is taking default hostage. If anyone wonders what the biggest problem for avoiding default right now is, it is Speaker MCCARTHY insisting he will exploit default to push a hard-right agenda. Speaker MCCARTHY realizes his hard-right agenda would never become law on its own because the American people are so opposed. So, instead, he is holding the country hostage to default. It is dangerous. It is reckless.

Avoiding default should not be contingent on passing the GOP's hard-

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1577

right, partisan agenda, and the American people overwhelmingly agree. A recent Washington Post-ABC poll found that when Americans were asked if debt limit and Federal spending should be handled separately or together, 58 percent of Americans believe they should be handled separately, just as we are saying, just as President Biden is saying. Only 26 percent of Americans say they should be linked, as Speaker MCCARTHY is proposing to do.

Even 46 percent of Republicans said it should be handled separately. A plurality of Republicans, 46 to 40, is against what MCCARTHY is doing by tying the two together. They realize—Americans realize—how dangerous this is.

So, again, avoiding default should not be contingent on passing the GOP's hard-right agenda—certainly, not one that will make drastic cuts to veterans, to healthcare services, run a buzz saw through Federal law enforcement, and abandon our seniors and working families.

What is more, the GOP's extremist bill is riddled with unrelated hard-right policies. It would gut rules for corporations, hollow out environmental law, and cut healthcare for millions of our Nation's most vulnerable.

The cherry on top—not much of a cherry, a sour cherry—MAGA Republicans want to undo Democrats' marquee legislation to invest in America, advance energy security, and reduce the deficit. That is the agenda Speaker MCCARTHY believes is worth threatening default.

Now the good news: The good news is that President Biden has asked the four leaders and our teams to sit down and begin talking about where we can agree on budget and appropriations. Our staffs will be having conversations beginning today that are part of the regular appropriations process.

Now, Speaker MCCARTHY will have plenty of say over the budget in the appropriations process. That is the proper place to have these debates, not during conversations about the full faith and credit of the United States.

When President Trump was in office and I was minority leader, I hated the Trump tax cuts on the rich and what it did to my State and my country. I could have easily said: I am holding default hostage unless we repeal the Trump tax cuts, unless we undo the Republicans' signature issue.

But, of course, I didn't do that because I knew the consequences of default would be too severe.

But Speaker MCCARTHY is doing the same thing. He is taking our signature issue—one of the leading ones, the IRA—and holding it hostage, saying he is tying it to default.

So, again, Speaker MCCARTHY must commit to taking default off the table, and we will continue to have a separate conversation with Republicans about the budget. And, as I said and as everyone knows, the Speaker has plenty of

say over the appropriations process. He won't be left out.

And if the Speaker wants to be honest, by the way, about the drivers of debt, he should take a cold, hard look at the damage caused by Republican tax cuts.

Next week, the Senate Budget Committee, led by Chairman WHITEHOUSE, will hold a hearing focused precisely on how GOP cuts have been primarily responsible for increasing the debt-to-GDP ratio. I thank Chairman WHITEHOUSE and members of the committee for their continued work on exposing the GOP's destructive policies. The committee will make it clear that much of the debt came at the insistence of a Republican President, the Republican Senators, the Republican House Members, but only now, with a Democratic President, does MCCARTHY do this awful, awful, dangerous gambit of holding default hostage.

I urge the Speaker and my Republican colleagues to come to their senses about avoiding default.

Mr. Speaker, you are standing alone in that meeting. Take the needless, reckless threat of default off the table. Time is of the essence, and there is nothing stopping us from coming together in a bipartisan way, as we regularly have, to ensure that America can continue to pay its bills.

MILITARY PROMOTIONS

Mr. President, on military holds, the senior Senator from Alabama, Senator TUBERVILLE, is continuing his dangerous and reckless hold of hundreds of routine, nonpolitical promotions of senior military officers.

This morning, Senator WARREN, Senator REED, and I released a new letter from Secretary of Defense Lloyd Austin detailing how the Senator from Alabama's blanket holds pose a clear risk to our military readiness and directly impact and hurt military families. And since these are general officers, they have spent decades—they and their families—serving our country.

Secretary Austin's letter confirms what Democrats have been saying for weeks: Senator TUBERVILLE's indefinite hold on the confirmation of our general and flag officers is reckless, unprecedented, and harmful to our military's readiness and sends the wrong message to our partners and allies.

In the letter, Secretary Austin warned that a prolonged blanket hold is creating unnecessary uncertainty in the chain of command that "diminishes our global standing as the strongest military in the world."

Let me say that again; it is so striking. The Senator from Alabama's blanket hold is creating unnecessary uncertainty that "diminishes our global standing as the strongest military in the world."

Secretary Austin's letter also laid out how the Senator from Alabama's hold is also harming our military families, preventing children from starting new schools, and spouses from starting

new jobs. That is shameful—hurting these generals' and admirals' families in this unique attempt to try and get his way, which will not happen.

Finally, Secretary Austin's letter highlighted that, over the next several months, there will be hundreds more promotions requiring Senate confirmation, including the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Staff of Naval Operations, Commandant of the Marine Corps, Commander of U.S. Cyber Command, Director of the National Security Agency, and so much more. These are just some of the positions at risk of delay if the Senator from Alabama keeps his reckless holds.

Secretary Austin's letter follows a letter, last week, from seven—seven—former Secretaries of Defense, Democrat and Republican, who served under Democrat and Republican Presidents, stating that blanket holds are both "harming military readiness and risks damaging U.S. national security."

And let's be clear-eyed about why the Senator from Alabama is carrying out this reckless act. He is doing it to advance the extreme MAGA Republican agenda. He is doing it because he fundamentally doesn't believe women have the right to make their own choice.

I hope Senate Republicans read Secretary Austin's letter, as well as the letter from the seven former Secretaries of Defense, and prevail on the Senator from Alabama to end this dangerous blockade and get our military operating to its full capacity. Destroying a Senate process that has been apolitical and pro forma throughout history should not fall victim to MAGA Republican politics.

I thank Senators WARREN and REED for continuing to bring attention to this issue.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

DEBT CEILING

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I was glad to attend yesterday's White House meeting in solidarity with Speaker MCCARTHY. Unlike the White House, the Speaker has been handling the debt limit in a responsible fashion.

Speaker MCCARTHY and House Republicans have passed the only legislation currently in existence that prevents default. He spent months waiting for President Biden to come to the table. But the White House has wasted 3 months—3 months wasted. The President of the United States has been MIA.

So let's hope yesterday was the start of the administration accepting the reality of our situation. Everybody knows there is only one way to defuse the looming crisis, the normal and routine thing—spending negotiations between the President and the Speaker.

The American people voted for divided government. President Biden refusing to compromise is really not an

option when you have a divided government. Unconstitutionally acting without Congress is also not an option. There is exactly one way—just one way—to prevent a pointless, avoidable crisis: the bipartisan negotiation that Speaker MCCARTHY has been calling for since way back in February.

Seven of the last 10 debt limit hikes came with a bipartisan deal on spending levels. Let me just say that again. Seven of the last 10 debt limit hikes came with a bipartisan deal on spending levels.

Just 4 years ago, we had today's situation in reverse. What happened? Secretary Mnuchin was sent to negotiate with Speaker PELOSI. They struck a caps deal, and the debt limit was addressed. It was exactly the situation we have now, in reverse.

Yesterday's meeting was an overdue first step. I hope President Biden has begun to wake up. Even rank-and-file Democrats in the House and Senate say the President's refusal to negotiate has been untenable.

The Democrats can't waste any more time. The White House has to stop sleepwalking towards default and reach a spending deal with the Speaker.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT VOTES

Mr. President, now on another matter, tomorrow, Senate Republicans will create two more opportunities to hit the brakes on runaway regulation. Thanks to the efforts of the junior Senator for Wyoming and the junior Senator for Oklahoma, we will consider two more resolutions under the Congressional Review Act.

Senator MULLIN's resolution targets a decision by the Fish and Wildlife Service to "uplist"—"uplist"—a creature called the northern long-eared bat as an endangered species. This designation would have massive repercussions for landowners, businesses, and infrastructure projects across as many as 37 of our 50 States. More than 3,000 infrastructure and development projects are currently in limbo—3,000 infrastructure and development projects currently in limbo—waiting for the extra environmental consultations that the Endangered Species Act will require if this case of uplisting is allowed to stand.

And get this: The Biden administration itself admits that the recent declines in the population of this particular bat are due mostly to fungal disease, not human development.

I don't care how long this bat's ears are—it can't get veto power over 37 State economies. Senator MULLIN's resolution will prevent this absurdity.

The second resolution, sponsored by Senator LUMMIS, targets the Biden administration's attempt to make a sweeping change to the very definition of the word "habitat" in Federal law. The last Republican administration adopted a clear and explicit legal definition which gave builders, landowners, and small businesses some certainty and peace of mind, but President Biden has let the far-left throw all of that into chaos. Now American families and

businesses could be facing decreased property values and predatory legal challenges if they wind up on the wrong side of Democrats' moving the goalpost. Senator LUMMIS's resolution will reintroduce certainty and common sense.

I would urge every Senator to support both measures later this week.

REMEMBERING DENNY CRUM

Now, Mr. President, on one entirely different matter, yesterday the University of Louisville's legendary men's basketball coach, Denny Crum, passed away at his home.

For 30 years, Coach Crum helmed my alma mater's basketball squad and led the Cardinals to unprecedented success. Denny revolutionized the program and transformed the team into a spectacle all Kentuckians were eager to tune in to. He was a true legend.

Unique among coaches at the time, Denny sought to play the toughest teams in the country early in the season, knowing that those hard-fought matchups would prepare the Cards better than anything else for post-season success. That bold playbook earned the coach nicknames like "Cool Hand Luke" and, for always keeping his eye on the big dance, "Mr. March."

Thanks largely to his smart strategizing, Coach Crum led the Cardinals to two national championships and six NCAA Final Four appearances, earning Denny an induction into the College Basketball Hall of Fame. He brought national recognition to our school and city and forged a deep connection with the UofL community through his calm leadership both on and off the court.

Even after retiring, Coach Crum continued to serve as an ambassador for the university, raising money to support scholarships, athletics, and academics.

Denny was a great coach, a great friend, and more than anything, a great man. Elaine and I send our deepest condolences to Denny's wife Susan and to his family, friends, and fans as they mourn the loss of Denny Crum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, they say that baseball is the great American sport, and I am a fan. I love watching baseball games, especially the Cubs and the Cards and the White Sox in the region where I grew up. But possibly one of the greatest moments remembered in baseball actually didn't occur during a game; it occurred in 1939 when a baseball player by the name of Lou Gehrig of the New York Yankees gave a famous farewell speech at Yankee Stadium.

Gehrig was an amazing baseball player. Naturally, he is in the Baseball Hall of Fame. He was indestructible. His nickname was the "Iron Horse"—so durable, so dependable. He was always there.

In April of that year, 1939, he had removed himself from the game, saying

he couldn't play any longer. Then, just a few weeks later, he made his famous farewell speech at Yankee Stadium. He was sick and suffering from a rare disease, known as ALS, but he stood up there in front of that microphone. We can still remember it in our mind's eye—that black and white film—when he announced he was the luckiest man on Earth. He died 2 years later from ALS.

The disease, because of his prominence and the public sentiment and profile, became known forever as Lou Gehrig's disease. It is still with us. It still is as virulent and deadly as it was in his time.

I have come to know a number of people who have suffered from that disease.

Recently, just a few months ago, my dear friend Gary LaPaille, who was the State chairman of the Illinois Democratic Party when I ran for the U.S. Senate and who was a strong supporter, passed away from ALS.

A great friend of mine, Bill Brandt, who lives in the suburbs of Chicago, is now battling it.

This morning, I had a visit in my office from Brian Wallach. Brian Wallach and his wife Sandra have been dealing with the diagnosis of more than 6 years ago, of ALS. Brian is still with us, thank goodness, because of his determination and the determination of his family.

Brian is an unusual and extraordinary person. He was working in the Obama White House with Sandra when they decided to marry. He is an exceptional, talented individual, as is his wife Sandra, who served as my communications director for many years.

When the diagnosis was handed down, it was a few days before they brought home their baby from the hospital—a little girl—6 years ago, but they were determined that Brian was going to see as much of her life as possible even though he had been diagnosed with ALS. So they created an organization known as I AM ALS and set out with an agenda to beat the disease.

Brian has been an amazing fighter in dealing with that disease and in trying to find ways to cure himself but, basically, to cure others who might be diagnosed in the years to come. Their focus is on many different areas, but primarily it is on medical research. What they have achieved when it comes to medical research—just the two of them with their organization and many supporters across the United States—is nothing short of remarkable. For example, after a 5-year period in which no new ALS drugs were approved, the FDA approved two new drugs over the past year, and there is another one that I understand was announced just a few days ago. They were pushing for research to find ways to treat ALS successfully.

The reason I tell that story—and the fact that Brian was just in my office is fresh in my mind—is I hear the debate on the floor of the U.S. Senate about

our Federal budget. Part of our Federal budget—an important part of our Federal budget—is the budget for the National Institutes of Health. This is the premier medical research Agency in the world—in the world. I am proud of the fact that it is in the United States and that every day it is responsible for dramatic breakthroughs against diseases and illnesses all across the spectrum and all across the United States and benefits to the world. Their discovery of new drugs for ALS is just one indication of the good work that they do.

For instance, Collins was the head of the NIH for many years under Presidents of both political parties. He is so good—and I am glad he is still working with the Biden administration—he is so good that Presidents—conservative, moderate, liberal; all of them—wanted Francis Collins to head up the National Institutes of Health, which he did remarkably. He was part of the team that discovered the human genome, which literally changed overnight the way we approach medicine in the United States and around the world.

I met with Dr. Collins a few years back and said: I would like to help you at the NIH. I think your work is one of the most important assignments in the Federal Government. What can I do?

He said: Senator, if you could give me 5 percent real growth in NIH budgeting each year, my researchers will continue their inspiring work to find cures and find new drugs that will make a difference in the lives of millions of people.

I set out to do that with the cooperation and help of Roy Blunt, a Republican; with Lamar Alexander, a Republican; and with PATTY MURRAY, who has just been our North Star when it comes to medical research.

We said: Let's try to achieve the goal of 5 percent real growth each year with the National Institutes of Health. We were lucky in the last 10 years to do it six or seven times. The question is, Will we be able to do it in next year's budget?

Sadly, the budget proposed by the Republicans in the House of Representatives devastates the National Institutes of Health's budget—at least a 20- to 25-percent cut in the amount of money on medical research. What impact does that have? Well, I can tell you it has a direct impact on lessening the number of grants that are awarded each year for medical research, but, secondarily, it sends a message to the researchers who are working so hard across the United States that they can't depend on us in Congress to fund their needed research in the years to come. That will discourage some, and some will walk away from a lot of research that could be very promising. And to do that in the name of helping America is just plain foolish. In fact, it is offensive.

I would like to say to Speaker MCCARTHY and those who are endorsing his budget: Stop for a minute and con-

sider the impact of what you are doing. There are people and families all across America who are counting on medical research for someone they love, and that research is coming through in remarkable ways, unprecedented around the world.

To think that we would cut the medical research budget of the United States by 25 percent and to argue that that is in the best interest of our country is madness, and it is political selfishness.

I would just plead with my friends on the other side of the aisle: At the end of this debate on the budget, don't let medical research be one of the casualties.

There are so many important areas I can add to that list of things that are critical for the future of America, but I wanted to speak to medical research this morning because Brian Wallach was a visitor in my office, and he reminded me that the determination of Brian and his wife Sandra and many people just like them to push for medical research is literally making a difference so that Lou Gehrig's disease will one day be a disease of the past that we will have conquered.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, for more than 35 years, Congress has failed to fix the immigration laws of America, and this week that failure is going to be on full display on the news every night. That is because tomorrow the COVID-19 emergency measure known as title 42 comes to an end.

This program was first created by President Trump during the earliest days of the coronavirus epidemic, and for the past 3 years, title 42 has done nothing to address the challenges at our border. It has simply shut the border down and turned away families seeking refuge in America.

Title 42 is not only inhumane, it is ineffective. By turning our back on asylum seekers and leaving Federal and local officials unequipped to address this crisis, we have only created more chaos and misery at our border. At this moment, there are thousands of families who have fled unimaginable horror and have nowhere else to go. And title 42 certainly hasn't made our border more secure; it has only postponed the inevitable.

Truthfully, there is only one group of people who has benefited from title 42. I am sorry to say they are the transnational criminal organizations. How can that be? It is because for the past 3 years, title 42 has shut down nearly any ability for one to seek asylum in America. That means asylum seekers have had no other option than to seek illegal pathways into the country. So they turn to smugglers, human traffickers, who charge them thousands of dollars to take them on dangerous journeys across the border. And what happens when these asylum seekers are caught and sent back to Mexico instead of being processed under our Nation's immigration laws? The cycle

repeats itself again and again and again. These smugglers can multiply their profits by taking asylum seekers across the border over and over again.

According to the Department of Homeland Security, the illicit smuggling enterprise has become a multibillion-dollar operation. One reason this enterprise is raking in the profits is that lawmakers in Congress, right here in the Senate, have refused to reform our immigration laws and instead have relied on Executive actions like title 42.

Now, it is worth noting that the Biden administration is at this moment doing everything it can to create an orderly process at our southern border, with the limited tools of our current immigration law. With the lifting of title 42 in just a matter of hours, we will likely see a significant increase in migrants seeking asylum. It goes to show that title 42 has failed to reduce the demand for those seeking entry into America. Really, that demand has been piling up for 3 years. So to help to manage this expected increase in border crossings, the Biden administration is deploying every resource at its disposal. They have increased the capacity to process asylum seekers, expanded access to lawful pathways into the United States, and partnered with other countries, like Colombia and Guatemala, to create new processing centers away from the southern border.

While all of these steps are important, there is no action by the President alone that can address the fundamental problem we face. Our outdated immigration system is collapsing under the weight of modern-day challenges, and the only way to change it is by enacting comprehensive immigration reform. If it seems like it is impossible, it is not.

Last week, the MAGA majority in the House introduced a proposal they claim is a solution, but really it just codifies the failures of title 42. Their bill provides no new legal pathways for entering into this country, erases nearly all humanitarian protection for families seeking asylum, and makes the situation at the border even worse.

The fact is, the Republicans can try and build a border wall as high as they like, but it will not change the reality on the ground. And here is the reality: We in this world are in the midst of the worst refugee crisis in history. From Ukraine to Venezuela, 100 million people around the world have been displaced from their homes by war, by hunger, by political persecution, by climate change; and one in five of these refugees reside in the Western Hemisphere.

Simply ignoring this global humanitarian crisis solves nothing, and shutting down our border won't deter these families from still trying to find refuge in America. It will force them to extremely dangerous alternatives, like smugglers and cartel members who are raking in billions because of our public policy failures.

Let's stop pretending the American people can't handle an honest debate on immigration. They can. Talk to small business owners and family-run farms in States like mine. They are the first to tell you our Nation needs more immigrant workers. We have two times as many jobs in this country as unemployed people to fill them.

I had the CEO of a major international corporation in my office yesterday. We talked about opportunities in the future, and he said the one thing that is holding him back is the lack of skilled employees. He begged me to find ways.

I gave a few suggestions to him, but I told him as well: Don't ignore the reality. America is a nation of immigrants, and with so many jobs unfilled in this country, we need help. There are thousands of immigrants who are ready, capable, and willing to meet our workforce needs. What are we waiting for?

Communities across America are struggling with worker shortages. It seems many in the other party are willing to entertain any solution except immigration in the land of immigrants.

Just look at States like Arkansas and Iowa, which recently passed laws rolling back child labor protections—kids they want to work in dangerous settings. When I hear the suggestion that a 15- or 16-year-old can work in a slaughterhouse, I remember those jobs that I held when I was going through college.

I spent 12 months working in a slaughterhouse in East St. Louis, IL. It was dangerous, deadly work. And to think that you would put a young person on that job without the training and protection that they need is just not American. It is mindless.

If you have any doubt that asylum seekers at our border are ready to fill the jobs that are available, let me tell you the story of Carlos from Venezuela, a country with one of the most ruthless dictators in the world.

Back in Venezuela, Carlos had a full-time job. But the political and economic crisis was so bad in this country, he couldn't put food on the table. His family was on the brink of starvation, and he feared for their safety from political violence. So last May, Carlos and his wife did what any parent would do: They picked up their 4-year-old daughter and their nursing infant and they took off for the border. It was an incredible journey, 5 months—much of it on foot—to the Texas-Mexico border from Venezuela. It was a nightmare of violence, theft, and exploitation.

I sat down with Carlos and his family when they got off the bus in Chicago, and he told me what they went through. He told me that at one point he thought they would die as they spent 9 consecutive nights in the Panamanian jungle. They were rescued by a local military force. All of their money, all of their cell phones had been stolen, but they pressed on to try to get to America.

After filing a claim for asylum once they arrived, Carlos and his family were relocated to my city of Chicago. That is where I met them last September. When I spoke with Carlos, I asked him: What can I do for you? What can I do for your family? What do you need? He said one word: "job." I need a job. I will go to work anywhere. I will do anything.

There are many employers across this country who would take Carlos up on his offer in a minute, but they can't because he is not legally allowed to work. Though he is legally in this country waiting for his asylum hearing, he is not legally allowed to work for at least 6 months or maybe longer. How does that make any sense?

Last week, the House Republicans finally introduced their response to our immigration hearings. The bill is more than 200 pages long. Not one word of it offers anything to employers in my State who need workers like Carlos. That is not a serious proposal.

Yesterday, the mayor of Chicago, noting that some 8,000 immigrants who have been sent to our city by the Governor of Texas and the Governor of Florida, begged for help and issued an Executive order saying do something to help me deal with these very serious problems. At the current moment, immigrants are sleeping on the floors of police stations in the city of Chicago.

Do you want to know what a serious immigration proposal looks like? Well, 10 years ago, the Senate actually passed one. We had a group of eight of us who worked for months to put together a bipartisan proposal. We brought it to the floor of the U.S. Senate, and it passed with an overwhelming majority. What happened to it in the Republican House? They refused to even consider it or debate it. Even Donald Trump's Secretary of Homeland Security admitted that that bipartisan bill would have made our border more secure, but the House Republicans refused to take it up and still refuse to face the reality of what comprehensive immigration reform looks like.

We still need that package today, one that addresses the needs of our economy, provides a path of citizenship for Dreamers and immigrant farm workers, and lives up to our Nation's legacy of providing safe harbor to refugees fleeing for their lives.

I have been told repeatedly by my Senate Republican colleagues that they will not negotiate until the House sends us a bill. We have waited long enough. This week, I am introducing a proposal that I hope we can all support and will start the debate.

My bill would provide immediate assistance to border officials and authorities to help secure the border and officially process asylum seekers. It would provide support to the communities that welcome migrants in our country.

This bill is by no means a comprehensive package, but it is an opportunity to show the American people

that we are not ignoring the reality and we can support our frontline officials and the communities that need help.

The American people are tired of partisan bickering and excuses over immigration. They want us to work together to secure our border, support our economy, and stand by the fundamental principles and values that have started this Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

(Mr. DURBIN assumed the Chair.)

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

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

DEBT CEILING

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, it is May 10—May 10. If the President's Treasury Secretary is correct, in 3 weeks, the United States could reach the limit of its borrowing capacity, and—and, absent an agreement between the President and Congress to raise the debt ceiling, begin to default on its debts. But if you think that means the President has gotten serious about reaching a debt ceiling agreement, you would be wrong.

The President did invite the Democratic and Republican leaders of the House and Senate to the White House yesterday, presumably, one would think, to finally begin negotiating. But as it turned out, the meeting was apparently a little more than an occasion for the President to reiterate his position that he won't negotiate.

Here is the political reality: The President can't raise the debt ceiling by himself. He has to work with Congress, and, more specifically, he has to work with Speaker MCCARTHY and the Republican-controlled House of Representatives. That is just the reality.

The American people sent divided government to Washington last November, and divided government requires compromise. It requires negotiation. Frankly, it is the height of arrogance for the President and the Senate Democratic leader to think that they are somehow the exception to that, to think that they should be able to simply decree what they want—in this case, an increase in the debt ceiling with no spending reforms—and have everyone else just fall in line.

That is not the way our system of government works. I get that the President would like things to work that way, but they don't, and the sooner he accepts that fact the better because the fiscal stability of our country is hanging in the balance here. Unless the President comes to the negotiating table for real, he is going to be responsible for the United States defaulting on its debts.

Let's talk for a minute about why the President doesn't want to negotiate, why he is insisting on a clean

debt limit bill. Well, it is really quite simple. House Republicans want to pair any increase in the debt ceiling with spending reforms, and the President doesn't want anything that will restrain his ability to spend. He is intent on expanding the size and reach of the Federal Government, and spending reforms would get in the way.

What President Biden does not seem to realize, however, is that our Nation is on an unsustainable spending trajectory. Spending under the Biden administration has reached staggering levels. The total Federal budget for fiscal year 2023 is up approximately 40 percent from 2019, the last budget before the pandemic—40 percent. And under the President's budget, over the next decade, the Federal budget would reach a staggering \$10 trillion, a 125-percent increase from its prepandemic level. Think about it—a 125-percent increase in the cost of government from the prepandemic level. Our country and our economy cannot take that level of spending.

Between October and March, the Federal Government borrowed \$6 billion a day—a day. That is more than the entire 2023 budget for my State of South Dakota. The amount of money that the Federal Government borrows in a single day is more than the entire budget for the State of South Dakota for the entire year. Debt at that level threatens economic growth. It jeopardizes our national security and leaves us excessively dependent on other countries who hold our Nation's debt, and it sucks money away from essential government spending on things like Social Security and Medicare and our national defense.

Just paying the interest on our debt is taking a toll on our Nation's budget. According to the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, 50 cents of every dollar our country borrows in the next 10 years will go just toward paying interest on our national debt. By 2028, we will be spending more on interest than on national defense. By 2044, we will be spending more on interest than on Medicare. And by 2050, we will be spending more on interest than on Social Security.

How in the world are we going to be able to pay for these programs and other essential government functions if we are spending that much money just meeting the interest—the interest alone—on that massive, going-on-\$32-trillion debt?

Negotiating over the debt ceiling is hardly new. Seven of the last ten debt limit increases have included some mix of policy or budgetary changes rather than a simple, clean increase. And the Democrat leader of the Senate, the same Democrat leader who is now insisting on a clean debt limit increase, is on the record during the last administration talking about using the debt ceiling as leverage to achieve Democrat priorities.

So the President and the Democrat leader's outrage that they might have

to yield to the realities of divided government and actually have to negotiate over the debt ceiling is a little hard to swallow. And it is profoundly disturbing that, with a national debt in excess of \$31 trillion and growing every day, the President and the Democrat leader can't be brought to consider even the mildest spending reforms.

House Republicans have proposed reasonable spending reforms. The nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget—where the President's own Treasury Secretary used to sit on the Board, I might add—called the Republican bill “a serious package” and a “realistic and extremely welcome first step.” But if the President doesn't like the House's proposed spending reforms, he should put forward his own spending reforms.

What he should not do, however, and cannot responsibly do is continue to refuse to engage in negotiations. If he continues to reject compromise, if he continues to insist that it is his way and no other, then, come June, he will be responsible for our Nation defaulting on its debts.

The President has already spent us into an inflation crisis. Let's hope he can see his way to negotiating before he plunges us into a default crisis as well.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

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

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

VOTE ON GORORDO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gorordo nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 117 Ex.]

YEAS—52

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

Hirono	Ossoff	Stabenow
Kaine	Padilla	Tester
Kelly	Peters	Van Hollen
King	Reed	Warner
Klobuchar	Romney	Warnock
Lujan	Rosen	Warren
Manchin	Sanders	Welch
Markey	Schatz	Whitehouse
Menendez	Schumer	Wyden
Merkley	Shaheen	Young
Murphy	Sinema	
Murray	Smith	

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Fischer	Mullin
Blackburn	Graham	Murkowski
Boozman	Grassley	Paul
Braun	Hagerty	Ricketts
Britt	Hawley	Risch
Budd	Hoeven	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Vance
Ernst	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—3

Feinstein	Gillibrand	Tuberville
-----------	------------	------------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 55, Glenna Lauren Wright-Gallo, of Nevada, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

Charles E. Schumer, Ben Ray Lujan, Peter Welch, Tina Smith, Tammy Duckworth, Tim Kaine, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Raphael G. Warnock, Christopher Murphy, John W. Hickenlooper, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Baldwin, Edward J. Markey, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Mazie Hirono.

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 Glenna Lauren Wright-Gallo, of Nevada, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, 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) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 118 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schatz
Booker	King	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Lujan	Sinema
Cardin	Manchin	Smith
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	Menendez	Tester
Collins	Merkley	Van Hollen
Coons	Murkowski	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Ossoff	Welch
Fetterman	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	
Hickenlooper	Romney	

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Fischer	Mullin
Blackburn	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Ricketts
Braun	Hagerty	Risch
Britt	Hawley	Rounds
Budd	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Vance
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young

NOT VOTING—3

Feinstein	Gillibrand	Tuberville
-----------	------------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The yeas are 52; the nays are 45.

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 Glenna Laureen Wright-Gallo, of Nevada, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:21 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. Rosen).

EXECUTIVE SESSION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

NOMINATION OF COLLEEN JOY SHOGAN

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor. This is like what they call in Delaware a “threefer”—three for one. And I appreciate the cooperation of the floor staff and from you to enable me to do this.

One of the things I always look for when I am hiring somebody is I ask for

recommendations and references of people they have worked for in the past. As it turns out, in the nomination of Dr. Colleen Shogan to be the Archivist of the United States, one of the people she used to work for was Senator Joe Lieberman, a good friend to all of us, Democrats and Republicans.

He was good enough to reach out to me several weeks ago, and we had just had a hearing on Dr. Shogan before us in the Homeland Security Committee. I was really impressed. He called and said: She used to work for me. And I said: No kidding? Well, I wouldn't disqualify her for that.

I am just kidding. But he went on to tell me what a remarkable human being she was, even at a younger age in her life. But as the Chief Administrator of the National Archives and Records Administration, the Archivist of the United States plays a vital role in a couple of different ways: one, especially with the preservation of the history of this country that we are all sworn to protect.

This person who has been nominated, this nominee, would serve as our Nation's recordkeeper for executive agencies and for Presidential records while also being responsible for the National Archives and Records Administration.

This role has been critical in leading the Federal Government's ongoing transition from paper to electronic records for a long time. Dr. Shogan is extremely well qualified to take on what is not a small responsibility; it is a great responsibility and important, too.

As Senior Vice President and Director of the David M. Rubenstein Center for White House History at the White House Historical Association, Dr. Shogan has already demonstrated her extensive skill set as an archivist.

She is a dedicated public servant, pulling a decade's worth of senior roles at the Library of Congress. She has developed a career in academia, Federal Government service, and nonprofit management. And one of those folks she worked with—worked for—was our former colleague, Senator Joe Lieberman.

At our hearing to consider her nomination before the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee earlier this year, Dr. Shogan reaffirmed her commitment to nonpartisanship, which is very important for this role. She highlighted her service as the Vice Chair of the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission.

Dr. Shogan also shared how she will work to address the backlog of veterans' record requests at the National Archives and Records Administration. As the last Vietnam veteran serving here in the United States Senate, that means a lot to me.

She also has vowed to make sure that the oftentimes long and arduous process that can prevent our veterans from receiving their critical services and benefits that they are entitled to, that they are addressed.

I strongly urge my colleagues to confirm Dr. Shogan as the Archivist of the United States, and I know she will serve our country well.

My talking points now say to yield the floor, but I am not, because I have been asked by the folks who help us manage the floor if I would like to go ahead and speak on two CRAs, which is the Congressional Review Act resolutions. And I would like to do that, if I may. I appreciate the tolerance and consideration of the chairman of our committee.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT VOTES

Madam President, on the first one, this is an unlikely one. Let me just say, Delaware has a very strong ag industry. If you look at the key industries in Delaware, our No. 1 slot, people think it is banking and chemicals and stuff like that. The No. 1 is agriculture. It has been agriculture for as long as I have lived in the First State. We raise a lot of chickens, we raise a lot of other things as well.

One of the creatures that helps us best in managing the battle against pests in our State—and, as it turns out, in over 35 other States—is an unlikely creature called the long-eared bat. What I want to do today is to talk about the resolution being offered by our friends on the other side to reverse a critical habitat designation under the Endangered Species Act with respect to this listing of the northern long-eared bat as an endangered species.

Madam President, last week, I came to the floor, you may recall, to this chamber to defend science-based protections for the lesser prairie-chicken. As I said then, that species has long been considered an important indicator of the health of American grasslands and prairie.

Today, I rise in opposition to two new congressional review act resolutions which would revoke science-based rules under the Endangered Species Act. Simply put, the Endangered Species Act is our best tool to address biodiversity loss in the United States. We know biodiversity is worth preserving for many reasons, whether it be to protect human health or whether it is a moral imperative or to be good stewards of our one and only planet.

The first resolution that we are going to consider would reinstate a rule from the Trump administration which limited the ability of the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to designate critical habitat based on the best available science.

What is critical habitat, some may ask? They are areas that our Federal Agencies identify as key to the recovery of threatened and endangered species. The agencies subsequently propose these areas for protection, and the habitat becomes the focus of conservation efforts.

The Trump-era rule that the CRA resolution would reinstate was especially damaging for species that are imperiled due to climate change. The

rule prevented the relevant Federal Agencies from designating critical habitat in areas that are not currently suitable habitat but could be in the future.

For example, when a species' habitat range shifts as a result of climate change, our Federal wildlife protection agencies may need to account for this shift when they decide what potential habitat we should protect to support their long-term recovery.

The number of imperiled species is growing, not diminishing, and more and more species are harmed by climate change, which, as we know, is getting more and more serious as the days go by. That is why our Federal Agencies need more, not less, flexibility to designate and protect habitat. That is our first resolution, S.J. Res. 23.

The second resolution we are considering today would overturn another science-based rule, reclassifying the northern long-eared bat from threatened to endangered species status.

Most people have never heard of the northern long-eared bat. They don't even think they exist, but they do in 37 States. And they are really good at one thing—eating pests, eating insects. There is actually a dollar value that has been put on what they can do and the contributions they make to agriculture in my State and 30-some other States, and the amount of money is over \$3 to \$4 billion a year.

These bats are found in 37 states from as far east as Maine, down the eastern seaboard, from Delaware all the way down to Louisiana.

Unfortunately, there is a disease called white-nose syndrome. Some people may have never heard of this bat, but they have heard of white-nose syndrome. But it is responsible for nearly 80 percent of the bat's habitat range in recent years. Data shows that white-nose syndrome has killed between 97 to 100 percent of northern long-eared bats in infected colonies. That, in addition to other factors, like habitat loss and climate change, has contributed to this important species' decline.

Bats, including the northern long-eared bat, contribute to an estimated \$3 to \$4 billion annually—I have actually heard it is as high as tens of billions of dollars to our Nation's agricultural economy. In any event, it is a lot. And the value impacts us and farmers all over the country. These bats basically provide service primarily through pest control and through pollination. The Biden rule not only helps the northern long-eared bats but also supports other bat species that are in decline due to white-nose syndrome. By protecting this species, we are protecting our farmers, our agricultural communities, and the revenues that they depend on.

To that end, CRA resolutions that undermine the endangered species and more generally, science, are in my view a dangerous diversion from the real work of protecting our environment and, for that matter, our economy.

As a recovering Governor with a little State with a big agricultural economy and as the current chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee, I believe we can protect our environment, including the species with which we share our planet while supporting economic development and job creation.

It is my hope that we can work together in ways to support these goals in a truly bipartisan fashion. With that in mind, I oppose the two resolutions I talked about, S.J. Res. 23 and S.J. Res. 24. I invite all my colleagues, Democratic and Republican, to join me in voting no.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks prior to the scheduled vote.

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

NOMINATION OF COLLEEN JOY SHOGAN

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, I rise in support of Colleen Shogan's nomination to be the Archivist of the United States.

The Archivist of the United States leads the National Archives and Records Administration, an important role that is responsible for maintaining and for preserving Presidential and Federal records.

In addition to preserving documents that tell the story of our Nation's history, the National Archives also provides access to critical records for the public to use, including providing veterans and servicemembers with military personnel records needed to access the benefits they have earned through their service.

As an accomplished political scientist who has held nonpartisan leadership roles throughout her career, Dr. Shogan is well qualified to lead the National Archives. She would also be the first woman to hold this job.

She is currently the Senior Vice President and Director of the David M. Rubenstein Center for White House History and the White House Historical Association and previously served as Deputy Director of the Congressional Research Service at the Library of Congress and Vice Chair of the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission.

Throughout multiple Congresses and Presidential administrations of both parties, Dr. Shogan has demonstrated a strong commitment to serving the American people with nonpartisan integrity.

During the nomination process, Dr. Shogan showed a deep understanding of the Archives' critical role and that she is prepared to lead the Agency as it tackles challenges such as the veterans' records backlog and the digitization of records all across the Federal Government.

Her nomination is supported by numerous individuals and groups representing the National Archives stakeholders, including the American Polit-

ical Science Association; the Council of State Archivists; the American Historical Association; and other national, nonpartisan, and nonpolitical organizations who have enthusiastically endorsed Dr. Shogan's nomination.

Madam President, I urge my colleagues to join me in confirming Dr. Shogan to this important role today.

NOMINATION OF GLENNA LAUREN WRIGHT-GALLO

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, I support the nomination of Glenna Wright-Gallo to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services at the Department of Education. Ms. Wright-Gallo has more than 25 years of public education experience supporting students with disabilities and 16 years of experience as a policy leader in State special education programs. She is currently a guest instructor at the Clark County School District in Las Vegas, NV. Before that, she served as the Assistant Superintendent of Special Education Services for the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction—OSPI—in Washington State. During her tenure, she successfully secured an additional \$155 million for state special education programs, \$37 million for improvement of statewide inclusionary practices, \$12 million for paraeducator training, and \$60,000 to reduce the use of restraint and seclusion.

Prior to her position at OSPI, Ms. Gallo spent 7 years as the State director of special education for the Utah State Board of Education. She has also twice served as the president of the National Association of State Directors of Education.

Earlier this year, the Committee on Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, which I chair, reported her out of committee by a bipartisan vote. Ms. Wright-Gallo is a strong, dedicated advocate for special education services and supports and understands the unique challenges that children and youth with disabilities face. She will make an excellent Assistant Secretary, and I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

VOTE ON WRIGHT-GALLO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Wright-Gallo nomination?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) would have voted "nay."

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 119 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hickenlooper	Romney
Bennet	Hirono	Rosen
Blumenthal	Kaine	Schatz
Booker	Kelly	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Lujan	Smith
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Collins	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warnock
Duckworth	Murphy	Warren
Durbin	Murray	Welch
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Reed	

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Ricketts
Boozman	Hagerty	Risch
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Britt	Hoeben	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Vance
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young
Fischer	Mullin	

NOT VOTING—4

Budd	Sanders
Gillibrand	Tuberville

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.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Colleen Joy Shogan, of Pennsylvania, to be Archivist of the United States.

Ms. SINEMA. We yield back all time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time is yielded back.

VOTE ON SHOGAN NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLI-

BRAND) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 120 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	Kelly	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Capito	Klobuchar	Smith
Cardin	Lujan	Stabenow
Carper	Manchin	Tester
Casey	Markey	Van Hollen
Collins	Menendez	Warner
Coons	Merkley	Warnock
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Welch
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Ossoff	Wyden
Fetterman	Padilla	
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Ricketts
Boozman	Hagerty	Risch
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Britt	Hoeben	Rounds
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Vance
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Mullin	Young

NOT VOTING—3

Gillibrand	Sanders	Tuberville
------------	---------	------------

The nomination was confirmed.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Geeta Rao Gupta, of Virginia, to be Ambassador at Large for Global Women's Issues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1192

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, title 42 will terminate tomorrow with the expiration of the COVID-19 public health emergency. Title 42 is one of the last tools available to Border Patrol agents, and the President is surrendering it during a record-shattering border crisis. It is unconscionable for Congress to stand aside and do nothing to preserve this critical authority.

Title 42 authority was initially based on the pandemic. While I agree that the pandemic is over, the border crisis is worse than ever. Whether to keep effective border security policies in place should not depend on the pandemic.

There is a new epidemic that is plaguing our Nation, one that demands immediate action. Deadly fentanyl—produced with the help of the Chinese Communist Party and smuggled across our southern border by drug cartels—has flooded into our communities. More than 100,000 Americans died of drug overdoses in the last 12 months alone—most from synthetic opioids like fentanyl. It is the No. 1 cause of death for Americans between the ages of 18 and 45.

The rise of fentanyl overdose deaths affects every State and every congressional district. It kills the young, the old, the rich, the poor. It affects cities and small towns alike. It is not a partisan issue, and finding a solution shouldn't be partisan either.

With the end of title 42, even the Biden administration is openly preparing for an already-recordbreaking crisis to get far worse by sending 1,500 Active-Duty troops to the southern border. It is an admission of the impending invasion.

To allow title 42 to end without creating a permanent new authority to replace it only empowers drug cartels. It enables them to illegally send migrants across the border at strategic points, bogging down Border Patrol agents with paperwork and processing that takes five times longer than under title 42. This dramatic increase in processing times will significantly decrease scarce resources available to actually patrol our southern border. Cartels will use the longer and more frequent enforcement gaps to move fentanyl across our border. We cannot allow this to happen.

Title 42 is an effective and important tool for controlling the flow of illegal migration at the southern border, but it is also an effective and important tool for dissuading migrants from making the dangerous journey to the southern border, to ultimately be exploited by drug cartels. But the current administration has no interest in dissuading migrants from coming to the United States. Instead, through Biden's border policies, they entice thousands more migrants per day to illegally cross into the United States, risking their lives as they magnify the humanitarian crisis at our border.

That is why I introduced legislation to add drug smuggling as an additional basis for invoking title 42 authority. It is called the Stop Fentanyl Border Crossings Act. Overdoses have become an epidemic in America, and no one can deny that. My legislation would allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to use title 42 to combat substantial, dangerous drug trafficking across our southern border. This bill would give Border Patrol a necessary tool to focus on stopping drug traffickers.

It seems like an obvious step to take. Everyone agrees fentanyl trafficking is a dire problem. Yet, in the last Congress, Democrats blocked this legislation three times. Now that title 42 is

actually coming to an end, it is time to get past the political posturing, and I hope my colleagues will join me. We cannot sit idly by. Without this authority, the recordbreaking border crisis and deadly drug overdose crisis that will follow will become unimaginably worse.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 1192 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SANDERS. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Senator HAGERTY's bill aims to expand the use of title 42 to restrict the entry of people and goods from countries where "substantial" drug smuggling exists.

I am very concerned about the increased use of fentanyl in this country. Everybody is. As you just heard, we have seen over 100,000 Americans die from drug overdoses in the last year alone. Unfortunately, this isn't the way to address this problem. Title 42 is a public health authority, and the use of it should be dictated by public health experts.

Instead of proposing real solutions to address drug trafficking based on what will keep people safe, some of my Republican colleagues want to use title 42 as a political stunt to keep out people seeking asylum. I welcome the opportunity to work with my Republican colleagues on serious solutions to address drug trafficking. Unfortunately, this is not one of them.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, my Democratic colleague is objecting to legislation that simply gives the Secretary of Health and Human Services the authority to limit border crossings when necessary to combat substantial, dangerous, illicit drug smuggling. It doesn't provide authority to stop all asylum claims. It only applies where substantial illicit drug smuggling is endangering health. More than 100,000 Americans are dying annually of drug overdoses, many of which result from drug smuggling at the southern border.

This legislation isn't a mandate; it is a tool to help save American lives whenever that is possible. Everyone acknowledges that an already record-breaking crisis will get worse without title 42. American lives and American communities hang in the balance. Yet my colleagues across the aisle are categorically opposed to any common-sense policy that will help us address this problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

COMPREHENSIVE AND PROGRESSIVE AGREEMENT FOR TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity to give some thoughts today on what is going on in the United States and around the globe.

Here in these early months of this new Congress, there clearly is broad bipartisan agreement on the importance of the Indo-Pacific region for our country's future. We are strengthening our military posture in that region, and last Congress, we passed legislation to strengthen our strategic industries.

What is being ignored, however, is a third component essential to our success in the region: expanding trade. At a State and Foreign Ops hearing in March, I noted the importance of our economic relationships around the world and asked Secretary of State Blinken about our approach to trade agreements, particularly America's absence from the Comprehensive and Progressive Trans-Pacific Partnership—the CPTPP.

He told me the original pact in 2015 had real benefits, economically and strategically, but since then the world has moved on. I agree with him, our allies and our partners have moved on. They have moved on without us.

A year ago this month, President Biden made his first trip to Asia and unveiled the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework, the administration's initiative to reengage the region on standards involving digital trade, supply chains, climate change, and corruption.

This is a small start, but it falls far short of what is needed today to advance American prosperity and security—also, the well-being of our Asian partners. In particular, the President's proposal fails to include greater U.S. market access.

The United States is belatedly offering a tepid leadership to a region that remains committed to open trade.

We can and must correct this or fall further behind in the most economically dynamic region in the world. I call on President Biden to enter into—and Congress to ratify—the CPTPP. It would be difficult to overstate how important the Indo-Pacific is to American prosperity. The region comprises 40 percent of the global economic output, and that is expected to grow to 50 percent by the end of the decade.

The largest economy in the region belongs to China, which is the largest trading partner for the region's countries. This provides Beijing with leverage to bully our allies and partners into making concessions in exchange for access to the Chinese market. It allows Beijing, not the United States, the same opportunity to have that relationship, so necessary.

China, for example, used coercion to retaliate against Australia after our allies in Canberra called for an investiga-

tion into the origins of COVID-19. Beijing regularly forces American businesses to refrain from criticism of China or conform to communist policies.

China's leaders can coerce and intimidate because they have economic strength. It is clear China will exert that tremendous leverage over other nations to achieve its global ambitions. Its attempts to bully countries into its sphere of influence are on full display through the Belt and Road Initiative, which has left trails of debt traps and human rights abuses. Unfortunately, the United States is ceding our economic leadership that we established and maintained for the last 80 years.

Having quit the Trans-Pacific Partnership under bipartisan, Republican and Democrat, criticism for that departure, the countries we worked with—treaty allies and partners—moved ahead. They moved ahead without us and in 2018 brought into force a successor agreement, the CPTPP. These countries represent more than 13 percent of global GDP, and in the last few weeks, Great Britain has gained membership.

So important is the CPTPP to the Pacific economies that China has applied for membership. They did so last September. It would be a grave mistake for us to assume that in America's absence China would be denied membership indefinitely.

China wants in, despite already being the largest member of the Regional Comprehensive Economic Agreement, which also includes our treaty allies, Japan and South Korea, Australia and New Zealand. This trade bloc accounts for nearly one-third of global GDP.

These two agreements, comprised of nations with diverse ideologies, underscore the importance of the economics of the Indo-Pacific region. In Asia especially, economics and security are one and the same, and for Washington to ignore that is a miscalculation.

Our allies and partners in this region are noticing. They notice our absence. Australia's Foreign Minister said at the end of last year:

America's decision not to proceed with the CPTPP is still being felt in the region. . . . We have reached a stage in the evolution of our alliances where they will increasingly require a fully developed economic dimension, as well.

In other words, we can't have the same relationship with countries that we don't deal with in trade in economic relationships.

At the end of 2022, Singapore's Defense Minister had this to say:

The U.S. increasing their military presence in Asia as a stabilizing force is virtuous, it is good and we will support that.

But then he made this key point:

We think that the U.S. should do more to engage as it did previously, to build an economic framework, which as a tide can lift all boats.

Despite our own National Security Strategy which declares that "we need to win the competition for the 21st century" and that we will "shape the rules

of the road for . . . trade and economics," the document makes clear President Biden believes "we have to move beyond traditional Free Trade Agreements."

But given the words of our Pacific friends, it is equally clear they have not moved beyond such agreements. In fact, they are doubling down on them without us. The President and his administration are either oblivious to this fact or indifferent.

Given the stakes, whichever one it is, it is a serious mistake. Dating back to the 1980s, the National Security Strategy is a congressionally mandated report issued by the President to convey the administration's national security goals and how to achieve them. In recent decades, one document is published each Presidential term rather than yearly.

The 2022 document, President Biden stresses upholding the "rules-based international order" but then refuses to engage in shaping one of the significant pillars of that order: trade.

The National Security Strategy invokes four principles, two of which are openness and inclusiveness. And as one scholar observed, the President's approach to trade is neither open nor inclusive.

This hurts our goals in this region, and it hurts Americans at home, our very national security. Our engagement really is about our own well-being. Our own well-being is often dependent upon the well-being of our friends and allies or those we want to be our friends or allies.

Economic partnerships can promote U.S. national security interests by protecting critical access to technology, minerals, and food supplies. We know what happens when we are so dependent upon one particular country for meeting our country's needs in strategic items. It is a mistake for us to have all eggs in a basket. Robust trade agreements safeguard the intellectual property and manufacturing capabilities that underpin our American military dominance.

Southeast Asia presents a situation in which our agricultural producers can score significant market access wins, while U.S. soft power can bolster our influence with these critical partners with these countries that are or can be our friends.

America's economy is the foundation of our power. Without the creation of wealth, we cannot afford to sustain the world's greatest military, which in turn defends the peace that enables the flow of goods. As a column in the Wall Street Journal just within the last week argued, "The U.S. must embrace the politics of growth. Our world must be, and must be seen to be, the surest, fastest path to raising living standards all over the world. That's what we did after World War II. We must find a way to do it again today."

What that is saying is we can't allow China to be seen as the path to economic well-being for people and na-

tions around the world and specifically in the South Pacific.

Southeast Asia presents a situation in which our agriculture producers can score significant market access wins while we are making a difference in our own capabilities to influence the world.

America's economy is the foundation of our power, and we must utilize it. In competing with China in the coming decades, it is essential that the United States provide a positive vision for the region that attracts countries to what America offers beyond security support. Leadership is more than making clear what we are against. We must offer a compelling case of what we are for and how it will benefit those we wish to lead, those we wish to be partners with.

Little in geopolitics is a win-win, but trade is a rare area that advances our interests and those of our partners. According to the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, the American people understand this. Three in four Americans think that trade is good for the U.S. economy, but Congress and the President are making a mistake ignoring the old idea of open trade.

To best compete with China in Asia and to help Americans at home, joining the CPTPP and providing greater market access is an obvious place to begin. Jobs, economic opportunity for us, and most importantly, the well-being of our Nation, our national security, depend upon trade and that relationship it creates.

(Ms. CORTEZ MASTO assumed the Chair.)

REMEMBERING GARY R. DOANE

Madam President, I rise today to honor the life and mourn the loss, the passing of a Kansan whom I was privileged to know well, Gary Doane. Gary touched the lives of all who knew him, and he left the world and our State a better place.

I know I speak for many, many others when I say we will all miss his wisdom and his kindness. In Kansas, we know the value of community, and we rely upon our neighbors in times of need. And Gary took these traits to heart, and his friends and neighbors always knew he would be there to lend a helping hand.

He was raised on a farm not far from my hometown, northwest of Downs. Gary knew the value of faith, of hard work, and service, and he practiced every day what he believed. He and his wife Glennys enjoyed 45 years of marriage, and they raised their three children on the farm just miles from his own childhood home. Gary was an active member in his community and a dedicated advocate for causes he believed in. He served at the county and State levels of the Kansas Farm Bureau, including 8 years on the State board of directors. He also served as chair of the board of directors of the Kansas Agriculture and Rural Leadership Program—what we know in Kansas as KARL.

Gary instilled a passion for service to his life in every circumstance. In 2001,

we had the pleasure of having his daughter Amy work on our staff when I was a Congressman representing "The Big First" in the House of Representatives.

Gary, what we all hoped to do, he did. He lived a life with purpose, and he loved to invest in the next generation of Kansans. He often spoke of how he wanted to help raise new leaders to preserve the same opportunities he enjoyed living and raising his family in North Central Kansas.

We all look for examples, and Gary's life is an example of the difference one person can make. And I know his legacy will live on in the community and in the State he loved. Rob's and my prayers are with his wife Glennys and his three children, Amy, Vic, and Edie, and the entire Downs community.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

DEMANDING THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA AND THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA IMMEDIATELY RELEASE MARK SWIDAN

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, a few months ago, I spoke on this floor about Mark Swidan, who has been unjustly imprisoned by the Chinese Communist Party for over a decade. Mark is from Luling, a small city in my home State of Texas. His mother, Miss Katherine Swidan, still lives in Luling. And for the last 11 years, Mark has endured a living hell, trapped in a Chinese prison. He is exposed to extreme heat and extreme cold. He is deprived of sleep. He is subjected to physical abuse. Mark has also been denied access to his family and to American diplomats.

And in 2019, a Chinese court sentenced Mark to death. Mark is being unjustly held by the Chinese Communist Party as a hostage. The CCP tells us that China is a great power, but this is how Third World thugs and dictators act.

I called for Mark's immediate release and called on the Biden administration to use any and every available means to secure Mark's freedom.

I am deeply distressed that since my speech on the floor a few months ago, Mark's plight has deepened. Recently, a Chinese court reaffirmed the death sentence imposed on him with a suspension for 2 years.

That is wrong, and it is outrageous. We need Mark to come home.

It is worth revealing how breathtakingly, infuriatingly unjust all of this is. How did it happen? On November 13, 2012, Mark was abducted by China's Public Security Bureau while he was in China on a business trip. A witness to the abduction said that Mark was detained because Chinese officials wanted to view the contents of his cell phone.

The Chinese officials accused Mark of being part of a criminal conspiracy to

manufacture and traffic drugs with 11 other individuals—charges that Mark has denied and which have been debunked over and over again.

Chinese officials tried to coerce Mark into confessing. Mark refused and pleaded not guilty in a trial in November 2013. During the trial, the prosecution didn't produce any forensic evidence to back up their allegations, and no drugs—zero—were ever found on Mark or in his hotel room. Mark's passport and other records show that he wasn't even in China at the time of the alleged offenses, and the 11 other individuals indicted in relation to this alleged drug conspiracy—none of them could identify Mark. The charges against Mark were completely bogus and false.

Meanwhile, Mark's mom Katherine is aching to see her son again. Her heart is breaking. This is a mom who wants to hold and hug and care for the son she loves.

I have been working with the Biden administration, and I have been pushing Chinese officials at a senior level to release Mark, but more needs to be done, and it needs to be done much more quickly.

Now, Secretary of State Blinken was planning to travel to China in February, and we had been pressing the State Department to make Mark's case a major priority for the Biden administration on the trip. Then what happened? A Chinese spy balloon came over the United States, and Secretary Blinken canceled his trip.

It is time to apply more pressure on the Chinese Communist Party to let Mark go and let him come home to Texas.

Madam President, the Chinese Communist Government is a tyrannical government. They don't like it when you turn up the heat. They don't like it when you shine a light on their atrocities. There is power in shining a light, and there is power in unity.

We need to bring Mark home. In a moment, I am going to propound a live UC request on a resolution I have introduced with my colleague from Texas, Senator JOHN CORNYN. When it passes, the Senate will, with one unanimous bipartisan voice, reiterate these declarations.

The resolution calls on the CCP to immediately release Mark. It condemns China from withholding from Mark access to his family, to diplomats, and to proper and independent medical care. And it calls on the Biden administration to prioritize efforts to secure Mark's release, both in their conversations with Chinese diplomats and in international forums.

No opportunity should be lost in urging Chinese officials, at every level of engagement, to release Mark. The Biden administration must use the voice and the vote of American diplomats to highlight his case.

This resolution has already passed the House. It will now pass the Senate. The United States Congress is with a

united and unanimous voice condemning and calling to end the unjust imprisonment of Mark Swidan by the Chinese Communist Party. Enough is enough.

Madam President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 53, S. Res. 23.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 23) demanding that the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China immediately release Mark Swidan.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 23) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of February 1, 2023, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. CRUZ. I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

VOTE ON GUPTA NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled vote occur immediately.

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

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called roll.

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

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 121 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Durbin	Menendez
Bennet	Fetterman	Merkley
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Murkowski
Booker	Hassan	Murphy
Brown	Heinrich	Murray
Cantwell	Hickenlooper	Ossoff
Cardin	Hirono	Padilla
Casey	Kaine	Peters
Carper	Kelly	Reed
Collins	King	Rosen
Coons	Klobuchar	Sanders
Cortez Masto	Lujan	Schatz
Duckworth	Markey	Schumer

Shaheen	Tester	Warren
Sinema	Van Hollen	Welch
Smith	Warner	Whitehouse
Stabenow	Warnock	Wyden

NAYS—47

Barrasso	Grassley	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeben	Rounds
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Manchin	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McConnell	Vance
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Fischer	Mullin	Young
Graham	Paul	

NOT VOTING—2

Cramer

Feinstein

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The Senator from Maryland.

DEBT CEILING

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I think everybody in this body now knows that, yesterday, President Biden convened a meeting at the White House to discuss how the United States would avoid a default—a default on the country, a default on our debt, a default which would be something that has never happened before in the history of the country.

The 14th Amendment, section 4 says:

The validity of the public debt of the United States, authorized by law, including debts incurred for payment of pensions and bounties for services . . . shall not be questioned.

"Shall not be questioned."

Throughout our history, in good times and bad times, we have always met our obligations as a country, and that is why President Biden wanted to bring together the congressional leaders to discuss making sure that we don't do that for the first time.

He was joined, of course, by Speaker MCCARTHY. He was joined by the minority leader from the House, Congressman JEFFRIES. From the Senate, he was joined by Majority Leader SCHUMER and Republican Leader MCCONNELL.

I was asked earlier today whether I felt better in the aftermath of this meeting having taken place. And I said: I am glad that the leaders planned to meet again on Friday, but, no, I don't feel more comfortable or confident today than I did before the meeting, and the reason is this: because Speaker MCCARTHY continues to threaten to default on America's debts unless he and the MAGA Republicans in the House can impose big parts of their agenda on the country, impose their agenda on the American people.

I just want to unpack for a moment what exactly that means. What exactly is Speaker MCCARTHY saying to the country? And he is saying this: that if

the Senate doesn't go along with the very extreme proposals passed by the House Republicans and if the President doesn't agree to sign on to those extreme proposals, he will allow the United States, for the first time in our history, to default on our obligations.

And what does that mean? It means he is threatening economic catastrophe, because there is no dispute among Republicans—I don't care if you are a Democratic economist or a Republican economist—economists across the board will tell you that a default would be catastrophic for our economy—massive job losses. We saw an estimate the other day of 8 million jobs lost in the country—retirement nest eggs that people have been working a lifetime to build up imploding, interest rates rising, the credibility of America around the world shattered, the dollar as the world's reserve currency being called into question.

I can tell you who will be celebrating if this happens, and that is the folks in Beijing, the PRC. They will be very happy if the United States undermines its credibility on the world stage, and they will be very happy if we lose our position of having the dollar being the world's reserve currency.

So what was President Biden's response? So what the President is saying—and I want to be clear about what he is saying. He is saying: Hold on, Mr. Speaker. Hold on, Speaker MCCARTHY. Paying our bills on time is not just a Democratic obligation. It is not a Republican obligation. It is not an Independent's obligation. It is an obligation of Uncle Sam. These are obligations the United States has built up during Democratic Presidencies and Republican Presidencies.

In fact, if you look at the record during the 4 years of the Trump administration, we accumulated one-quarter of the total debt owed by the United States today. Yet, during those 4 years, the House and the Senate, without drama, said: Yes, the United States is committed to paying its debts, and we will do so, and we will address the debt ceiling in that manner.

Just to emphasize once again, what we are talking about is obligations the United States has already incurred, that we have already said as a country: We will do this. We will pay your Social Security. We will pay your Medicare. We will pay our veterans. We will pay our obligations as a country, including those who have purchased U.S. Treasury bonds.

That is what we said when we passed those things, and it is important that we keep our word.

So what President Biden says is, look, these are Uncle Sam's obligations. Mr. Speaker, you don't get to come in here and threaten the health of the American economy if you and House Republicans don't get to enact your policies, don't get to enact your agenda. So take your finger, Mr. Speaker, off the default detonator, and then we should talk about issues of

common concern. We can talk about the budget. We can talk about the deficit and debt. We can talk about spending. We can talk about revenue.

In fact, President Biden has submitted to the House and Senate his budget proposal. I serve on the Senate Budget Committee. We as a Senate have received that. President Biden has proposed a budget that achieves \$3 trillion in deficit reduction over the next 10 years. The proposal passed by Speaker MCCARTHY and Republicans in the House achieves about \$4.5 trillion in deficit reduction over 10 years.

So what the President is saying to Speaker MCCARTHY and House Republicans is: We are happy to sit down as part of the normal budget process. We are happy to talk as part of the normal appropriations process about how we can address the deficit and the debt. I put forward my proposal. You put forward a proposal. Let's sit down.

But President Biden is not saying this to Speaker MCCARTHY: You have to reduce the deficit by \$3 trillion the way I, President Biden, have done it, and if you don't agree to my proposal for reducing the deficit by \$3 trillion, then I am not going to sign a bill to raise the debt ceiling.

If President Biden said that, people would say he is crazy, and it would be very irrational. But that is exactly what Speaker MCCARTHY and House Republicans are doing. They are saying: Mr. President, if you don't reduce the deficit our way, we are going to blow up the American economy.

So let's step back from the brink here. Speaker MCCARTHY, take your finger off the default detonator, and let's have a discussion about how to reduce the deficit and debt, because when you do that, you understand that many of our Republican colleagues really don't care that much about the deficit and debt. Why do I say that? Because if you say "Let's reduce the deficit and debt by increasing revenue by asking some of the wealthiest people in the country—billionaires, people who make hundreds of millions of dollars every year—if you say "Let's reduce the deficit by asking them to pay more in terms of taxes," you won't get any support from our Republican colleagues, the same folks who say it is absolutely urgent that we reduce our deficit and debt.

But we know there are two sides of the equation. There is spending, and there is revenue. In fact, if you go back to the last time the United States balanced our budget, which was around the year 2000, you will find that revenues as a share of our GDP, revenues as a share of our economy, were about 20 percent. Today, if you look forward to the next couple of years, the projections are that total revenues will be about 18 percent of our economy. The difference between 18 percent revenues as a share of our economy and 20 percent may not sound like a big number, but 2 percent of a very big American economy is a lot of revenue.

So what President Biden is saying is: You know, the last time we actually balanced our budget, revenue as a share of GDP was 20 percent, so at least let's look at that as a contribution. Let's look at raising the top rate on corporations to a level that would still be lower than it was just 10 years ago but higher than it is today.

All this talk about the IRS agents—you know, Republicans say: Let's get rid of the additional funds to support IRS agents.

These are IRS agents who are going to go after very rich tax deadbeats. In fact, the Congressional Budget Office projects that if you invest in that effort to go after very rich tax deadbeats, you actually raise revenue. So the action the House took in this regard actually increased the deficit and is just protecting folks who make a boatload of money from paying the taxes that are already due and owed.

What President Biden has said is: OK, sit back. Let's talk through the normal budget appropriations process, but don't threaten to blow up the American economy.

President Biden's budget also has cuts in it. In fact, what the President has proposed is that the Medicare Program pay Big Pharma—pay the pharmaceutical industry a little less for the drugs that the Medicare Program purchases. After all, all of us in this room and every American citizen contribute billions and billions of dollars every year to really important work done at the National Institutes of Health, which is headquartered in my State of Maryland. It is an American treasure. It is an amazing place, and it is a great engine of invention. We spend billions and billions of dollars in taxpayer money every year for them to do research that has uncovered really important cures and really important treatments and helped the pharmaceutical industry develop a lot of the drugs. Yet, Big Pharma uses the research developed with taxpayer dollars and then often turns around and sells those drugs at prices that American taxpayers can't afford. So what President Biden has proposed is that they take a little less. We give the Medicare Program even more negotiating authority so we can reduce those costs to Medicare and to the taxpayer. So he has proposed those kinds of cuts.

I know a lot of our Republican colleagues don't like those ideas, but that is why you come to the table. That is why Speaker MCCARTHY should accept President Biden's invitation to come to the table to discuss, in the normal course—in the budget and the appropriations process—how we can address issues of the deficit. What are our priorities? What should we do on the revenue side? What should we do on the spending side? But don't, Mr. Speaker, continue to threaten to blow up the American economy if you don't get your way.

I am just going to end with a story from 2011 because that is the last time

we really faced this kind of crisis. I am especially worried this time. It was very bad in 2011. We came very close to going over the waterfall. The markets got very jittery. Interest rates did begin to creep up. It cost the U.S. Government more to meet our obligations. I am more worried this time because we apparently have a lot more folks in the House of Representatives who don't seem to fully appreciate and understand the disastrous consequences of default for American families, for our economy.

So I remember back in 2011. It was right after the 2010 elections. Republicans had won a big majority in the House of Representatives. President Obama was in the White House. And they were threatening early on to hold the issue of default and threatened to use it for budget purposes. It is true and we have heard it said that Vice President Biden at the time came down to the Hill, and they formed what was called the Biden group. They met in an office right around the corner here on this floor of the U.S. Senate. I was one of the House Members who participated in that. There was a total of about 10 from the House and Senate, Republicans and Democrats. We had at least 10 meetings.

Vice President Biden would begin each meeting this way—he would say: I know today we are going to talk about the cuts that are being proposed by House Republicans, and we will do that. But I want you to know two things. One is, nothing is agreed to until everything is agreed to, and after we go through these proposed cuts, we are going to go through proposed revenue increases. We are going to close tax loopholes for very wealthy people. We are going to attack the deficit from both sides of the equation. We will do some cuts, but you also have to be prepared to talk about revenue.

Everybody at the table nodded their head—Senate Republicans, House Republicans, Democrats.

Well, after 10 meetings of discussing cuts, a lot of us were getting concerned that we hadn't really begun to dig into revenues.

Vice President Biden said: You know, I said at the beginning of every meeting that we have to get to revenues. We are going to do that.

At that moment, the talks broke down. Eric Cantor, who was the majority leader in the House at the time; Speaker Boehner was Speaker; KEVIN MCCARTHY walked out of the talks, largely because he was afraid he was going to be fingered by his House Republican colleagues for having agreed to talk about revenues. Imagine that. You care about the deficit, but you won't talk about any ways to raise even a penny of revenue from very wealthy people. That sort of exposed the whole charade at the time.

Now Joe Biden is President of the United States. I am sure he is thinking about those days when he served as the head of that budget group, and I am

sure he is thinking back to the fact that our Republican colleagues came to the table and said they cared about deficit reduction and all nodded their heads and said “Yes, after we talk about cuts, we are going to talk about revenues” and then walked out of the room when that moment came.

That just shows that what we are dealing with here is not a commitment to deal with the deficit and debt. What we are talking about is a power play to threaten the health of the American economy in order to impose the MAGA House agenda.

President Biden is absolutely right to say: I am more than willing to talk about the budget and deficits and fiscal policy, but first, Mr. Speaker, take your finger off the default detonator.

That is what Mr. MCCARTHY needs to do, and then we can deal with this in a way that the country deserves.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The Senator from Colorado.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 46 through No. 52, No. 82 through No. 107, No. 110 through No. 113, No. 130 through No. 139; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, reserving the right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, I want to thank my friends from the House for their support today. But the question today is, What kind of Nation do we want to be? This debate speaks to the moral fabric of our society.

We boast the most powerful military in the history of the world. The purpose of that military is for the strongest among us to protect the weak.

In America, those with the broadest shoulders guard those with the narrowest. Yet the Biden administration wants to mobilize our military against the weakest and the most defenseless—the unborn. I believe that is wrong. It is immoral.

My colleague has described an abortion as just another medical procedure. He mentioned Lasik. He also talked about bunions.

The children of our Nation are not just another routine medical procedure. That is why I am standing here to object.

For 40 years, we have had a bipartisan agreement—40 years. Americans may have different views about abor-

tion, but the majority of this country believes that taxpayers should not have to fund abortions. Secretary Austin blew up 40 years of tradition, an agreement, by just one memo—one memo. There was no debate in the Senate. There was no vote in the House. And here is why. They didn't have the votes. This administration couldn't change abortion laws here in the Senate or the House, so they wrote a memo.

Our Cabinet Secretaries aren't supposed to be politicians. They are there to uphold and enforce the laws made in this building. Yet Secretary Austin is the most political Secretary of Defense we have ever seen.

I am glad to hear Senator WARREN got her prompt reply from Secretary Austin this week. As I recall, she made her request on April 6. She got a response a month later. That is certainly not the kind of treatment I have received from the Pentagon. Maybe it has got something to do with my political party.

Nearly a year ago I joined 12 other Republicans in a letter to Secretary Austin, this past July. We asked the Secretary to substantiate the comment he made about abortions being necessary for military readiness. We are still waiting for a reply.

In November, we sent the Department another letter. This time it was just asking for a short and small briefing—just a briefing. That is all we were asking for. We heard they were going to move forward with an abortion policy that was illegal. Secretary Austin did not reply.

In December, I informed Secretary Austin in writing that I would hold his highest nominees if he went forward with this unlawful abortion policy. Well, in February, Secretary Austin implemented that policy, so I kept my word. The very next day, we put a hold on his nominees.

You know, I didn't get a phone call from Secretary Austin until 1 month after I put the hold into effect—1 month. During the call, he offered me absolutely no compromise. He didn't offer to meet or discuss. Unlike Senator WARREN, since then, I have heard nothing from Secretary Austin except what he has said about me—the things that are pretty negative—in Armed Services Committee hearings.

Ten months into this dispute, the Pentagon and I are still waiting for one single fact to support this argument—one single fact.

I read Secretary Austin's letter to Senator WARREN. It is long on opinions, short on facts. I also read the boilerplate letter signed by the former Secretaries of Defense that were put out this week. It reads like a Democrat press release. The letter simply repeats the same unsubstantiated claims made by Senator WARREN, Senator BENNET, and Senator SCHUMER. Frankly, I think these letters vindicate my opinion. These letters were part of a coordinated effort by the Democrats to use

the authority and the prestige of the Secretary of Defense to distract from the facts. Frankly, I don't think that will work either.

The Biden administration has done everything possible to turn our military into just one more institution for leftwing social engineering. Well, for all of history, Secretary Austin will be the Defense Secretary who oversaw America's worst military defeat since Vietnam.

The Senator from Colorado has twice now accused me of mischaracterizing what he did just a few months ago. My goal is to end an illegal abuse of taxpayer funds. That is what we are trying to do here today.

Senator BENNET's hold was so he could get a meeting with Secretary Austin. So how did Senator BENNET's threatened hold end? Senator BENNET got what he wanted. Senator BENNET got his meeting with the Secretary of Defense. Again, this is more than I received.

So let's remember what I am asking for. I am asking for the Pentagon to drop a policy that is illegal. I am asking Secretary Austin to do his job and follow the law. I understand that Senator BENNET is a strong supporter of abortion. That is all understood. But if he wants this abortion policy, then let's pass a bill.

But it hasn't been done that way. Democrats know that they can't get that done. They know they don't have the votes. The burden is not on me to pass legislation to stop this illegal policy. That is not my job. The burden is on the administration to stop breaking the law.

I am glad that Senator WARREN is concerned about our military readiness. Maybe she will actually vote for this year's Defense bill. She hasn't voted for it since 2017. Senator WARREN has a long history of holding military leadership nominations—a long history. In fact, she held the nomination of one of our witnesses at the most recent Armed Services Committee hearing, Air Force Secretary Frank Kendall. This was the same witness she asked about my hold, was it a big problem? Senator WARREN has held his nomination several times. And guess what. She got what she wanted from the Pentagon, just like Senator BENNET with his hold on military nominations.

So I am glad Senator WARREN is concerned about military readiness. It excites me that she is excited about the military. Maybe now Senator WARREN and Senator SCHUMER will support funding our military at a level necessary to actually win a war. That is something else that they have resisted doing throughout their long careers in Washington.

If Democrats were actually concerned about readiness, then we would be voting. The U.S. Senate has had more than 30 days off already this year. If we want to pass this, let's vote. But we have had 30 days off. That is not in-

cluding the weekends. The rhetoric just doesn't match the reality of how this is being handled.

This is more than enough time for us to have confirmed literally all the nominations we have been talking about. We could have already done this, taking them one at a time. This could have been done. Yet that is not what we are doing.

This week, we are having another 3-day workweek. We are getting ready to go on recess 8 days from now. If my Democratic colleagues actually were concerned, then we would be voting on these nominations.

And if Secretary Austin is so worried he can't live without these nominees, he can suspend his memo. That is all he has to do. Drop your memo, and these nominees will proceed by unanimous consent. I am a man of my word. I will stand down. Until then, I am standing up for the Constitution and the unborn, and that is why I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam President, I am proud to stand with my friend, the senior Senator from the great State of Alabama, as he continues to fight against the Department of Defense's attempt to circumvent Congress and ignore existing Federal law which prevents the Department of Defense facilities from being used to provide or facilitate abortions for servicemembers.

The policy is immoral, taking the Department of Defense abortions from less than 20 per year to over 4,000 abortions annually.

It is beyond me why the White House wants to pick this fight. The policy is illegal. It forces taxpayers to subsidize abortion in violation of Federal law. The policy is outside the Department of Defense's mission to uphold and fight for life, not destroy it.

The Biden administration and Senate Democrats claim this is harming our military readiness. With policies like this, they continue to destroy recruiting. If readiness was truly a concern of theirs, they wouldn't have discharged 8,000 troops for choosing not to take the COVID vaccine, a vaccine with minimal benefits to an otherwise healthy, young population.

Look, this policy is wrong, and until the military gets back to providing for our common defense and out of the business of abortion, I will proudly stand with Senator TUBERVILLE.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I want to say thank you to my colleagues from Alabama and Kansas for being out here on the floor today. I regret that we are here with this conflict and this confrontation, but I think that it reflects the deep divisions that exist in this country when it comes to abortion. That is something that I have always said that I understand deeply; that I respect people's different

points of view when it comes to abortion in the United States. I do.

It has led me to conclude—and I know that not everybody agrees with this, although the majority of Americans certainly agree with this. The majority of Coloradans agree with this. It has led me to conclude that this is a decision that should be made between a woman and her doctor. That is who should make the decision. It shouldn't be made by the government.

But at the same time I realize there are differences of opinion. I hope that people on the other side realize that there are differences of opinion here too.

But unlike the position that my colleague from Alabama espouses on the Senate floor, he is not with the majority of Americans on this issue. That might be a point of pride for him.

But I want to first call attention to the reason we are here tonight, which is that I just asked for unanimous consent to move forward the promotions of the flag officers at the Department of Defense. This is the fourth time that I have been on this floor asking us to do what Senates have done for 230 years. Never in the history of the United States of America, literally, never in the history of the United States of America has there been a Senator who put a blanket hold on every single flag officer at the Department of Defense. Talk about playing politics.

By the way, I will correct the record for a third time, if not the fourth time. My hold had nothing to do with flag officers. Mine had to do with a political appointee. You can look it up. I will find that article, and I will put it in the record again.

In contrast to my hold, what the Senator from Alabama is doing and now the Senator from Kansas and the rest of the people who are supporting this, including Members of the House of Representatives who were here tonight, is a blanket hold on 200 military flag officers—a blanket hold on 200 military flag officers. That has never happened in the history of the United States.

These are really important command positions. They are really important. I am not going to go through all of them. The leader of the Fifth Fleet in Bahrain is on this list. The leader of the Seventh Fleet in the Pacific is on this list. These are positions that are critical to checking Iran and to checking China as well.

I was just in Bahrain. We visited with people with the Fifth Fleet, including people from Colorado who are stationed there. We know how important the mission is. I assume they know how important the mission is.

I have heard them say out here—the Senator from Louisiana before—that it is not the generals who are important; it is the enlisted people who are important. Both are important. Both are important. You can't tell me that it is a good idea to have the Fifth Fleet not have the commander that it is supposed to have, not to mention the fact

that people who have spent their entire lives—their entire lives—learning what is needed to get promoted into a position with that kind of trust, that kind of duty and patriotic responsibility, and when it comes time for them to fulfill their mission, that some politician on the floor of the Senate says: No, I am putting a blanket hold on you and 200 other people because of my politics.

I will come back to that in a second.

Our military representative to NATO is on this list. The future Director of Intelligence at U.S. Cyber Command is on this list. So it is not surprising that, while the Senator from Alabama may have his own particular view about military readiness, other observers of what is going on here, including veterans of the DOD, are saying it is the Senator from Alabama who is affecting our readiness.

Just last week, seven former Pentagon Chiefs from Republican and Democratic administrations—both Republicans and Democrats—sent a letter saying that the Senator from Alabama's block is "harming military readiness and risks damaging U.S. national security." That is not me. That is them.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

LETTER FROM SEVEN FORMER UNITED STATES SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE

MAY 4, 2023.

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

DEAR LEADER SCHUMER AND LEADER MCCONNELL: As former Secretaries of Defense, we strongly urge the Senate to act expeditiously on the nearly 200 nominees for general and flag officer who are being blocked from Senate confirmation.

The blanket hold on the promotion or reassignment of these senior uniformed leaders is harming military readiness and risks damaging U.S. national security. Because the Senate is required to confirm every general and flag officer for promotion or for reassignment, this practice has traditionally been a pro-forma exercise, except where there have been specific concerns about individual nominees, which were then handled separately.

The current hold that has been in place now for several weeks is preventing key leaders from assuming important, senior command and staff positions around the world. Some are unable to take important command positions, such as leading the 5th Fleet in Bahrain and the 7th Fleet in the Pacific, which are critical to checking Iranian and Chinese aggression, respectively. Others include the next military representative to NATO, a post essential to coordinating allied efforts in support of Ukraine, as well as the future Director of Intelligence at U.S. Cyber Command. Leaving these and many other senior positions in doubt at a time of enormous geopolitical uncertainty sends the wrong message to our adversaries and could weaken our deterrence.

Moreover, if this blanket hold is not lifted, nearly 80 three- and four-star commanders who are ending their terms in the coming months will not be able to be replaced. Worse, this will impact certain members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, including the Chairman of the JCS.

There are also real-world impacts on the families of these senior officers. Most cannot move and resettle their families; their children cannot enroll at their next schools on time; and spouses cannot start new jobs at the next duty station. We can think of few things as irresponsible and uncaring as harming the families of those who serve our nation in uniform.

We appreciate that Senators can have sincere and legitimate concerns about a Pentagon policy, including as it may relate to broader domestic or social issues. These lawmakers also deserve timely and thorough responses to their questions. However, we believe placing a hold on all uniformed nominees risks turning military officers into political pawns, holding them responsible for a policy decision made by their civilian leaders.

Rather, senators should leverage the numerous means available to them to challenge and change DOD policy, such as introducing legislation, conducting oversight hearings, or amending the annual National Defense Authorization Act.

We, therefore, strongly urge the Senate to ensure the continued readiness of the U.S. armed forces by lifting the blanket hold and promptly voting to confirm these uniformed nominees.

Sincerely,

HON. WILLIAM J. PERRY,
Former U.S. Secretary
of Defense.

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN,
Former U.S. Secretary
of Defense.

HON. ROBERT M. GATES,
Former U.S. Secretary
of Defense.

HON. LEON E. PANETTA,
Former U.S. Secretary
of Defense.

HON. CHUCK HAGEL,
Former U.S. Secretary
of Defense.

HON. JAMES N. MATTIS,
Former U.S. Secretary
of Defense.

HON. MARK T. ESPER,
Former U.S. Secretary
of Defense.

Mr. BENNET. Quote:

Leaving these and many other senior positions in doubt at a time of enormous geopolitical uncertainty sends the wrong message to our adversaries and could weaken our deterrence.

Today—today—the Secretary of Defense, Secretary Austin, wrote:

The longer that this hold persists, the greater the risk the U.S. military runs in every theater, in every domain, in every Service.

He said that this uncertainty "diminishes our global standing as the strongest military in the world."

I don't think it is surprising that he would say that or that it is political that he would say that. It is stating the obvious when you can't do something that we have done for 230 years because of politics that has infected the floor of the Senate.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have Secretary Austin's letter printed in the RECORD.

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

MAY 5, 2023.

Hon. ELIZABETH WARREN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR WARREN: Thank you for your letter requesting a full accounting of the impact on our national security and the risks to our military readiness resulting from Senator Tuberville's indefinite hold on the confirmation of our general and flag officers.

I appreciate and share your deep concern over this hold, which is unprecedented in its scale and scope. Delays in confirming our general and flag officers pose a clear risk to U.S. military readiness, especially at this critical time.

The Department of Defense has 64 three- and four-star nominations pending for positions due to rotate within the next 120 days. These include the Chief of Staff of the Army; the Chief of Naval Operations; the Commandant and Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps; the Director of the National Security Agency and Commander of United States Cyber Command; and the Commander of United States Northern Command.

Additionally, several one- and two-star nominations are now on indefinite hold for general officers and flag officers slated to take command or support critical positions across the Joint Force. Within the next nine months, approximately 80 three- and four-star rotations are projected across the Department. Those positions include the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, and the Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force. In total, between now and the end of the year, the Department projects that approximately 650 general and flag officers will require Senate confirmation.

This indefinite hold harms America's national security and hinders the Pentagon's normal operations. The United States military relies on the deep experience and strategic expertise of our senior military leaders. The longer that this hold persists, the greater the risk the U.S. military runs in every theater, every domain, and every Service.

MISSION VACANCIES

The tenure of Service Chiefs is limited by law, and thus, incumbents must vacate their positions at the appointed time and may only be extended under extraordinary circumstances. Collectively, these positions oversee more than 1.2 million active and reserve component Service members and provide Service personnel and resources to the commanders of the unified combatant commands. By law, Service Chiefs preside over the capabilities, requirements, policies, and plans of their Services and serve as the principal military advisors to the Secretaries of the Military Departments. Put simply, our Service Chiefs train and equip the Joint Force. Without these leaders in place, the U.S. military will incur an unnecessary and unprecedented degree of risk at a moment when our adversaries may seek to test our resolve.

The hold causes especially acute, self-inflicted problems in new domains of potential conflict. The Director of the National Security Agency and Commander of United States Cyber Command, is responsible for supporting every combatant commander and Service member around the globe—including troops in hostile or hazardous areas—with actionable signals intelligence and cybersecurity support. The Director also ensures

that military communications and data remain secure and out of the hands of our adversaries, safeguarding our advanced command, control, communications, computer intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities against the People's Republic of China, Russia, Iran, North Korea, ISIS, and more. Failing to fill this position weakens the cybersecurity of the United States.

Furthermore, delays in confirming a large number of one- and two-star general and flag officers jeopardizes our current and future readiness. The Department relies on these experienced leaders to execute tactical actions every day and extend our strategic advantages for the long term. General and flag officers at this level are responsible for executing strategy, acquiring new technologies, enhancing tactical effectiveness, conducting joint training, and strengthening global alliances. These general and flag officers also provide direct leadership and mentorship to thousands of enlisted Service members and junior and field grade officers across the Department. Their importance cannot be overstated.

POWER PROJECTION ABROAD

General and flag officers provide oversight of the Department's military and civilian staffs, help decide how we employ our forces, and take care of the Service members, civilians, and families in their organizations. Delays in confirmation will soon foist vacancies on the most senior military positions across each of the Services, imposing new and unnecessary risks on U.S. warfighters across multiple theaters of operations.

The hold also makes it harder for the United States to fulfil its global leadership responsibilities, including to our treaty allies and our valued partners around the world. Our smoothly running normal processes and predictable military transitions have long set helpful expectations among allies and partners. Now, however, this hold has created unnecessary uncertainty. That diminishes our global standing as the strongest military in the world, which is in large part based on our stable processes and orderly transitions.

General and flag officers have the authority to make decisions and commit resources, develop key policies, work with our allies and partners, and confront our rivals and foes. The full impact of this hold may not be immediately noticeable because of the resilience built into our military organizations, but over time, the hold will cause cascading impacts to our readiness and needlessly hinder our ability to meet our strategic objectives in the Indo-Pacific, Europe, the Middle East, and beyond.

The absence of experienced and Senate-confirmed senior leadership limits our ability to deepen our cooperation with our allies and partners through multilateral training and cooperative engagements. Recent exercises, such as Balikatan 2023 with the Armed Forces of the Philippines or joint U.S.-Israeli naval activity in the Bab el-Mandeb Strait, may become even more difficult if delays in confirmation force other leaders to take on the responsibilities of officers held up by the Senate. This hold could force senior leaders to become dual-hatted, which would force them to juggle competing priorities and sap their ability to excel.

KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERTISE

Our general and flag officers cultivate their expertise and experience over decades of service. Military units need leaders, and our Service members deserve to be led by fully confirmed general and flag officers. The failure to confirm leaders in key roles transfers strategic risk down the chain of command and forces our units to operate with

less experienced decision makers in charge. By destabilizing the senior military promotion and rotation process, we put our short- and long-term readiness at significant risk.

Failure to fill these positions in a timely manner is simply irresponsible. We owe it to our Service members to provide them with the best leadership possible, and the current hold jeopardizes the continuity and effective transition of leadership.

SERVICE MEMBERS AND FAMILIES

This hold disrupts not only our most senior military leaders but their families as well. Service members and military families are resilient, but the current hold adds another layer of stress and unnecessary uncertainty.

The damage here includes not just the disruption to our most senior officers, but also profound confusion and disturbance to our rising one- and two-star general and flag officers and their families. Extended holds increase the time from selection to promotion, which could further delay promotion timelines by 12 to 24 months. This impedes not only the current cadre of officers but those in the groups behind them as well.

General officer and flag officer end strength is tightly controlled by statute. Promotion of one cadre of officers is possible only with the retirement of others. Long-term holds have a corrosive and cascading effect: they prevent our rising officers and their families from being able to predict promotion and rotation windows, which can increase the pressure to leave the military in favor of greater stability. The more our normal promotion processes are jolted, the more we risk the loss of the diverse warfighting and technical expertise that America needs to confront its 21st-century security challenges.

The current hold also means delaying or canceling permanent change of station moves—not only for those now nominated and on hold but also for numerous officers and their families who must be extended on station to prevent critical gaps. Military children will be unable to move to new schools when the next school year begins, which imposes needless additional stress on those students and their families. Military families enrolled in the Exceptional Family Member Program may endure serious delays or be unable to access the services and support that they need and deserve when they transition to their new duty stations. And outstanding military spouses may not be able to accept or start new jobs because they cannot predict when they could start. The families of our general and flag officers serve right alongside their Service members.

The current hold imposes additional burdens upon our military families that are both unnecessary and unconscionable.

A PERILOUS PRECEDENT

As such, the Department urges the Senate to resolve the current situation as swiftly as possible to limit these serious consequences. Never before has one Senator prevented the Department of Defense from managing its officer corps in this manner, and letting this hold continue would set a perilous precedent for our military, our security, and our country.

The ripple effects of this unprecedented and unnecessary hold are increasingly troubling. Ultimately, the breakdown of the normal flow of leadership across the Department's carefully cultivated promotion and transition system will breed uncertainty and confusion across the U.S. military. This protracted hold means uncertainty for our Service members and their families and rising disquiet from our allies and partners, at a moment when our competitors and adversaries are watching.

As public servants and officials sworn to protect and defend our Constitution, I hope that we can all acknowledge the national security risks posed by these needless delays and come together to safeguard the lethality and readiness of the most powerful fighting force in human history.

Thank you for your continued strong support for our Service members and our national security. I again urge swift action to confirm all U.S. general and flag officers.

Sincerely,

LLOYD J. AUSTIN, III.

Mr. BENNET. Today, any American who wants to read this stuff can actually read all of it and see all of it.

The Senator from Alabama—and he said it again tonight—has said that he will continue to hold these promotions for “as long as it takes”—“for as long as it takes”—to which, I think, the obvious question is, As long as it takes to what? What is the political principle for which he is on the floor, using the unprecedented tactic of holding up every single flag promotion in the DOD and our U.S. military? What is it that he is trying to do? What principle is he trying to enshrine?

The rule that he is objecting to and the rule that my colleague from Kansas is also objecting to is a rule that does three things.

One thing it does is to say, if you are in need of reproductive healthcare and you are a woman who is in our military, that you can take paid leave to be able to do that. You don't have to take unpaid leave to travel to a place if you are stationed in, for example, a place like Alabama where abortion is illegal—I think only with the exception for the life of the mother.

There is no exception for rape or incest if you are serving in a State like Alabama—where a doctor could go to prison for 99 years for performing an abortion, where they are having debates down there about whether or not they can use laws that are written for fentanyl and apply them to the use of chemicals during an abortion. It is a State in which, by the way, a majority of Alabamians says there should be some access to abortion.

But if you are somebody who is stationed there through no fault of your own, you don't get to decide where you are going to be if you sign up and you get sent to, for example, Alabama. What the Secretary of Defense said was, OK. We are going to pass a rule that says that if you have to take leave, you can take paid leave.

We are going to say that if you need to take a minute to think about whether you want to talk to your superior officer about the condition that you are in and the procedure that you have to take, then you can take a little bit longer to do that, to tell your commanding officer.

We are saying, also, that we can pay for your travel just like we do for other care—to leave your duty station and go someplace else. Those are the three things.

So when he says “as long as it takes”—I gather what he means when

he says “withdraw the memo”—it is as long as it takes to make sure that a woman cannot travel from her duty station to someplace else and have that paid for like other procedures; that a woman has to take unpaid leave—she can’t get paid leave even though she can for other procedures; and that a woman has to tell her commanding officer the minute that she learns of this.

Those are the three things. Those are the three things. That is why he is objecting to every single flag officer’s promotion. I don’t know what to do about that because I will bet you—I can’t prove it, but in standing here tonight, I will bet you that 80 percent of the American people, no matter what their positions are on the underlying issue here, would agree with those three policies.

By the way, I didn’t compare abortion to bunions or abortion to LASIK. What I said was those other procedures are things to which the same rules apply. That is what I said. The reason that is important to this debate and to the discussion that we are having right now is that my colleague from Alabama is saying that if it doesn’t say “reproductive services” or “reproductive healthcare” or “abortion” in the statute books, that means that there is no ability for the Secretary of Defense to write rules to protect the rights of our enlisted—in this case, enlisted women. That is what he is saying.

What I have pointed out is that there is no place in the statute that says that you can go get your foot work done or LASIK surgery. That is not in the statute because this body and the House of Representatives confers judgment for this on the leaders of the Defense Department. And, unlike the Senator from Alabama, I actually have a lot of sympathy for the minefield that they are having to navigate.

By the way, one other thing I just want to point out for the record so that it is absolutely clear is that nothing in this rule says that the U.S. Government is paying for an abortion. There is nothing in this. There is nothing in these three things. So to anybody on that side who says that is what this is about, that is a debate for another day. That is not the debate for this.

But why would I say I have sympathy? Why do I have sympathy? I have sympathy because something has happened in America that I could never have imagined 30 years ago. I don’t remember now when it was 30 years ago—1997? I can’t do the math. I hope the pages can do the math—1993? I don’t even have the date right. It was when I was in law school. Something has happened that I never would have imagined, and that is that the Supreme Court of the United States, for the first time in our history—for the first time since Reconstruction—has ripped away from the American people a fundamental right, a fundamental freedom. When I was the pages’ age here, I never would have imagined that would have happened. When I was in law school, I

never imagined that would have happened.

That is because, from our founding until today, in general, this country’s history has always been about expanding freedoms and expanding rights and making our country more democratic, more fair, and more free. But, after a 50-year campaign—none of this was accidental. After a 50-year campaign led by some people on the other side of the aisle here, they finally got what they wanted, which is *Roe v. Wade*’s being overturned, and we are having to deal with the consequences of that as a society, as a country. The Secretary of Defense is having to deal with that.

When they say there has been a 40-year consensus, that consensus was ripped violently from the American people by the Supreme Court. It stripped us of a 50-year consensus when it came to a woman’s right to choose, when it came to that fundamental freedom. Then there were some people on the other side of the aisle who said: Don’t be so hysterical. This is just returning it to the States. You don’t need to worry about it.

I don’t think that was ever a genuine thing to say, but let’s look at the facts here. Eighteen States have banned abortion since this happened. Nine of those States have no exceptions for rape or incest. In Texas, they are paying \$10,000 bounties if your friend or your neighbor or the person down the street reports on you and reports that you are going to pursue something that has been a fundamental right in the United States of America for 50 years—something that has been a fundamental right in the State of Colorado, the State that I represent.

My colleague says that I am pro-abortion. That is not why I am out here. That is not why I am out here. I am sure he didn’t mean to say that. I am out here because I believe that my judgment isn’t better than the judgment of a woman and her doctor and that the government shouldn’t be making the decision. I am proud to live in a State that was one of the first States—probably, I think, the first State in America—to enact a woman’s right to choose even before *Roe v. Wade* was passed, and it was the first State to codify *Roe v. Wade* after—the Supreme Court overturned that precedent.

Think about what is happening in Florida. It is one of the biggest States in America. It is one of the largest States. I can’t remember. Is it the third largest State or the fourth largest State? It is huge. It is huge. They have just banned abortion in Florida at 6 weeks—banned it at 6 weeks. When I was the age of these pages and when I was in law school, that would have been unimaginable.

There might be a reason the Governor down there signed that law at 11 o’clock at night. There might be a reason—because 65 percent of Floridians think it is a terrible idea. They think that this should be a decision that is

made between a woman and her doctor. They don’t need their Governor telling them. They don’t need a Senator telling them. They don’t need the Federal Government telling them or weighing in on this incredibly difficult decision.

And we are here tonight because, as a result of that—I would say—balancing act, that commonsense approach that the Secretary of Defense has tried to take here when it comes to the people who are serving in our military, we now face real harm to our national security.

Part of the challenge is the recruitment challenge that my colleagues talk about on the Republican side. And I can tell you the studies that have been done that have asked the question about what the reversal of *Dobbs* is going to mean for recruitment in the Department of Defense. The Presiding Officer won’t be surprised to know it is not good. It is not going to make matters better if you think that you can be assigned to a State where they have outlawed abortion or they are saying that doctors can get a 99-year prison sentence or there are no exceptions for rape or incest or the life of the mother; or you are in Florida, and now you have a 6-week ban. That may affect the recruiting that goes on in the U.S. military, not to mention the 700,000 civilians who serve in the Department of Defense.

Servicemembers don’t decide where they are going to serve; DOD decides. Before *Dobbs*, our troops at least had some assurance. Today, they don’t have any assurance. That is why we are here.

So any talk of this 40-year consensus ignores completely what has happened, and what has happened is the Supreme Court overturning *Roe v. Wade*.

I just want to say to my colleagues, tonight, that I think it is important for the American people to understand, it is important for the next generation of Americans to understand, that this did not happen by accident. For 50 years, there has been a campaign in America to strip us of this fundamental right, to strip us of this fundamental freedom.

When I was in law school, in the early 1990s, it was just after this new legal doctrine had been invented in America called originalism. I have said here on the floor that I think whoever came up with that name should get the Pulitzer Prize for political names. It is genius. It is genius because the idea is that, somehow, by putting on your originalist view of the world, you are going to be able to divine what the Founding Fathers were writing when they wrote the Constitution; that, if you are a judge, you are restricted to what they refer to as the plain meaning of the Constitution; and that, if you can’t get to the plain meaning, you should be able to divine their intention as close to the text as possible, as if it is possible to divine the original intent of the Founders, because, if you are somebody who believes that you can do

that, you are channeling George Washington or Thomas Jefferson or Ben Franklin or John Adams; that you have a leg up on anybody else who is trying to interpret what the Constitution says because, if you know what they were originally saying, if you have that secret decoder ring to tell you what they were originally saying, then that gives you an elevated position over anybody else who might disagree with you. In fact, there isn't really room for disagreement since you have divined what the Founders believed.

I have no idea where the pages are in their history lessons on the American Constitution. I hope they do. I am sure they do. But anybody who has read anything about the Constitution of the United States knows that almost every word is a product of compromise. Almost every word is a product of compromise.

There are some things in there where it is not confusing about what they said. I owe my friend ANGUS KING for this. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article that he wrote, my colleague from Maine.

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

AMY CONEY BARRETT'S JUDICIAL PHILOSOPHY
DOESN'T HOLD UP TO SCRUTINY

(By Angus King Jr., Heather Cox Richardson)

The Constitution should be the sturdy vessel of our ideals and aspirations, not a derelict sailing ship locked in the ice of a world far from our own.

During her confirmation hearings, Amy Coney Barrett argued that the judicial philosophy known as "originalism" should guide judges in their interpretation and application of constitutional principles. Most famously associated with the late Justice Antonin Scalia (for whom Judge Barrett clerked), this idea sounds simple and sensible: in determining what the Constitution permits, a judge must first look to the plain meaning of the text, and if that isn't clear, then apply what was in the minds of the 55 men who wrote it in 1787. Period. Anything else is "judicial lawmaking."

In some cases, interpreting the Constitution with an originalist lens is pretty easy; for example, the Constitution says that the president must be at least 35 years old ("35" means, well, 35), that each state has two senators (not three and not one), and that Congress is authorized to establish and support an Army and a Navy. But wait a minute. What about the Air Force? Is it mentioned in the text? Nope. Is there any ambiguity in the text? Again, no. It doesn't say "armed forces"; it explicitly says "Army" and "Navy." Did the Framers have in mind the Air Force 115 years before the Wright brothers? Not likely.

So is the Air Force unconstitutional, even though it clearly fails both prongs of the "originalist" test? No, a more reasonable and obvious interpretation is that the Framers intended that the country be protected and that the Air Force is a logical extension of that concept, even though it wasn't contemplated in 1787. This isn't judicial lawmaking; it's judges doing what they're hired to do.

Mr. BENNET. There are supposed to be—not supposed to be; there are—there are two Senators from every

State. That is in the Constitution. I don't think we are going to disagree about what that means.

I know that people on the floor staff tonight are thinking: I wish there was one Senator from Colorado who would stop talking.

And I will stop talking. But that is what it says, and I can read the plain meaning of that—"two Senators." But it becomes less clear when the words are things like—again, credit to ANGUS KING—"due process," or when the words don't even show up in the Constitution of the United States—"Air Force"—because they didn't have a single plane when they wrote the Constitution of the United States.

I think that Thomas Jefferson's view of this was certainly closer to mine than some others, which was that they expected the government to evolve. They expected the interpretation of these documents, over time, to evolve. That is a good reminder, by the way, of the disagreements that the Founders had, originally.

As to their original intent, some of them were slaveholders, in the case of Thomas Jefferson, in the case of George Washington, in the case of Madison. Some of them were abolitionists, in the case of John Adams. But that was a fundamental thing that ended up being wrestled to a horrendous compromise that allowed slavery to continue in the United States of America, and the results of that horrible compromise are going to be with us for the rest of our days.

But if you had told me when I was in law school that a majority of the Supreme Court of the United States would subscribe to originalism, I wouldn't have believed it. I would not have believed it—maybe one Justice. There had never been a Justice on the Court who ever signed up to that thing called originalism because it hadn't been invented yet. You know, it had just been invented.

But I read Justice Alito's majority opinion for the Supreme Court in the Dobbs case, and, man, he believes it because the fundamental conviction is: If it wasn't a freedom in 1868, it is not a freedom today; it is not a right today. That is what the originalist's view would be.

The dissent points out that the men—the men, the men—who ratified the 14th Amendment in 1868 "did not perceive women as equals, and did not recognize women's rights. When the majority says that we must read our foundational charter as viewed at the time of ratification . . . it consigns women to second-class citizenship."

By definition, how can that not be true? Women were second-class citizens when the Constitution was written. They were second-class citizens when the 14th Amendment was passed in 1868. It took women in this country another 50 years—almost, almost—after a hundred years of fighting for it, to get the right to vote in America, the self-evident right to vote.

And because the Supreme Court majority didn't have to wrestle with the realities of this freedom, the realities of this right, because for them the only pertinent question was: Was it around in 1868? That is not completely unfair to them; they were asking a question like was it around 300 years, 400 years ago but ignoring the 50 years that it had been a right, that it had been a freedom in the United States of America. They didn't have to contend, nor did they want to contend, with the effects their decision was going to have on everyday people in the United States of America, including people who served in our military.

One of the very first calls I got after Dobbs was decided was from a woman whom I know who was an officer in the Air Force, who called me and said me: Michael, let me tell you a story about my life and decisions I had to make. And, now, what are people going to do?

We talked about the privacy issues that were at stake. Those aren't even touched on here.

If I were in charge, I would hope that we would have something in there about privacy. We don't have anything. There is not even anything about privacy. Everybody in the unit is going to know everything that there is to know.

She wanted to talk about that, but what she really wanted to talk about is readiness; this is going to affect our readiness.

In response to that concern, the Pentagon drew up these three policies: travel allowances for servicemembers, as I mentioned; being able to take your absence without unpaid leave; and more time for servicemembers to be able to tell their commanding officers. That is all it is.

Now the Senator from Alabama is out here saying that, you know, it is making the DOD into an abortion factory, or—he didn't say it tonight, but he said it before—into an abortion travel agency, and that is why he is holding up these 200 flag officers.

I am really worried—I am really worried—about what the implications of this are because I don't know what is going to make him stop, and I don't know what damage is going to be done to our national defense in the meantime.

I will say I believe very strongly that this country should codify women's rights to choose at the national level. I believe that. I believe that. Most Americans agree with that position. Most Americans disagree with the Supreme Court. Most Americans disagree with the 50-year campaign that has reversed *Roe v. Wade*.

We have to adjust to this new reality. It is not about evading laws or evading statutes. It is about supporting the men and women in our military, in our armed services. That is what this is about. That is what this is about.

To hold hostage the promotions of flag officers at DOD because of your particular view of a woman's right to choose or whether Dobbs was rightly

decided by the originalist majority that now sits on the Supreme Court—that is pretty tough, man. That is pretty tough. It is tough enough that this right has been stripped and this freedom has been stripped.

I think there are people who thought it wasn't really going to happen in America. I said I thought it wasn't going to happen. I didn't. I didn't. When I was the age of the pages here, when I was in law school and college, the last thing from my mind is that this would happen. I think it is surprising to the American people, and I think it would be very surprising to the American people if they knew that there was a Member of the U.S. Senate using a procedure that has never been used in the history of our country to try to impose their view of social policy.

And I don't think the American people should accept this. I will tell you, I know that Colorado doesn't accept this. In Colorado, as I said earlier, we protect reproductive care for service members. We protect it for everybody in my State, and we do everything we can to protect our readiness as well.

We are home, in Colorado, to the U.S. Air Force Academy; to Fort Carson, to Schriever, to Peterson, to Buckley; and to Space Command. In the case of Space Command, we have a live example of how the Supreme Court's decision could hurt our national security. This is one of the saddest stories that I know. I am sorry to be here tonight telling this story because I think decisions about where to locate our military installations should be made in the national security interest of the United States of America. That is what I believe. It is devastating to think that we could have had a situation where elected leaders—politicians, a President—could play politics instead of making a decision in our national security, but in the case of Space Command, that is exactly what happened.

Every top general in the Air Force who was asked recommended Peterson in Colorado Springs as the home for Space Command, and there were three reasons. One was, it could get stood up faster than if it were moved anywhere else; it was going to be cheaper to repurpose buildings that were there; and because they were also concerned that if they moved it from Colorado, there would be massive attrition, both in the DOD workforce and the civilian workforce. That was their conclusion. That was their conclusion: Leave it in Colorado. And President Trump overruled them. Every general said: Leave it in Colorado. They went into the White House. The President made a different decision and said: Move it to Alabama. Let's send Space Command to Alabama.

How do I know he made the decision on politics, not on national security? How do we know that? Well, he went first on a radio program called—this is President Trump. He went on a radio program called the “Rick & Bubba

Show,” and they asked him, and he said: I singlehandedly moved it to Alabama. They wanted it to be somewhere else, but I singlehandedly moved it to Alabama.

The GAO and DOD's own inspector general confirmed these facts—confirmed these facts—about the generals saying it should be in Colorado and President Trump saying: I singlehandedly made the decision.

Mayor John Suthers, who is the mayor of Colorado Springs, confirmed these facts. In fact, in a letter to Air Force Secretary Frank Kendall, here is what Mayor Suthers wrote: In the spring of 2019, President Trump told him that “despite any process the Air Force was pursuing, he”—President Trump—“would make the decision ‘personally’, and the only question is whether it would be before or after the 2020 election.”

In February 2020 when Mayor Suthers—not that it matters, but just for the record, Mayor Suthers is a Republican mayor. This is not a Democratic mayor who is recalling these statements by President Trump; it is a Republican mayor.

In February 2020 when Mayor Suthers again made his case to President Trump to keep Space Command in Colorado, Trump asked him if he was a Republican.

He is a Republican. I don't know why that mattered, but he is a Republican.

When Mayor Suthers replied that he was, President Trump asked what President Trump's chances were of carrying Colorado in the 2020 election. After Mayor Suthers responded that his chances were “uncertain,” he noticed that made the President seem “perturbed.” President Trump said again he would make the decision after the 2020 election and he wanted “to see how it [turned] out”—to see how the election turned out.

The generals all recommended Colorado. They went into the White House. Donald Trump, President Trump, overturned what they said, and, in his own language, we know the reason why.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD, Madam President.

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

MARCH 7, 2023.

DEAR SECRETARY KENDALL: I am the Mayor of Colorado Springs, Colorado, and have been since June 2015. I have also served as the Attorney General of Colorado and U.S. Attorney for Colorado. During my role as Mayor, I have been involved in the effort to retain US Space Command headquarters in the city.

While I am hardly an unbiased observer of the process, I do want to relate two conversations I had with former President Donald Trump that led me to conclude the President's decision to move Space Command headquarters to Huntsville, Alabama was a wholly political one. Both conversations took place on the tarmac at Peterson Space Force Base and both were witnessed by high-ranking officers in the US Space Force. The first was in the spring of 2019 when President

Trump came to Colorado Springs to speak at the Air Force Academy graduation, and the second came in February 2020 when he came to the city for a political rally. In both instances, I was the first to greet him when he got off Air Force One and I mentioned Colorado Springs had been the home of all previous iterations of Space Command, and we hoped to remain the permanent home of Space Command headquarters. In the spring 2019 meeting, I was surprised to hear the President assert that, despite any process the Air Force was pursuing, he would make the decision “personally”, and the only question is whether it would be before or after the 2020 election. The February 2020 meeting was more extensive and enlightening. My wife Janet and I were both standing next to high-ranking Space Force officers. When I once again made my pitch to President Trump, he asked me if I was a Republican mayor. When I replied that I was, he asked what his chances were of carrying Colorado in the November election. When I said they were “uncertain” he seemed perturbed. He then turned to the high-ranking officer in the Space Force and asked him, “Is this where it should be?” The high-ranking officer replied, “Absolutely, Mr. President.” The President then reiterated that he would make the decision and said it would be after the 2020 election. “I want to see how it turns out,” he said.

Because of these conversations with the President, and the role played by Alabama Congressman Mo Brooks in the rally before the storming of the US Capitol on January 6, 2021, I was disappointed, but not surprised, that the President, after the decision to move to Huntsville was made a week before he left office, fully admitted to Alabama Audiences that he “single-handedly” made the decision to move the command to Huntsville.

I understand there are some in the Biden Administration who contend the Trump Administration's decision to move Space Command headquarters was not wholly political, despite the former President's public assertions to the contrary. I hope my conversations with President Trump, which were witnessed by others, as related herein, will shed further light on the matter.

I would be glad to answer any questions you or anyone else might have about the matter, or provide an affidavit, if requested.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. SUTHERS,
Mayor of Colorado Springs.

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, and instead of removing this stain of politics from this decision, DOD, I am sad to say, has proceeded as if nothing were wrong, as if there were just a garden-variety bureaucratic process that they are going through, an inevitable outcome that preserves that political judgment, which would be a horrendous precedent for our country—horrendous. It would ratify a political decision that should have been a decision made in the interests of our national security. It would be a green light for future Presidents to do that kind of thing.

There are estimates that the attrition could be as much as 80 percent if you move this from Colorado to Alabama. The reason this comes up in the context of this debate is that, in Colorado, we have preserved a woman's right to choose. In Alabama, they have banned it—no exceptions for rape or incest. And now the Representatives, the

Senators from Alabama don't want anybody to be able to pursue their interests and their judgments about their own healthcare.

President Trump's decision would be a self-inflicted wound as we face a major land war in Ukraine and the saber-rattling that we are hearing in the Pacific. Every day that goes by, there is another article about how critically important our space assets are in this fight for freedom all around the world.

I am really, really pleased that President Biden is coming to Colorado Springs next month to speak to the graduating class of the Air Force Academy, and I hope that is going to give us the opportunity to learn about this decision and how harmful it was and give us the chance to restore integrity to the process—to ensure that national security, not politics, drives our basing decision—and at the same time give us the chance once again to stand on the side of expanding rights and expanding opportunity in America, not restricting it.

The Supreme Court had no interest—had no interest—in grappling with the consequences of their ruling on our country, on our society, on the men and women in uniform, on our national security. They didn't have to because if it wasn't a right in 1868, it is not a right today; if it wasn't a freedom in 1868, it is not a freedom today.

The men and women in our 21st-century Department of Defense deserve better than that. The men and women who have signed up to serve this country selflessly deserve better than that.

I heard my colleague from across the aisle say that this was a country about the stronger defending the weaker. I don't think that is what this is about. The responsibility each one of us has—each one of us has—whether we are born strong or weak or rich or poor or in Colorado or in Alabama, to uphold our national security, to uphold our democracy, to make sure that we land on the side of our highest ideals.

I think most people feel like there has been too much politics in America lately. I think people would see that they have fundamental disagreements with each other about a woman's right to choose or an endless number of things, but I also think people could understand what would happen if, instead of continuing to debate, continuing to have a conversation, that our attitude was “I am just taking my ball and going home” or, in the case of the Senator from Alabama, “I am going to hold up 200 flag officers who have been duly promoted in our Department of Defense.”

So I don't know how this is going to end, Madam President. This is not a great day in the history of the U.S. Senate. There is a reason why all of our colleagues going back for 230 years haven't put the kind of hold that we have seen put on today.

It is staggering to me that, at a moment when the majority of Americans

are saying that they think the decision in Dobbs was wrongly decided, that they think this decision should be made between a woman and her doctor, that we would be out here on the floor of the Senate using tactics that nobody has ever used before to impose one's personal view on the rest of the country.

I would ask that the Senator from Alabama reconsider the position he has taken, and I would ask the Biden administration to undo the terrible political decision President Trump himself said he was making singlehandedly, over the objection of the generals in the Air Force.

Now, in the wake of the decision in Dobbs and seeing what the intention is among some folks on the other side of the aisle, there is no excuse to picking up this military installation and moving it all the way across the country, the United States of America, just to ensure that women don't have the free exercise of their freedom and to ensure that it would be delayed as a result of going there and that we will be less safe as a result of it going there.

I know the temptation is strong to not overturn the previous decision because people, I think, are worried about looking political. It would be political to keep this political decision in place. They need to listen to the words of the Republican mayor, John Suthers; listen to Donald Trump's own words; listen to what the generals said.

But this is the fourth time I have been out here, Madam President, on this issue, and I am going to keep coming back as long as it takes. I appreciate your patience and your indulgence this evening.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

ABORTION

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to print the following article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

NOT ENOUGH ABORTIONS?

(By Marjorie Dannenfelser, Senator Cindy Hyde-Smith)

When Americans think about supporting U.S. troops, they usually think about servicemembers with difficult deployments far from their families. Or wounded veterans in need of health care, jobs, or homes. You know what doesn't top the list? Abortion. “Not enough abortions” probably never crosses their minds as a problem that needs solving, much less as taxpayer expense.

AT this very moment, unbeknownst to many Americans, the Biden administration is using our tax dollars to pay travel expenses for elective abortions—and not only for servicemembers, but for their kids, spouses, and other dependents. This isn't just a brazen moral affront to hardworking Americans, it is also illegal. At this pace, it is estimated to lead to an increase of more than 4,000 unborn children killed in abortions each year.

Senator Tommy Tuberville of Alabama is doing all Americans who value life a great service by exposing this scheme and vowing to put a hold on promotions at the Pentagon until it stops. Senator Tuberville is not alone. A majority Americans and many colleagues in the Senate and House support his effort to hold the Biden administration accountable to the law and the people.

Americans have made it clear repeatedly that they abhor their tax dollars going to fund abortions. The latest annual Marist poll shows 60% of Americans—millions of Independents and rank-and-file Democrats included—oppose using tax dollars to fund abortion domestically, and 78% oppose using tax dollars to fund abortion abroad.

The people's will is expressed in our federal laws and in bills that Congress votes on year after year. The most familiar is the longstanding Hyde Amendment, which saves millions of lives by keeping taxpayer-funded abortion out of programs like Medicaid and has been reapproved annually in larger bills supported by Democrats. In addition, the Defense Department specifically has been prohibited in permanent law from paying for elective abortions for nearly 40 years.

Pro-abortion Democrats have failed to get rid of these critical protections through legislation, so the Biden administration is resorting to violating federal law to bypass them and impose agenda that would never fly at the ballot box.

Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin and the pro-abortion media accuse Senator Tuberville of impairing military readiness. But the truth is that Senate Democrats don't need Senator Tuberville's help to move personnel appointments forward—they simply complain that he is not helping fast-track them. The issue he raises is not frivolous, it is one of life or death.

Democrats also complain that service members don't have enough access to abortion on demand. With a handful of exceptions like North Korea and China, virtually the entire world—including most of Europe—has stronger national protections for unborn children than the United States. Clearly, this has never ground our military to a halt.

Only when the U.S. Supreme Court returned the right to protect unborn children and their mothers to the people and their elected representatives, and more than a dozen states moved swiftly to let the people's consensus become law, did this become a political maneuver for Democrats to appease its radical, angry base.

We are grateful for all those who are already making their voices heard, and we hope others who have not yet joined in will soon add theirs. The GOP's long tradition of standing for life is a great strength and there

is growing support in Congress to block this administration's lawless abortion policies for our military, including Iowa Senator Joni Ernst's bill to do just that. Sadly, Senate Democrats have insisted on promoting abortion on demand until birth, paid for by the taxpayers, and stonewalled Senator Ernst's legislation, rather than allow any debate.

What is more important: that Majority Leader Schumer and Senate Democrats spend less time on the Senate floor approving military promotions and nominations, or that the most vulnerable and defenseless of American lives are protected from President Biden's lawlessness?

The time is now to hold the Biden administration accountable for its illegal policies that have conscripted our military into facilitating the violence of abortion. We are proud to stand with Senator Tuberville, Senator Ernst, and others in fighting back. Together we will not back down.

MEMORIAL DAY TRIBUTE TO MICHIGAN'S VETERANS

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise today to honor the Michigan veterans throughout history who have given their lives for our Nation.

During some of the toughest times for our country, Michiganders have been there. We have been willing to put our lives on the line for the cause of freedom. That certainly was the case during the Civil War. More than 3 million Americans fought in the Civil War. Around 90,000 of them were Michiganders, and more than 85,000 of them were volunteers. It is said that President Lincoln exclaimed, "Thank God for Michigan!" when 75,000 volunteers from our State arrived in Washington, DC, in May of 1861.

The 24th Michigan Infantry fought at Gettysburg, where a monument stands to this day commemorating their service in the "Iron Brigade." And the 24th was selected to provide military escort during President Lincoln's funeral procession. Few trials have so tested a nation—or a President—as did the Civil War. As historian Jon Meacham explores in his new book "And There was Light: Abraham Lincoln and the American Struggle," President Lincoln and the Nation he led faced multiple existential threats: the fracturing of our country, threats against our democracy, and an institution that treated 4 million Americans not as people, but as property.

The echoes of these challenges remain in our Nation to this day. And in Lincoln, we see a path forward. We see that by keeping our moral center as our North Star, a nation can, in the words of Lincoln, "long endure." We have long endured as a nation in part thanks to those brave, selfless Michiganders who were willing to put their lives on the line in order to preserve our Union. More than 13,400 of them never made it home. They have been followed by so many others.

This Memorial Day, we honor all Michigan veterans throughout history who gave their lives in service to our country. And we honor their families.

It is only because of their sacrifice that our democracy lives on.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE YOUNG AT HEART CENTER

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I rise today to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Young at Heart Senior Citizens and Community Center in Rock Springs, WY. On May 19, 2023, a gala will be held at the Young at Heart Center to celebrate its 50th anniversary.

The Young at Heart Center has served the Sweetwater County community since its founding in May, 1973. Founding board members were J. Garrett Smith, Louis M Groh, Ruth Lucas, T.H. Smith, Dwight J Jones, Lyda Hium, Elmer Halseth, Willie Heikes, and Ernest J Mecca. The center was originally designed to serve the senior population. With the construction of their new facility in 2009, their services expanded to address the needs of the entire community.

The Young at Heart Center exemplifies their mission of "a community place for the young and the young at heart." The center offers 14 different programs with amenities, activities, and services for residents of all ages. Young at Heart is a safe place for Sweetwater County residents to gather, receive educational and nutritional services, pursue interests, and participate in social and recreational activities. The center is also a public-use space for meetings and events. The center serves as a cornerstone for the senior population by providing meals and care. Seniors participate in numerous daily activities that include games, hobbies, exercise, and opportunities for friendship.

Young at Heart added several home health and caregiver services for patients 18 and older. These include skilled nursing services, personal care services, assistance to at-home caregivers with support and education, home-delivered meals, and the Senior Companion Program. Each of these fosters wonderful relationships within the community. Many young people in Sweetwater County have been impacted by the Young at Heart's Early Learning Center. The Early Learning Center focuses on building children's self-esteem and self-worth through strong partnerships with parents. The center provides positive guidance, indoor and outdoor gross motor space, and technology to enhance learning. The importance of nutrition is highlighted by the dedicated kitchen staff who prepare breakfasts, lunches, and afternoon snacks.

The Young at Heart Center receives funding through various government grants and private programs. They also rely on the generosity of Sweetwater County organizations and individuals. The Young at Heart Center would not be able to provide a safe and engaging space without the dedication of staff and volunteers. Volunteers use their

skills and interests to help lead support groups, serve meals, assist special events, offer companionship, and maintain the grounds.

Jamie Loreda began her career with the center as the activities coordinator and facilities secretary. In the fall of 2022, she took over as executive director. Her resolute dedication to the center is notable. She has focused on gaining community involvement, helping to advance the center's success. Jamie has made a significant difference in the lives of Sweetwater County residents.

The wonderful staff and board members who keep the center running are:

Jamie Loreda, Executive Director
 Louise Webb, Receptionist
 Brianna Romero, Early Learning Center Director
 Billie Seneshale, Director of Nursing
 Brandy Sellers-Martin, In-Home Services Supervisor
 Gina Randolph, Access Care Coordinator
 Misty Wilson, Center Bookkeeper
 Cindy Stensgard, Home Services Bookkeeper
 Daphne Palmer, Kitchen Manager/Home Delivered Meals Coordinator
 Kandi Lewis, Facility Secretary/Activities Coordinator/Outreach Coordinator
 Meagan Rogers, Aging Division Coordinator/ Outreach Coordinator
 Board of Directors
 Diana Jessop
 Suzette Williams
 Kent Porenta
 Richard Vandersloot
 Michelle Quiroz
 Kathy Gilbert
 Wanda Bobo-Ferber
 Kevin Maloney
 Sue Riggs
 Mary Thoman, County Liaison

It is an honor for me to recognize this significant milestone for the Young at Heart Center. The center serves as a gathering place where the Sweetwater County community can enjoy friendship and fellowship. Bobbi joins me in extending our congratulations to the Young at Heart Center on their 50th anniversary.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ALAN S. RUDOLPH

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary public service career of Dr. Alan S. Rudolph as he concludes his tenure as vice president for research at Colorado State University—CSU—one of the Nation's top research universities.

Dr. Rudolph received his undergraduate degree from the University of Michigan, an MBA at George Washington University, and a doctorate in zoology from the University of California, Davis. As a National Research Council postdoctoral fellow, his work at the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory NRL showed how we can learn from organisms that survive extreme environments to protect biosensors and blood products for use in the field.

Following his time at the NRL, he was recruited to join the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency—DARPA—as chief of biological

sciences and technology, where he led new strategic efforts for investments in biosciences and biotechnology. He led seminal programs in biorobotics, including starting the design and prototype of Spot, the Boston Dynamics robotic dog, and brain machine interfaces, where he led new programs in brain-controlled prosthetics.

In 2003, he left civil service for the private sector to start new corporate biotechnology efforts with Adlyfe, an Alzheimer's diagnostics company, and Cellphire, Inc., which freeze dries blood products. In 2010, Dr. Rudolph was recruited by the Obama administration and inducted into the Senior Executive Service to lead the Department of Defense Biodefense Program as Director of the Joint Science and Technology Office for Chemical and Biological Defense. At the Pentagon, Dr. Rudolph invested in broad programs to protect the Nation, including new antibody treatments that saved the lives of three Americans in the U.S. during the Ebola outbreak in 2014. Dr. Rudolph concluded his 17-year civil service career leading the Department of Homeland Security's Chemical and Biological Science and Technology Office.

In 2012, through an international research foundation started by Dr. Rudolph, he led a project across over 30 countries to demonstrate the application of brain technology to help injured patients relearn their ability to walk in the Walk Again Project. The trial culminated at the opening of the World Cup in Sao Paulo, Brazil, where a paraplegic opened the world games by kicking a ball onto the pitch with a new prosthetic under brain control.

Dr. Rudolph's outstanding public service continued when he became vice president for research at Colorado State University in Fort Collins, CO, in 2013. At Colorado State, he oversaw record-breaking annual research expenditures approaching \$500 million annually and representing 38 percent of the university's overall budget. During his service, he doubled the number of specialized centers and institutes, including the Center for Healthy Aging, One Health Institute, and Data Science Research Institute, and catalyzed other partnerships in mental wellness, climate adaptation, and agricultural sustainability. Today, CSU ranks among the top tier of research universities in the United States.

Dr. Rudolph has served on numerous executive-level committees and advisory boards. He was a member of the executive board for the Colorado BioScience Association, board member at Innosphere Ventures, and chairman of the board of CO-Labs, which represents 30 Federal research laboratories in the front range. He was on the board of the Colorado Energy Research Collaboratory and the Colorado Department of Education's Higher Research Alliance.

Dr. Rudolph has been recognized for his public service, including a meritorious civil service citation from the

Office of the Secretary of Defense for his contributions to life sciences and national security investments. He also won numerous research awards for his scholarly publications in blood research and tissue engineering.

Dr. Rudolph has performed outstanding Federal service, showing an unwavering commitment to promoting science in service of the public, and has earned the trust and utmost respect of his colleagues and the citizens of Colorado.

I am pleased to honor Alan S. Rudolph's distinguished service and want to express a deep appreciation for his dedication, sacrifice, and outstanding service to his country in the name of science and education.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONNECTICUT AUDUBON SOCIETY

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I rise today to recognize the Connecticut Audubon Society as it celebrates 125 years of dedication to the protection and preservation of Connecticut's birds, other wildlife, and their habitats.

The Connecticut Audubon Society was founded in 1898 in Fairfield, CT, by a group including the noted author and conservationist Mabel Osgood Wright. In its first year, the group rapidly expanded into a statewide organization, with members in towns and cities across Connecticut, including Bristol, Ivoryton, Bridgeport, Brooklyn, New Haven, Hartford, Roxbury, Farmington, and Greenwich. On June 4, 1898, the organization ratified its first bylaws and outlined its purpose: "to discourage the destruction of birds and their eggs, and to promote the study of nature." Connecticut Audubon Society remains true to this purpose today, while also having expanded the scope of their work to conservation efforts more broadly.

For more than a century, the Connecticut Audubon Society has provided refuges for birds and other wildlife and important opportunities for people to enjoy nature at its sanctuaries and preserves. Today, the organization manages 22 sanctuaries totaling more than 3,400 acres, including the oldest private songbird sanctuary in the United States, Birdcraft, established in 1914. The organization now has regional centers in Fairfield, Milford, Old Lyme, Pomfret, Hampton, and Sherman, an educational program in Hartford, and an EcoTravel office in Essex—a truly statewide presence, bringing their important work to all corners of Connecticut.

One hundred and twenty-five years after its founding, the Connecticut Audubon Society continues its vital mission through conservation, education, and advocacy. The organization boasts 5,600 member-families in every town in

the State, and its outdoor conservation, science, and education programs reach more than 100,000 students and adults each year.

Dedicated to preserving our natural heritage and advocating for a more sustainable future, the Connecticut Audubon Society is a positive model for environmental education and wildlife conservation. I applaud its many accomplishments and hope my colleagues will join me in congratulating the Connecticut Audubon Society on 125 years of unceasing commitment to ecological and environmental excellence.●

TRIBUTE TO JOLENE MOLITORIS

• Mr. BROWN. Madam President, it is a privilege to extend my congratulations to Jolene Molitoris as APTA honors Jolene for her extraordinary career and achievements for the public with APTA's Lifetime Achievement Award.

My partnership with Jolene goes back decades, to our early work together in State government in Ohio when Jolene served on the staff of the Ohio Rail Transportation Authority. I introduced Jolene at her Senate confirmation hearing in 1993 for Federal Railroad Administrator, the first woman ever to head that Agency. Jolene went on to become the longest serving FRA Administrator. Jolene blazed more firsts when in 2009 Ohio Governor Ted Strickland appointed her as the first woman to lead the Ohio Department of Transportation, and in that role, she also chaired the Ohio Rail Development Commission.

Recognized by WTS as Woman of the Year in 1995, Jolene has helped boost the women transportation stars who shine today, in addition to her own achievements. While at FRA, she served on the Amtrak board of directors when Amtrak launched the Acela in the Northeast Corridor, promoted rail revitalization with innovative new investment programs, and expanded the number of contracts her agency awarded to women-owned businesses to new Federal highs. At ODOT, Jolene oversaw ODOT's largest construction budget ever to that time and secured \$400 million to bring robust rail service back to Ohio.

Jolene's absolute passion for safety has meant the most. As recent tragic events in Ohio have again unfortunately demonstrated, safety demands unwavering commitment. At FRA and ODOT, Jolene urged Vision Zero, that we must passionately pursue zero incidents and zero casualties. She focused her agencies on safety root cause, expanding focus beyond mere blind compliance by the regulated community. During her FRA tenure, the railroad industry achieved 7 of the safest years to that time.

Nearly 30 ago in 1996, Jolene brought together rail labor, rail management, and other stakeholders to form the FRA Railroad Safety Advisory Committee to develop new regulatory standards through a consensus process.

RSAC continues to operate to this day as one of the few standing negotiated rule-making committees in the Federal Government, offering an elevated voice for rail labor and other advocates in our unceasing pursuit of safety.

Jolene's promotion of Transportation safety excellence, rail passenger, and freight investment, of equity and inclusion—her vivid passion to do the right things for the people of Ohio and for our Nation—drive this APTA honor. I am proud to count Jolene as my partner and my friend, and I salute APTA for presenting this Lifetime Achievement Award to a most distinguished leader: Jolene Molitoris.●

TRIBUTE TO MIKE ROCK

● Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I would like to take this occasion to congratulate Mike Rock on his retirement last month from the American Hospital Association—AHA. For 39 years, Mike was a valued member of the AHA's Federal Relations team and proved to be one of the most knowledgeable, effective, and indefatigable healthcare lobbyists on Capitol Hill.

Mike came to Washington in 1975 from Nebraska. He started working in the mail room of Senator Roman Hruska and then joined the staff of Representative Charles Thone of Nebraska. From there, he went to work for Representative Virginia Dodd Smith as a legislative assistant, handling tax, education, and defense issues.

After 9 years on the Hill, Mike joined the AHA in December 1984. Shortly after Mike started at the AHA, his mother Marilyn paid a visit, where his colleagues informed her that their nickname for him was "Cool Breeze." For nearly four decades, Cool Breeze Mike played an integral role in the AHA's advocacy activities and so many of its successes, including expanding access to healthcare for millions of Americans. I have been on the receiving end of Mike's advocacy work for my entire time in Congress. During my tenure on the House Ways and Means Committee and now as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, I relied on Mike's subject matter mastery of healthcare and tax policy, his political astuteness, and his intuitive grasp of what Congress might be able to achieve to improve the Nation's healthcare system. It was always a joy to welcome him into my office.

At the AHA, Mike met his future wife Renee Blankenau, and they have two grown children: Clare and Paul. I am glad Mike will have more time to spend with his family and his avocations: cycling and swimming. I am truly grateful for our friendship and wish him many more happy miles and adventures in his retirement.●

RECOGNIZING THE GREATER PRINCE GEORGE'S BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

● Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I would like to take this occasion to congratulate the Greater Prince George's Business Roundtable, which is celebrating its 20th anniversary tomorrow at MGM National Harbor. Since 2003, the roundtable—a nonprofit, non-partisan business alliance of chief executives whose companies employ nearly 60,000 people—has worked to improve the county's political and economic landscape and enhance the county residents' quality of life.

Nearly 200 years ago, in "Democracy in America," Alexis de Tocqueville wrote, "In America I encountered sorts of associations of which, I confess, I had no idea, and I often admired the infinite art with which the inhabitants of the United States managed to fix a common goal to the efforts of many men and to get them to advance to it freely." Voluntary associations, de Tocqueville observed, were one of the building blocks upon which our democratic self-governance rests.

The roundtable is a perfect example of such an association. Its members participate voluntarily, hosting community forums on crime and education, creating a VisionFramework to help residents imagine a bright future for the county, and producing a Quality of Life Index to gauge the county's progress toward that future. The roundtable established and runs the Andrews Business and Community Alliance, which promotes Joint Base Andrews, the home of Air Force One, the 459th Air Refueling Wing, and one of the county's two largest employers. All these activities and efforts are done collaboratively, with input from residents and in a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect. As the roundtable's home page states so eloquently, "We believe that business is more than just adjusting overhead or the bottom line. We believe that by giving of our time, our expertise and our inherent sense of altruism, we will help to bring about a better home for all Prince Georgians."

I want to thank Jim Estep, the roundtable's president and chief executive officer; Doyle Mitchell, Jr., the roundtable's board secretary and treasurer; Michael Chiamonte, the board chair; the other board members; and all roundtable members for their indefatigable efforts to make Prince George's County a better place to live and work in. I have been privileged and please to work with the roundtable on so many initiatives these last 20 years. I congratulate the roundtable, confident in my expectation that the next 20 years will bring even more success.●

350TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF SOUTHBURY, CONNECTICUT

● Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I rise today to congratulate the town of

Southbury on its 350th anniversary. In 1673, 15 families seeking free religious expression traveled up the Housatonic River and settled on land that is known today as Southbury. Those humble beginnings have grown into a vibrant community of almost 20,000 people. As the only town in the Nation to bear its name, Southbury is truly one of a kind. I was grateful to be invited this past November to participate in the town's 85th anniversary of Southbury's residents coming together to stop the Neo-Nazi organization, the German-American Bund, from establishing a presence in the town. Their determination reminds us of the importance of standing with our neighbors and calling out hate and bigotry in all its forms.

During my 6 years as Southbury's Congressman and the past 10 years as its U.S. Senator, I have come to know many of the town's past and current citizens. Dr. Mark Taylor, a friend and mentor, became nationally known for his knowledge and passion about critical water sources from the Pomperaug River. Lieutenant Colonel Benjamin Hinman was a Revolutionary War hero who also took part in the Constitutional Convention. Gladys Taber was a prolific writer, best known for her series about life at Stillmeadow, her farm in Southbury.

Congratulations to the Town of Southbury on this impressive milestone of 350 years and counting. It is a privilege to represent a community with such a storied past and bright future, and I look forward to continuing to work together to strengthen Southbury for many years to come.●

RECOGNIZING NORTH CAROLINA BAPTIST HOSPITAL

● Mr. TILLIS. Madam President, North Carolina Baptist Hospital opened on May 28, 1923, as an 88-bed hospital in Winston-Salem, with a simple commitment: to be a place of healing and teaching.

Since 1923, North Carolina Baptist Hospital has served the community and the region through educational programs. The School of Nursing educated nurses from 1923 to 1974, and the Bowman Gray School of Medicine graduated its first class in 1943.

Today, the hospital plays a pivotal role in research and education for Wake Forest University School of Medicine, a nationally known leader in groundbreaking research and experiential medical education, and the academic core of Advocate Health. North Carolina Baptist Hospital has grown over the years. Now known as Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center, the hospital continues to grow to meet the needs of those it serves.

Today, Atrium Health Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center, has grown to become an 885-bed tertiary care hospital that includes Brenner Children's Hospital, and the health system includes five community hospitals, more

than 300 primary and specialty care locations, and more than 2,700 physicians. It has over 20,000 employees and is Winston-Salem and Forsyth County's largest employer. In 2022, construction began for a new critical care tower at the medical center. The investment in this world-class facility will transform emergency and critical care throughout the region.

The hospital and the health system continues to expand services, make research discoveries to bring medical innovations to patients more quickly, and educate the next generation of healthcare professionals—to meet the growing needs of the communities it serves and to improve health, elevate hope, and advance healing—for all.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Kelly, one of his secretaries.

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13873 OF MAY 15, 2019, WITH RESPECT TO SECURING THE INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATIONS TECHNOLOGY AND SERVICES SUPPLY TO CHINA—PM 10

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13873 of May 15, 2019, with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain, is to continue in effect beyond May 15, 2023.

The unrestricted acquisition or use in the United States of information and communications technology or services designed, developed, manufactured, or supplied by persons owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of foreign adversaries augments the ability of these foreign adversaries to create and exploit vulnerabilities in information and

communications technology or services, with potentially catastrophic effects. This threat continues to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13873 with respect to securing the information and communications technology and services supply chain.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 10, 2023.

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13667 OF MAY 12, 2014, WITH RESPECT TO THE CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC—PM 11

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the Central African Republic declared in Executive Order 13667 of May 12, 2014, is to continue in effect beyond May 12, 2023.

The situation in and in relation to the Central African Republic has been marked by a breakdown of law and order; intersectional tension; the pervasive, often forced recruitment and use of child soldiers; and widespread violence and atrocities, including those committed by Kremlin-linked and Yevgeniy Prigozhin-affiliated entities such as the Wagner Group. These dynamics threaten the peace, security, or stability of the Central African Republic and neighboring states, and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13667 with respect to the Central African Republic.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 10, 2023.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:23 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 676. An act to amend the Federal Ocean Acidification Research And Monitoring Act of 2009 to require the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to collaborate with State and local governments and Indian Tribes on vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, research planning, and similar activities, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1715. An act to direct the Department of Energy and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to conduct collaborative research in order to advance numerical weather and climate prediction in the United States, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 676. An act to amend the Federal Ocean Acidification Research And Monitoring Act of 2009 to require the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, to collaborate with State and local governments and Indian Tribes on vulnerability assessments related to ocean acidification, research planning, and similar activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

H.R. 1715. An act to direct the Department of Energy and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to conduct collaborative research in order to advance numerical weather and climate prediction in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES DISCHARGED PETITIONS

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, hereby direct that the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 23, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Marine Fisheries Service relating to "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Regulations for Listing Endangered and Threatened Species and Designating Critical Habitat", and, further, that the joint resolution be immediately placed upon the Legislative Calendar under General Orders.

Cynthia M. Lummis, Ron Johnson, John Cornyn, Marsha Blackburn, Mike Lee, Tommy Tuberville, Rick Scott, J.D. Vance, Eric Schmitt, Mike Rounds, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Dan Sullivan, Ted Budd, Shelley Moore Capito, Bill Hagerty, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, Roger Marshall, James E. Risch, James Lankford, Mike Crapo, John Barrasso, Chuck Grassley, Katie Boyd Britt, Marco Rubio, Mitt Romney, John Thune, Kevin Cramer, Thom Tillis, Ted Cruz.

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, hereby direct that the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works be discharged from further consideration of S.J.

Res. 24, a joint resolution 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; Endangered Species Status for Northern Long-Eared Bat", and, further, that the joint resolution be immediately placed upon the Legislative Calendar under General Orders.

Markwayne Mullin, John Cornyn, Bill Hagerty, Joni Ernst, Lindsey Graham, Roger Marshall, Shelley Moore Capito, James E. Risch, Kevin Cramer, James Lankford, Mike Crapo, John Barrasso, Chuck Grassley, Katie Boyd Britt, Thom Tillis, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Marco Rubio, Mitt Romney, John Thune, Steve Daines, Cynthia M. Lummis, Ron Johnson, John Kennedy, Mike Brown, Dan Sullivan, Mitch McConnell, Joe Manchin, III, John Boozman, Roger F. Wicker.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following joint resolutions were discharged from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, by petition, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 802(c), and placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 23. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the National Marine Fisheries Service relating to "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Regulations for Listing Endangered and Threatened Species and Designating Critical Habitat".

S.J. Res. 24. Joint resolution 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; Endangered Species Status for Northern Long-Eared Bat".

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. CANTWELL, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Special Report entitled "Legislative Activities Report of the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the United States Senate during the 117th Congress" (Rept. No. 118-21).

By Ms. CANTWELL, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment:

S. 467. A bill to modify the age requirement for the Student Incentive Payment Program of the State maritime academies (Rept. No. 118-22).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. President, for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation 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.

*Coast Guard nominations beginning with Alaina M. Accumanno and ending with

Kristen E. Zelman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on March 14, 2023. (minus 1 nominee: Andrew D. Ray)

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1508. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1509. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to extend and reform the conservation reserve program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1510. A bill to amend provisions relating to the Office of the Inspector General of the Government Accountability Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. DAINES, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BUDD, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 1511. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure that public institutions of higher education eschew policies that improperly constrain the expressive rights of students, and to ensure that private institutions of higher education are transparent about, and responsible for, their chosen speech policies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

S. 1512. A bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act and the Poultry Products Inspection Act to allow for the interstate internet sales of certain State-inspected meat and poultry, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 1513. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to seek to enter into negotiations with the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office to rename its office the "Taiwan Representative Office", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 1514. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to establish a mortgage insurance program for first responders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. VAN HOL-

LEN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1515. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service of Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 1516. A bill to authorize funding to expand and support enrollment at institutions of higher education that sponsor construction and manufacturing-oriented registered apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 1517. A bill to extend and modify a pilot program to improve cyber cooperation with foreign military partners in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KING, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1518. A bill to improve the classification and declassification of national security information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 1519. A bill to require a United States security strategy for the Western Hemisphere, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 1520. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to purchase, procure, or distribute pipes or cylindrical objects intended to be used to smoke or inhale illegal scheduled substances; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 1521. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to modernize and improve the licensing of non-Federal hydropower projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

S. 1522. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study on the designation of biosimilar biological products as interchangeable; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rehabilitation expenditures for public school buildings to qualify for rehabilitation credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 1524. A bill to ensure that whistleblowers, including contractors, are protected from retaliation when a Federal employee orders a reprisal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHMITT:

S. 1525. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to address governmental interference in content moderation decisions by providers of interactive computer services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1526. A bill to amend the National Telecommunications and Information Administration Organization Act to establish the Office of Policy Development and Cybersecurity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BENNET, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. KELLY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 1527. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to ensure that members of the Armed Forces and their families have access to the contraception they need in order to promote the health and readiness of all members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1528. A bill to streamline the sharing of information among Federal disaster assistance agencies, to expedite the delivery of life-saving assistance to disaster survivors, to speed the recovery of communities from disasters, to protect the security and privacy of information provided by disaster survivors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1529. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide for greater protection of roosters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1530. A bill to permit COPS grants to be used for the purpose of increasing the compensation and hiring of law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HASSAN, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1531. A bill to designate certain National Forest System land and certain public land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture in the States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming as wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, wildland recovery areas, and biological connecting corridors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAGERTY, and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 1532. A bill to suspend the entry of covered aliens in response to the fentanyl public health crisis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1533. A bill to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to authorize grants to assist in redeveloping abandoned shopping centers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 1534. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make adjustments to payment rates for

skilled nursing facilities under the Medicare program to account for certain unique circumstances; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 1535. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to promulgate regulations to allow the transport of firefighters on board a covered aircraft operated on a mission to suppress a wildfire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 1536. A bill to ensure that all federally recognized Indian Tribes that are eligible for gaming in the United States are regulated under the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 1537. A bill to require the imposition of additional duties with respect to articles imported from the People's Republic of China until trade between the United States and the People's Republic of China comes into balance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HEINRICH:

S. 1538. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants for outdoor learning spaces and to develop living schoolyards; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1539. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act and the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to make the native sod provisions applicable to the United States and to modify those provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1540. A bill to amend the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to provide for circumstances under which reinitiation of consultation is not required under a land and resource management plan or land use plan under those Acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. KING, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 1541. A bill to provide for a system to classify information in the interests of national security and a system to declassify such information, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. TESTER, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. KAINE, and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 1542. A bill to improve services provided by pharmacy benefit managers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARSHALL:

S. 1543. A bill to require regulations concerning the disclosure of direct and indirect compensation from entities providing pharmacy benefit management services or third party administration services; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1544. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equitable payment for, and preserve Medicare beneficiary access to, diagnostic radiopharmaceuticals under the Medicare hospital outpatient prospective payment system; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. TUBERVILLE):

S. 1545. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to improve the ability of veterans to access medical care in medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs and in the community by providing veterans the ability to choose health care providers; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 1546. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out educational programs that include the history of peoples of Asian, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander descent in the settling and founding of America, the social, economic, and political environments that led to the development of discriminatory laws targeting Asians, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders and their relation to current events, and the impact and contributions of Asian Americans, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders to the development and enhancement of American life, United States history, literature, the economy, politics, body of laws, and culture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. COONS, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1547. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Ms. SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. HEINRICH, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1548. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to encourage deployment of electric school buses and vehicle-to-grid technologies and applications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1549. A bill to provide the Congressional Budget Office with necessary authorities to expedite the sharing of data from executive branch agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 205. A resolution supporting the designation of May 10, 2023, as "National Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Mental Health Day"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. Res. 206. A resolution designating June 10, 2023, as "Veterans Get Outside Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 22

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island

(Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 22, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of California, Oregon, and Washington.

S. 106

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 106, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to States to improve outreach to veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 178

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 178, a bill to establish protections for passengers in air transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 265

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 265, a bill to reauthorize the rural emergency medical service training and equipment assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 566

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 566, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify and extend the deduction for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions.

S. 576

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 576, a bill to enhance safety requirements for trains transporting hazardous materials, and for other purposes.

S. 656

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 656, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the rules for approval by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of commercial driver education programs for purposes of veterans education assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 668

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) 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.

S. 789

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 789, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint a coin in recognition of the 100th anniversary of the United States Foreign Service and its contribution to United States diplomacy.

S. 791

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 791, a bill to increase access to agency guidance documents.

S. 821

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 821, a bill to establish an Ambassador-at-Large for the Arctic Region.

S. 866

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 866, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance tax benefits for research activities.

S. 977

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor 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.

S. 985

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 985, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure campus access at public institutions of higher education for religious groups.

S. 1111

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1111, a bill to enhance United States civil nuclear leadership, support the licensing of advanced nuclear technologies, strengthen the domestic nuclear energy fuel cycle and supply chain, and improve the regulation of nuclear energy, and for other purposes.

S. 1146

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1146, a bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to identify obstacles to identifying and responding to re-

ports of children missing from foster care and other vulnerable foster youth, to provide technical assistance relating to the removal of such obstacles, and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1170, a bill to reauthorize and update the Project Safe Childhood program, and for other purposes.

S. 1176

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor 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.

S. 1181

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1181, a bill to amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to improve financial stability, and for other purposes.

S. 1192

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1192, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide the Secretary of Health and Human Services with the authority to suspend the right to introduce certain persons or property into the United States in the interest of the public health.

S. 1207

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1207, a bill to establish a National Commission on Online Child Sexual Exploitation Prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 1264

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1264, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to strengthen the drug pricing reforms in the Inflation Reduction Act.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1271, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to trafficking of illicit fentanyl and its precursors by transnational criminal organizations, including cartels, and for other purposes.

S. 1273

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1273, a bill to require a study on Holocaust education efforts of States, local educational agencies, and public elementary and secondary schools, and for other purposes.

S. 1274

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1274, a bill to permanently exempt payments made from the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account from sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

S. 1284

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1284, a bill to improve forecasting and understanding of tornadoes and other hazardous weather, and for other purposes.

S. 1310

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1310, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 1334

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1334, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense to develop, in cooperation with allies and partners in the Middle East, an integrated maritime domain awareness and interdiction capability, and for other purposes.

S. 1351

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) and the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1351, a bill to study and prevent child abuse in youth residential programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1371

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1371, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to require that consumer reporting agencies and other credit reporting companies provide certain protections to small businesses, and for other purposes.

S. 1372

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1372, a bill to prohibit certain business concerns from receiving assistance from the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 1384

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1384, a bill to promote and

protect from discrimination living organ donors.

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) were added as cosponsors of S. 1384, supra.

S. 1435

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of 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 and landscape health.

S. 1446

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1446, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude certain Nurse Corps payments from gross income.

S. 1473

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1473, a bill to authorize the immediate expulsion of inadmissible aliens attempting to enter the United States by fraud or without a necessary entry document, and for other purposes.

S. 1483

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1483, a bill to prohibit the purchase of certain telecommunications or aerospace goods or service from entities affiliated with the People's Republic of China or the Russian Federation and to require reporting relating to investment by foreign persons in the aerospace industry in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 91

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 91, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on the value of a tax agreement with Taiwan.

S. RES. 134

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 134, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of the Rise Up for LGBTQI+ Youth in Schools Initiative, a call to action to communities across the country to demand equal educational opportunity, basic civil rights protections, and freedom from erasure for all students, particularly LGBTQI+ young people, in K-12 schools.

S. RES. 201

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 201, a resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Nurses Week, to be observed from May 6 through May 12, 2023.

S. RES. 203

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the names of the Senator from Colorado

(Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 203, a resolution recognizing the significance of Jewish American Heritage Month as a time to celebrate the contributions of Jewish Americans to the society and culture of the United States.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 1508. A bill to amend the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act to add Rhode Island to the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. REED. Madam President, today I am introducing the Rhode Island Fishermen's Fairness Act along with my colleague Senator WHITEHOUSE. I am also pleased that my colleague Representative MAGAZINER will be introducing a companion measure in the House of Representatives.

Our legislation will give Rhode Island a voice and voting representation on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council, MAFMC, which manages some of the most important fish stocks for our State's commercial fishing industry—chief among them squid. Indeed, the National Marine Fisheries Service reported that Rhode Island led Atlantic States in the harvest of squid in 2022, bringing in 31.5 million pounds and helping make Point Judith, RI, one of the most productive and valuable commercial fishing ports in the United States. For years now, Rhode Island's landings of stocks managed by the MAFMC have outpaced the landings of those managed by the New England Fishery Management Council, where Rhode Island is represented. Moreover, Rhode Island has a larger stake in the Mid-Atlantic fishery than many of the States that currently hold seats on the MAFMC.

Because so much is at stake for our State in every decision the MAFMC makes, our bill would expand the MAFMC by two seats in order to ensure that Rhode Island will have the minimum number of seats guaranteed to other States on the council. It will allow Rhode Island to continue to have representation on the New England Fishery Management Council, where it still has significant interests.

This proposal is not unprecedented. In fact, it is modeled on a provision of the 1996 Sustainable Fisheries Act that added North Carolina to the MAFMC in 1996 while allowing it to retain its membership on the South Atlantic Fishery Management Council. Moreover, it will join States like Florida

and Washington which all have representation on more than one fisheries management council.

This is a commonsense proposal and one that my colleagues and I will be working to advance either on its own or as part of the reauthorization of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1523. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow rehabilitation expenditures for public school buildings to qualify for rehabilitation credit; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, today I want to discuss legislation I am introducing, the School Infrastructure Modernization Act, with my colleague Senator WARNER.

To claim the Federal tax credit for historic preservation, a building renovation must be for a different purpose than that for which the building was previously used, a requirement known as the prior use rule. This bill waives that requirement for renovations of K-12 public school buildings. This will make it easier to restore historic-but-dilapidated school buildings across the country so our children have safe, modern spaces in which to learn.

As a Richmond City Council member and later mayor, I faced challenges familiar to many municipalities—overcrowded schools, aging buildings, and limited dollars in the budget. But in one particular case, I and a group of local stakeholders identified a creative solution. On one hand, we had an overcrowded Thomas Jefferson High School with in-zone and magnet students. On the other hand, we had a closed Maggie Walker High School that needed renovations. We put together a financing package that made use of Federal and State historic tax credits to renovate Maggie Walker High School and satisfied the prior use rule by consolidating the magnet program from Thomas Jefferson into a new Maggie Walker Governor's School for Government and International Studies. Today, some 30 years later, this is one of America's highest performing public high schools. Without the Federal historic tax credit, this would have been too expensive to make happen.

This bill will make it easier to do similar projects around the country. More modern school buildings will bolster the quality of public education, and carrying out these projects will generate private sector infrastructure investment and jobs. In Virginia alone, according to a 2021 study, more than 1,000 K-12 schools are at least 50 years old, representing more than half of all the K-12 schools in the Commonwealth.

I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense incentive that is good for education, good for infrastructure, and good for jobs.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 1539. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act and the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to make the native sod provisions applicable to the United States and to modify those provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. THUNE. 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. 1539

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 “American Prairie Conservation Act”.

SEC. 2. CROP PRODUCTION ON NATIVE SOD.

(a) FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE.—Section 508(o) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act (7 U.S.C. 1508(o)) is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) NATIVE SOD CONVERSION CERTIFICATION.—

“(A) CERTIFICATION.—As a condition on the receipt of benefits under this subtitle, a producer that has tilled native sod acreage for the production of an insurable crop as described in paragraph (2)(A) shall certify to the Secretary that acreage using—

“(i) an acreage report form of the Farm Service Agency (FSA-578 or any successor form); and

“(ii) 1 or more maps.

“(B) CORRECTIONS.—Beginning on the date on which a producer submits a certification under subparagraph (A), as soon as practicable after the producer discovers a change in tilled native sod acreage described in that subparagraph, the producer shall submit to the Secretary any appropriate corrections to a form or map described in clause (i) or (ii) of that subparagraph.

“(C) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than January 1, 2024, and each January 1 thereafter through January 1, 2028, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the tilled native sod acreage that has been certified under subparagraph (A) in each county and State as of the date of submission of the report.”.

(b) NONINSURED CROP DISASTER ASSISTANCE.—Section 196(a)(4) of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7333(a)(4)) is amended by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

“(C) NATIVE SOD CONVERSION CERTIFICATION.—

“(i) CERTIFICATION.—As a condition on the receipt of benefits under this section, a producer that has tilled native sod acreage for the production of an insurable crop as described in subparagraph (B)(i) shall certify to the Secretary that acreage using—

“(I) an acreage report form of the Farm Service Agency (FSA-578 or any successor form); and

“(II) 1 or more maps.

“(ii) CORRECTIONS.—Beginning on the date on which a producer submits a certification under clause (i), as soon as practicable after the producer discovers a change in tilled native sod acreage described in that clause, the producer shall submit to the Secretary any appropriate corrections to a form or map described in subclause (I) or (II) of that clause.

“(iii) ANNUAL REPORTS.—Not later than January 1, 2024, and each January 1 there-

after through January 1, 2028, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes the tilled native sod acreage that has been certified under clause (i) in each county and State as of the date of submission of the report.”.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. COONS, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1547. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to introduce the Reach Every Mother and Child Act of 2023, known as the Reach Act. This bipartisan legislation would strengthen the United States' efforts to end preventable deaths of mothers, newborns, and young children in developing countries by 2030. I want to thank Senator COONS for his partnership on this important bill, and I also appreciate the cosponsorship of Senator DURBIN and Senator WICKER.

Senator COONS and I have led efforts to ensure robust funding for the U.S. Agency for International Development's maternal and child health programming. These programs have been the backbone of the United States' commitment to helping to end preventable child and maternal deaths globally.

Due in part to American leadership and generosity, many lives have already been saved. While progress has been made in reducing maternal mortality rates, recent data suggest that these improvements are slowing. Far too many mothers, newborns, and young children under the age 5 continue to succumb to disease and malnutrition that could easily be prevented.

Nearly 300,000 women die annually from causes related to pregnancy and childbirth, with 99 percent of maternal deaths occurring in developing nations. In addition, a significant proportion of the deaths of children under the age of 5 occur in the first 28 days after birth, with newborns accounting for nearly 50 percent of all under 5 deaths. In 2021, 5 million children under the age of 5 died from mainly preventable and treatable diseases.

The Reach Act aims to help these mothers and children with simple, proven, costeffective interventions that we know will help them survive. A concentrated effort could end preventable maternal and child deaths worldwide by the year 2030, but continued U.S. leadership and support from the international community are critical to achieve this goal.

To advance this cause, our bill would require the implementation of a strategy focused on bringing to scale the highest impact, evidence-based interventions, with a focus on country and

community ownership. These interventions would be specific to each country's needs and include support for the most vulnerable populations. We do not have to guess what interventions will work—the reality is that thousands of children die each day of conditions we know how to treat.

These lifesaving interventions include clean birthing practices, vaccines, nutritional supplements, handwashing with soap, and other basic needs that remain elusive for far too many women and children in developing countries. This must change.

Our bill would require the establishment of a Maternal and Child Survival Coordinator at USAID who would focus on implementing the 5-year strategy and verifying that the most effective interventions are being scaled up in key countries. The Coordinator would identify and promote the most effective interventions to end preventable maternal and child deaths globally, which would improve the efficiency of the programs operating across several Agencies.

To promote transparency and greater accountability, our bill would also require detailed public reporting on progress toward implementing the strategy.

The Appropriations Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations recently heard testimony from USAID Administrator Samantha Power. During that hearing, asked Administrator Power about the Reach Act and emphasized the critical reforms needed to increase the success and impact of USAID's maternal and child survival programs.

Administrator Power testified to sharing the goals that motivate this important legislation.

She agreed about the importance of resourcing key U.S. investments, scaling them up, and getting them to mothers and children living in remote areas.

Other bipartisan initiatives, such as the successful President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, or PEPFAR, which was started by President George W. Bush, demonstrate that results-driven interventions can turn the tide for global health challenges. Applying lessons learned from past initiatives, our bill would provide the focus and tools necessary to accelerate progress toward ending preventable maternal and child deaths.

I urge my colleagues to join Senator COONS, Senator DURBIN, Senator WICKER, and me in supporting this legislation that will save the lives of mothers and children around the world.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 205—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 10, 2023, AS “NATIONAL ASIAN AMERICAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND PACIFIC ISLANDER MENTAL HEALTH DAY”

Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. CORTEZ

MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 205

Whereas the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander (referred to in this preamble as “AANHPI”) community is among the fastest growing population groups in the United States and has made significant economic, cultural, and social contributions;

Whereas the AANHPI community is extremely diverse in terms of socioeconomic levels, education, employment, languages, cultures of origin, acculturation, migrant status, and colonization status;

Whereas, in 2021, 77 percent of the estimated 2,600,000 AANHPI individuals who meet criteria for a mental health problem did not receive treatment;

Whereas, in 2021, only 24.5 percent of Asian adults with a mental health problem received mental health services in the past year, and Asian adults have the lowest rates of utilization of mental health services out of any racial population;

Whereas, from 2018 to 2020, AANHPI youth 10 to 24 years of age were the only racial or ethnic population in this age category whose leading cause of death was suicide;

Whereas it is imperative to disaggregate AANHPI population data to get an accurate representation of the depth and breadth of the mental health issues for each subpopulation so that specific culturally and linguistically appropriate solutions can be developed;

Whereas language access continues to be a critical issue for AANHPI individuals seeking mental health services, whether due to the limited number of providers with the necessary language skills to provide in-language services or the significant language loss faced by Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander communities due to colonization;

Whereas there is a need to significantly increase the number of providers, including paraprofessionals, representing AANHPI communities and providing them with the necessary training and ongoing support;

Whereas historical discrimination and current racial violence toward AANHPI individuals increases trauma and stress, underlying precursors to mental health problems;

Whereas there is a critical need to raise awareness about and improve mental health literacy among the AANHPI community to reduce the stigma associated with mental health issues; and

Whereas May is both National Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month, an opportunity to celebrate the vast contributions of this population to the United States, and National Mental Health Awareness Month, recognizing the importance of mental health to the well-being and health of AANHPI families and communities and connecting the importance of one's cultural heritage to good mental health: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 10, 2023, as “National Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Mental Health Day”;

(2) recognizes the importance of mental health to the well-being and health of families and communities;

(3) acknowledges the importance of raising awareness about mental health and improving the quality of care for Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander communities;

(4) recognizes that celebrating cultural and linguistic heritage is beneficial to mental health; and

(5) encourages Federal, State, and local health agencies to adopt laws, policies, and guidance to improve help-seeking rates for mental health services for the Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander community and other communities of color.

SENATE RESOLUTION 206—DESIGNATING JUNE 10, 2023, AS “VETERANS GET OUTSIDE DAY”

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. KING, and Mr. CRAMER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 206

Whereas, between 2000 and 2022, the Department of Defense found that more than 460,000 members of the Armed Forces were diagnosed with traumatic brain injuries;

Whereas studies have found that, after decades of combat in Afghanistan and Iraq, 20 percent of veterans of the Armed Forces are suffering from post-traumatic stress and depression;

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs found that veterans suffer a disproportionately higher rate of suicide compared to nonveterans, and post-traumatic stress, traumatic brain injury, depression, and anxiety are root causes of the suicide epidemic in the veteran community, with an estimated 16.8 suicides per day in 2020;

Whereas the Department of Veterans Affairs has been successful in reducing the number of veterans' suicides, but there are still gaps in mental health care for veterans, and the United States needs to use every treatment available to support the veteran community;

Whereas studies have shown that exposure to nature and the outdoors have a positive therapeutic impact on mental health, including by resulting in lower risks of depression and improved focus and attention, and even a single day outside can improve an individual's overall mood and lessen feelings of isolation;

Whereas studies have found that individuals with increased access to green space have a lower suicide risk;

Whereas the Forest Service sponsors a National Get Outdoors Day to promote the health benefits of outdoor recreational activities;

Whereas the United States has recognized the need to connect veterans with nature by providing free admission to national parks and forests; and

Whereas a targeted outreach effort, such as Veterans Get Outside Day, to veterans living with post-traumatic stress, traumatic brain injury, depression, and anxiety may lead to further participation in outside events and improved mental health outcomes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 10, 2023, as “Veterans Get Outside Day”; and

(2) encourages the Department of Veterans Affairs, the Forest Service, and the Department of the Interior to coordinate and cooperate in promoting “Veterans Get Outside Day” along with National Get Outdoors Day.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I have 10 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to Rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

The Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 10, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 10, 2023, at 9:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 10, 2023, at 10 a.m.

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 10, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 10, 2023, at 9:45 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 10, 2023, at 1 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 10, 2023, at 2:45 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 10, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 10, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 10, 2023, at 8:30 a.m.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 107-12, the appointment of the following individual to serve as a member of the Public Safety Officer Medal of Valor Review Board: Sheriff Errol Toulon of New York vice Joseph Fox of New York.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF COUNTERING INTERNATIONAL PARENTAL CHILD ABDUCTION MONTH

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 56, S. Res. 115.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (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.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 115) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of March 16, 2023, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, MAY 11, 2023

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thurs-

day, May 11; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of Calendar No. 61, S.J. Res. 23, Calendar No. 62, S.J. Res. 24; that notwithstanding Rule XXII at 11 a.m., the joint resolutions be considered read a third time en bloc and the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolutions in the order listed; further, upon disposition of the joint resolutions, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Garcia nomination and then immediately recess subject to the call of the Chair; that when the Senate reconvenes, there will be 2 minutes for debate, equally divided, prior to a vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination.

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

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, for the information of the Senate, there will be two rollcall votes at 11 a.m. and one vote at approximately 1:45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:03 p.m., stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 10, 2023:

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

GLENN LAUREN WRIGHT-GALLO, OF NEVADA, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

GEETA RAO GUPTA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AMBASSADOR AT LARGE FOR GLOBAL WOMEN'S ISSUES.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

L. FELICE GORORDO, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS.

NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION

COLLEEN JOY SHOGAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE ARCHIVIST OF THE UNITED STATES.