



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 17, 2022

No. 48

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our shelter from the storms, protect the Ukrainian people as they trust You for safety.

Lord, all the good we will ever have comes from You. You have been faithful to Your people for millennia. Do not disappoint us now in this season of desperation. We see no other God but You, as this conflict continues to maim, kill, and destroy.

Lord, provide our lawmakers with the wisdom to cooperate with Your divine omnipotence in accomplishing Your purposes on Earth. May generations not yet born be told that You saved your people.

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 (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 17, 2022.

To the Senate:

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

appoint the Honorable JACKY ROSEN, a Senator from the State of Nevada, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. ROSEN 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 and resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, first, I see that you and many on the podium are decked in green. Happy St. Patrick's Day to all of you and to all of America.

NOMINATIONS

Madam President, now, yesterday, the Senate moved forward on a dozen judicial and administrative nominees,

many of them with solid bipartisan support.

Today, we will hold three more floor votes: two to confirm a pair of district judges and one to move on the nomination of Judge Ali Nathan for the Second Circuit.

When I met Judge Nathan 10 years ago, I thought, "Here is someone truly special and truly brilliant," and, a decade later, I still hold that view.

Ask her colleagues on the bench or ask her colleagues from private practice or even the likes of President Obama, and they will all say the same thing: Judge Nathan is a first-rate jurist and a consensus builder by nature.

I am pleased the Senate is acting on this well-deserving judge today, setting up a final confirmation vote next week.

NOMINATION OF JUDGE KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Madam President, speaking of nominations today, today is the last day the Senate will meet before we begin a truly historic series of hearings next Monday, starting at 11 a.m. The Senate Judiciary Committee will begin hearings for Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson's nomination to the U.S. Supreme Court.

These televised judiciary hearings will give millions of Americans a chance to hear from the judge directly for the first time since her nomination. These hearings matter. Americans deserve to hear for themselves from Judge Jackson, whose decisions will echo across American law for a long, long time.

Of course, the historic nature of this nominee must not be minimized. Of the 115 Justices who have sat on the Court, only 5—only 5—have been women; only 2—2—have been African Americans, Justices Thurgood Marshall and Clarence Thomas; only 1 has been Hispanic, Justice Sonia Sotomayor from the Bronx.

But, to date, never has an African-American woman come before the Judiciary Committee for consideration to the highest Court. Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson will be the very first.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S1229

And the public will also see that her credentials, her vast experience in both public and private practice, and her near 9 years on the Federal bench make her stupendously qualified to bear the title “Justice.”

I thank Chairman DURBIN and the members of the Judiciary Committee for their work orchestrating what has been a fair and quick nomination process, and all of us look forward to next week’s hearings.

OIL

Madam President, now, on oil, I want to return to a worrying trend. Over the past few days, the price of crude has actually gone down, but the average price of a gallon is still stuck at nearly \$4.30. If anyone thinks this is fair, efficient, or sensible, they are probably an oil executive. No matter what, the divergence between the price of crude and the price of a gallon is causing immense—immense—damage to American families at a time when they are all struggling to make ends meet.

Meanwhile, it is nothing short of repugnant for oil companies to be touting what are truly dizzying profit margins while soaking American families with these exorbitant prices. Last year, the top 25 oil and gas companies reported a combined \$205 billion in profits. And what have they done with this avalanche of cash? Invest in new technologies? Nope. Give Americans a break at the pump? Nope.

They have been using their profits to reward shareholders by implementing stock buybacks. Listen to this. According to a recent Bloomberg report, in the fourth quarter of last year, oil and gas companies increased stock buybacks by over 2,000 percent from the previous year—2,000 percent—and none of it to produce more energy or invest in new technologies; just a massive windfall for shareholders. And their increase in stock buyback over the previous year is more than any other industry by quite a large margin.

The Senate, I am glad to say, is soon going to call executives from oil and gas companies to come testify and explain why they see fit to reward shareholders instead of finding ways to give Americans a break at the pump.

RUSSIA

Madam President, finally, on PNTR, on a final note, the House today is expected to vote on legislation revoking permanent normal trade relations with Russia.

For weeks, Members of the Senate, the House, and the White House have been working together to draft a strong and effective bill that will increase the pain on Putin’s Russia and that our European allies will accept. To date, both parties, Democratic and Republican, remain united in sending Putin a clear message. His inhumane violence against the Ukrainian people will come at a crippling price.

And today’s step by the House is another way we are making that come true. When the House passes this bill, I expect it will have broad bipartisan

support here in the Senate, and I will work with my colleagues to find a way to move it through this Chamber quickly.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, next week, the Judiciary Committee will hear firsthand from President Biden’s Supreme Court nominee Judge Jackson. It will be a serious and dignified process. The American people need answers to more important questions than what somebody wrote in the nominee’s high school yearbook.

The Senate needs to examine Judge Jackson’s qualifications, and we need to examine her judicial philosophy and see if she will apply laws as written and weigh cases without favoritism. And we need to explore why the farthest left activists in the country desperately wanted Judge Jackson, in particular, for this vacancy.

Judicial philosophy is a key qualification for the Supreme Court. There are plenty of smart lawyers in the country, but they don’t all understand that a judge’s proper role is to apply the text of the laws neutrally. Some would rather start with liberal outcomes and reason backward.

So it is unsettling that senior Democrats have lauded Judge Jackson for the “empathy” they suggest shapes her judicial approach. So if you are the litigant for whom the judge has special preexisting empathy, well, it is your lucky day; but the other party is being denied their fair day in court.

The Senate Democratic leader, the House majority whip, and multiple legal academics all say Judge Jackson will rule with “empathy.” Helpfully, one professor clarified which kinds of litigants would benefit from her empathy. He proposed that because of Judge Jackson’s “ample criminal defense experience,” she would “bring a measure of empathy to the criminal defense cases, the Fourth and Fifth Amendment cases.”

So liberals are saying that Judge Jackson’s service as a criminal defense lawyer and then on the U.S. Sentencing Commission give her special empathy for convicted criminals. Her supporters look at her resume and deduce a special empathy for criminals. I guess that means that government prosecutors and innocent crime victims start each trial at a disadvantage.

That isn’t my assertion. That is what the nominee’s liberal supporters are all saying. In fact, the nominee has all but

said it herself. Here is what the Washington Post reported last year when Judge Jackson was nominated to the DC Circuit:

She and her allies credit her work as a public defender as helping her develop empathy.

And here they quote the nominee herself:

There is a direct line from my defender service to what I do on the bench, and I think it’s beneficial.

So, look, nobody is saying that public defenders ought to be disqualified from judicial service. It is an important role. But as the New York Times reported this week, the Biden administration is on an intentional quest to stuff the Federal judiciary full of this one perspective. Even amid a national crime wave, a disproportionate share of the new judges President Biden has nominated share this professional background that liberals say gives judges special empathy for criminal defendants.

Here is the New York Times:

It is a sea change in the world of judicial nominations. . . . The type of high-profile murder cases handled by some of Mr. Biden’s nominees would have been considered disqualifying only a few years ago; now the president . . . is actively seeking to name more jurists who have such experience.

It is not just Judge Jackson.

At least 20 other lawyers with significant public defender experience have been nominated by the Biden administration.

One soft-on-crime advocate marveled to the reporter:

We have never seen anything like this.

Such enthusiasm.

President Biden is deliberately working to make the whole Federal judiciary softer on crime. Even liberals admitted as much. They actually applaud it. But with murders and carjackings skyrocketing nationwide, I doubt the American people feel the same way.

I look forward to learning more about how Judge Jackson believes her service as a criminal defense attorney leads her to interpret the text of our laws and our Constitution differently than other judges. If any judicial nominee really does have special empathy for some parties over others, that is not an asset; it is a problem.

ENERGY

Madam President, on another matter, as Democratic policies have unleashed runaway inflation, families have felt particular pain at the gas pump.

Since President Biden took office, gas prices have climbed nearly \$2–\$2. The Biden administration wants to claim that a full year’s worth of price hikes were all caused by a war Putin started 3 weeks ago. But this fictional version of events doesn’t fool anyone.

Two years ago, then-candidate Biden told everyone he was ready to wage war on the most reliable forms of American energy:

No ability for the oil industry to continue to drill, period. [It] ends.

That is President Biden.

I guarantee you . . . We're going to end fossil fuel.

In other words, either the Biden administration has a shaky understanding of supply and demand or soaring energy prices have been baked into their agenda right from the beginning.

For 14 months now, energy policy has followed a disturbing pattern. First, the Biden administration rolls out a direct attack on American energy, then working families feel the pinch, and then Democrats try to deflect the blame. Take the Keystone XL Pipeline. President Biden made canceling it a day one priority. Then, as gasoline, diesel, and other energy prices climbed, the White House justified itself by saying the project would have taken years to affect prices anyway.

The problem is, back during the Obama administration, their own analysis suggested the project would be fully operational by 2013. They spent a decade fighting against a pipeline that would have taken a couple of years to come online by complaining it was not immediate enough.

That was their argument a decade ago, and it is their argument now. The pipeline could have been built multiple times over in the time the Democrats spent resisting it. Besides, if slow construction were really the problem, the administration would be rushing to rein in their own regulatory army that is handcuffing other new and existing pipelines with mountains of extra bureaucracy.

Just weeks ago, while Putin was already amassing forces and trying to make energy hostages out of Western Europe, the Biden administration's Federal Energy Regulatory Commission went out of its way to make permitting new American natural gas pipelines radically more difficult.

Here is yet another example. Last year, the Biden administration directed the SEC to prioritize discouraging loans, capital, and financing for fossil fuel energy projects. But now that a worldwide scramble has sent prices sky-high, the administration blames the industry and says it is "time for oil and gas companies to work with Wall Street to unleash our productive capacity." The administration that campaigned on ending fossil fuels now claims the fossil fuel companies are just layabouts who don't want to drill. It is enough to make your head spin.

Oh, and President Biden rushed to lash America back to the mast of a climate deal that actually gave China a pass to keep increasing their emissions. As Germany prepared to give Putin an even tighter hold on Europe's market for natural gas with the Nord Stream 2 pipeline, President Biden fought bipartisan efforts to stop the pipeline.

His response to soaring prices hurting families last year was to go hat in hand and beg OPEC and Russia to produce more. And now that Russia has invaded Ukraine, the Biden administra-

tion is reportedly exploring more imports—listen to this—from Venezuela and Iran, totalitarian regimes with contempt for human rights and the environment.

So it turns out the Biden administration doesn't mind fossil fuel production after all. They just don't want to "Buy American." The administration will buy oil from the Supreme Leader of Iran; they will buy oil from Maduro. If North Korea had oil, they would probably try to buy that, too. Anything—anything—to avoid keeping those jobs and that energy independence right here in the USA.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Virginia.

MONACAN INDIAN NATION

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I rise today to speak about a really important victory in Virginia yesterday—a victory for the Monacan Indian Nation, and it is a victory that I have had a hand in over the course of many years. I want to describe it and celebrate it.

When the English came to Virginia first in 1607, there were thriving Virginia Native populations. The populations east—in eastern Virginia, east of Richmond—were part of a larger confederacy called the Powhatan Confederacy, and they spoke an Algonquian-based language. There were Tribes in the southern part of Virginia that spoke an Iroquois-based language, and Tribes in the western part of Virginia spoke a Sioux-based language. One of these Tribes was the Monacan Tribe.

John Smith, in 1607, 1608, and 1609, traveled all around the Chesapeake Bay and its tributaries and did some very detailed mapmaking of the area, including a town that he called the chief Monacan town named Rassawek. Rassawek is on a point of land in what is now Fluvanna County, VA, where the Rivanna River and the James River combine.

Rassawek was the headquarters, or the chief administrative town, of the Monacan Tribal Nation. The story of the Virginia Tribes is one of triumph, but also one of tragedy. Many of the Tribes made peace treaties with the English in the 1670s. All of these Tribes were discriminated against, and some were driven far from their homes.

The Monacan Tribe was driven by the English settlers from Rassawek, further west into Amherst County, and then many of them were driven even further west into the middle west end and other places. But Rassawek maintained its sacred status to the Monacan Nation for many reasons, including the fact that so many of Monacan families were buried there and their remains are still there.

An aspect of the tragedy of the Virginia Tribes is that: When I was elected to be a Senator in 2012, none of the Virginia Tribes had ever been recognized, even though many still live intact in communities in Virginia. There were over 500 Tribes that had been federally recognized. The Virginia Tribes are

part of exhibits at the Smithsonian Museum at the foot of Capitol Hill; and yet they had never been recognized. And they had never been recognized for three reasons.

One, they made peace treaties with the English rather than with the United States. Often, recognition begins with the treaty entered into with the United States. Second, often, recognition is determined by extensive submission of land records and other records. Many Virginia courthouses were burned during the Civil War, and so records establishing Tribal lands, for example, were destroyed.

But, finally, and most cruelly, Virginia had an official named Walter Plecker who served as the State's director of the Department of Vital Statistics from 1920 until the 1960s. And he was a eugenicist. He believed there was no such thing as Indians, that they were all color. And, systemically, he determined to take every record he could find of Tribal communities in Virginia and change the racial designation of those records—birth certificates, marriage licenses, death notices—of Indian members to "color," even to the point of disinterring Indians who had been buried in cemeteries that were primarily cemeteries for Caucasians. This made it, again, very difficult for these Tribes. They refer to this as the "paper genocide" for them to assert their claim for Tribal recognition.

I started working with the Monacan and six other Tribes when I was mayor of Richmond on this issue because I became friends with a guy named Steve Adkins, who is the chief of one of these Tribes, the Chickahominy Tribe.

We worked over the course of many, many years—these Tribes coming to Congress and asking for Federal recognition. And when I came into office in January of 2013, this was very, very high on my to-do list, to finally right this historic wrong and correct an injustice and allow these Virginia Tribes—whose stories are so well known and still live in these communities—to finally be recognized.

Now, we have gotten seven Tribes recognized—one through the Bureau of Indian Affairs process, the Pamunkey Tribe, and six through an act of Congress. I thank the Presiding Officer because all of my colleagues joined together at the end of 2018 and, in a unanimous vote, finally did justice by the Virginia Tribes, including the Monacan Tribe.

Now onto Rassawek. The Monacans were driven further west and now have their, sort of, Tribal headquarters in a place called Bear Mountain in Amherst County. The chief of the Tribe is a man named Ken Branham. Ken is a good friend.

In 2014, a local authority, the James River Water Authority in Fluvanna County, decided that strategic location at the merger of two rivers would be a perfect place to build big water treatment intake and treatment facility. It

is a growing community. There are more water needs in the community. The facility was needed, but the site they chose for the construction of the facility was Rassawek.

The authority proceeded forward to purchase the land and then undertake engineering studies to build this water treatment facility. At the time, 2014, the Monacans had not yet been federally recognized. They could complain, and they could argue, but they didn't have the clout that Federal recognition would eventually give them. Yet many people rallied to the Monacans' cause and said, "Look, we preserve other sites all the time."

Virginia is first in the Nation in preserving, for example, Civil War battlefield sites, and we preserved the ancestral home of the Powhatan of Werowocomoco on the York River, which is soon to be a national park. Should we allow Rassawek to be essentially destroyed and the remains of Monacans buried there for generations to be disturbed?

Armed with Federal recognition, the Monacans attracted even more support. The National Trust for Historic Preservation, in 2020, named Rassawek as one of the most 11 endangered sites in the country. A huge grassroots effort developed because of the hard work of the Tribe that assembled thousands and thousands of supporting individuals—some very nearby Rassawek, but some very far away—to advocate that there has to be a better solution for this water treatment need in Fluvanna County than to disturb and destroy Rassawek.

Yesterday, the James River Water Authority, in a unanimous vote, decided to set aside their plan to do the water intake facility in Rassawek and to donate the land that they have purchased for that facility to the Monacan Tribe. The Monacan Nation, in gratitude, pledges to work together with the James River Water Authority to find a more acceptable site. A number of alternatives have already been identified.

This summer, I was canoeing on the James River. I canoed the entire James River from where it starts, the Allegheny Mountains, to Fort Monroe in Chesapeake Bay—350 miles. It took me 26 days that I spread over the spring, summer, and fall. One day in August, I was canoeing from a town called New Kent to Columbia, passing Rassawek, which was on river left as I went downstream.

So I reached out to Chief Branham, knowing that the fight about the future of Rassawek was underway. I said: Could you and Tribal leaders meet me? I will pull my canoe onshore when I pass by. Meet me and talk to me about the status of this fight and why it is so important to the Monacan Nation to win.

So coming down the river with a friend, my former State director who used to work on this Tribal recognition issue, John Knapp—I want to thank

him, as well as other staffers, Evan and Nick and Tyee and Mary and other staffers in my office, who worked on this. John and I pulled our canoe over on the shore in this beautiful spot in rural Virginia where the two rivers come together. We beached the canoe on a sand point, climbed a bluff, and met Chief Branham and other members of Monacan leadership to see the beauty of the site and to share a meal but also to talk to them about the importance of Rassawek and why they really, really needed to win this battle. They don't have a plan to develop Rassawek. They are not going to build anything there. They just want it to be preserved in its natural beauty out of respect for Monacan people who have lived there for nearly 5,000 years. Yesterday, this unanimous vote by the local water authority—a vote of respect, a vote of acknowledgment—recognized that this is a sacred site.

We in Virginia, we love our history. We love our history, and we don't want to lose it. The history of the Monacan Nation, the history of all of our Tribes is worthy of battling. You don't win every battle. The Monacan Nation won a really important one yesterday, and it might not have happened. Ninety-nine of my colleagues joined with me to make sure that the Monacan Nation and the other Virginia Tribes were finally, after hundreds of years, given Federal recognition.

I just wanted to express my congratulations to the Monacan Nation and my appreciation to my colleagues for helping me do something good.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF GIGI SOHN

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, the Senate Commerce Committee recently voted on the nomination of Gigi Sohn to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission. I voted against her nomination for a number of serious reasons, as did the 13 other Republican committee members.

I was deeply disappointed that not one of my Democratic colleagues on the committee stepped forward to affirm what should be glaringly obvious: that Ms. Sohn is not an appropriate candidate for a position on the Federal Communications Commission.

One substantial concern I have with Ms. Sohn's nomination is her extreme position on net neutrality.

Back in 2014, the Obama administration decided that the Federal Government wasn't regulating the internet enough. So in 2015, the Obama Federal Communications Commission passed what was known as the Open Internet

Order—mis-labeled, I would add, but which dramatically expanded the Federal Government's power over the internet. The justification for this massive regulatory expansion was net neutrality.

Now, net neutrality is a concept that enjoys broad support in both parties. I support net neutrality and rules that prevent blocking, throttling, and the paid prioritization of internet traffic. I don't think a major service provider should be able to block a small news startup. But what the Obama FCC did in 2015 went far beyond net neutrality. The Obama FCC asserted broad, new government powers over the internet using rules that were designed for telephone monopolies back during the Great Depression. This opened the door to a whole host of internet regulations, including price regulations, and unsurprisingly, broadband investment declined as a result.

That was a problem for Americans generally, who benefit when the United States is at the forefront of internet growth and expansion, and it was particularly bad news for Americans in rural States like South Dakota. Getting broadband to rural communities is already more challenging than installing broadband in cities or suburbs, and the possibility of heavier regulations acted as a further disincentive to expanding access.

Fast-forward to 2017, and the Federal Communications Commission under Chairman Pai voted to repeal those heavyhanded regulations passed by the Obama FCC, and here is what happened: Broadband investment rebounded, and broadband access expanded. Internet speeds increased. Our Nation positioned itself at the forefront of the 5G revolution. While European internet providers were slowing internet speeds during the pandemic, American providers were increasing them. All this despite the repeal of the heavyhanded internet regulation Democrats claimed we needed—or more accurately, because of the repeal of the heavyhanded regulation Democrats claimed we needed.

Why do I go into all this history? Well, because Ms. Sohn not only wants to bring back the heavyhanded internet regulation of the Obama administration, but she wants to go further and have the FCC regulate broadband rates and set data caps.

Just as service providers are working to implement nationwide 5G networks, Ms. Sohn wants to reinstate rules that will discourage broadband investment and diminish access opportunities for Americans outside of major cities and suburban areas. That is a big problem. The light-touch approach to internet regulation that the Federal Government has historically taken has resulted in growth and access, both of which would be threatened by Ms. Sohn's agenda.

Now, while I was very pleased that the FCC under Chairman Pai repealed

President Obama's heavyhanded internet regulation, I believe the best solution for the long term is for Congress to step in and pass bipartisan net neutrality legislation. Swings in net neutrality policy from administration to administration do not encourage long-term broadband investment.

I believe there is bipartisan support for a long-term legislative solution but not, it would seem, from Ms. Sohn, who has openly disparaged bipartisan work on this issue. Now, I think Ms. Sohn would be fine if Congress produces a bill to her liking, but I have serious concerns that if she thought a bipartisan solution didn't go far enough, she would ignore the will of Congress and use her position at the FCC to impose the heavyhanded regulatory regime she favors.

As a resident of a rural State, I am also concerned about Ms. Sohn's position on expanding broadband access to rural communities—an issue every Member of this body cares deeply about. She has been publicly hostile to the efforts of rural broadband companies in expanding reliable internet access to rural areas, while at the same time supporting the use of scarce government dollars to build new internet networks in already well-served urban areas.

As someone who has worked long and hard to expand internet access for unserved Americans, I find her hostility to rural broadband companies very troubling. The vast majority of these companies have spent years building out reliable networks to some of the most remote parts of the country, allowing more rural areas, like those in South Dakota, to reap the benefits of advanced services in healthcare, education, and economic development.

It is not only Republicans who have taken note of her hostility to the needs of rural Americans. Our former Democratic colleague from North Dakota has also questioned how one could support rural broadband and Ms. Sohn.

Ms. Sohn's policy positions alone would lead me to oppose her nomination, but there are other even more troubling factors that should be leading Members of both parties to oppose her nomination.

To start with, Ms. Sohn was not forthcoming to the Commerce Committee about her past history on the board of a company that was ordered to cease operations after being found in violation of copyright laws. This raises serious concerns about her fitness to sit on the FCC.

After questions were raised about her involvement with this company's settlement with broadcasters, she did volunteer to recuse herself, if she is confirmed, on a variety of issues related to broadcasting and copyright violations. But why on Earth—why on Earth should we choose a Commissioner who would have to recuse herself from participating in substantial parts of the FCC's work? How does it serve Ameri-

cans to have an FCC Commissioner who can't fully do her job? Surely, there are other qualified nominees who don't have Ms. Sohn's conflict of interest.

But my objections don't end there. While I am concerned about Ms. Sohn having to recuse herself from doing parts of her job, I am most concerned about whether or not Ms. Sohn can do any part of her job in a fair and impartial manner.

Ms. Sohn has a history of virulent partisanship and far-left activism, including support for such far-left initiatives as defunding the police. She has publicly expressed her disdain for Republicans, and she has a record of outspoken criticism of the very same conservative media outlets that she would be responsible for regulating. Perhaps the most notable example is her hostility towards FOX News, which she has referred to as "state-sponsored propaganda" and accused of playing a role in "destroying democracy."

"Destroying democracy."

And yet we are supposed to believe that she would approach cases involving the FOX corporation impartially? I think it is pretty clear that would not be the case.

I don't expect a Democrat nominee to the FCC to agree with Republicans on all the issues—far from it. But I do expect a Democrat nominee to do his or her job and do it in an impartial and unbiased manner.

In the case of Ms. Sohn, President Biden has nominated someone who cannot fulfill part of the responsibilities of FCC Commissioner and whose record strongly suggests that she cannot be relied upon to fulfill any of her responsibilities in an impartial manner.

Americans deserve an FCC nominee who can do her job impartially, no matter what the matter before the Commission. And I hope that if Ms. Sohn's nomination comes to the floor, at least some of my Democrat colleagues will join Republicans in opposing her nomination.

We should all be able to agree that virulent partisanship and an inability to fulfill the responsibilities of one's job are disqualifying characteristics for a role on the FCC.

I yield the floor.

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

PROTECTION OF WOMEN AND GIRLS IN SPORTS
ACT OF 2021

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, today I want to talk about the real March madness that we are having this month, moments about basketball and the tournament, but I want to talk about the madness of attacking title IX, attacking women's sports, and attacking women in general.

Last night marked the beginning of the 2022 NCAA Women's Swimming and Diving Championship. Instead of celebrating the many hard-working women who earned their spot in the championship, I expect much of the media atten-

tion to be around a singular competitor—a transgender athlete who competed as a male as recently as 2019.

But the discussion should not be about inclusivity; it should be about fairness. I have spoken about this issue before and, last March, actually forced a vote on the amendment that would have prevented Federal funds from going to educational institutions that allowed biological males to compete in women's athletics.

Unfortunately, colleagues on the left were more interested in pandering to the far left than they were in protecting the ability for girls and women to participate in fair—and I repeat, fair—competition. They refused to support my amendment.

And I would argue that by allowing biological males to compete in women's athletics, Democrats have set serious efforts for women's equality back by decades. And, ultimately, this will have the effect of discouraging many, many, many young women from participating in sports.

In a recent article, two parents of a current collegiate athlete said:

I think the NCAA needs to change its policies, and find a way to include transgender women without trampling all over biological women.

I agree.

Well, the NCAA has been silent. They have failed to take decisive action in ensuring a level playing field for all of women.

And so now Congress must act to do so. This is why I joined Senator MIKE LEE and 16 fellow colleagues in introducing the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2021. This is critical legislation that would make it a violation—a violation—of title IX for a recipient of related Federal funds to permit a biological male from participating in an athletic program or activity designated for women and girls.

The bill would also establish the definition of "sex" in title IX as based "solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth."

It is imperative for Congress to act so that an entire generation of women aren't discouraged from pursuing their athletic dreams, whether on the field, whether on the court, or whether in the swimming pool.

As some of the most talented female swimmers in the country prepare to compete over the next few days, it would be wrong not to call out the inherent unfairness in allowing a biological male to participate in several women's events.

Penn's transgender athlete will compete in the women's 100-, 200-, and 500-yard freestyle events. Just a few short years ago, this athlete was competing in men's collegiate swimming events.

Since being allowed to switch, this swimmer has shattered—and I mean completely shattered—records in women's events.

In December, at the Zippy Invitational, this athlete set new national and school records in the 1,650-, the

500-, and the 200-yard freestyle events and continues to dominate the competition.

At the invitational, this swimmer won the 1,650-yard freestyle with a new record time of 15:59.71. The second-place swimmer finished 38 seconds later.

At the Ivy League Championships last month, this swimmer broke the 200-yard freestyle record of 1 minute and 43 seconds, beating out the last record by over a half a second, and the pool record was beat by 2 seconds.

Having been a coach for 40 years, I can attest more so than anyone in Congress that there are fundamental differences between men and women when it comes to sports. But you don't have to take my word for it. A recent study concludes that "on average, males have (1) 40-50 percent greater upper limb strength, (2) 20-40 percent greater lower limb strength, and (3) an average of 12 pounds more skeletal muscle mass than age-matched females at any given body weight."

Lungs are bigger; heart is bigger. Competing in swimming, in the women's swimming division, has given this Penn athlete an unfair advantage that no one else in the field can overcome.

Some have been too afraid to speak up, fearing they will be sacrificed at the altar of political correctness, or that they will be canceled if they say it is unfair for a biological male to compete against a biological female, or that they will be shunned if they don't embrace inclusivity over fairness.

But some have already bravely voiced their opinion.

The advocacy organizations Champion Women and Women's Sports Policy Working Group released dual petitions on Tuesday with over 5,000 signatures, asking for policymakers to prioritize "fairness and safety for females" instead of "blanket transgender inclusion or exclusion" in women's sports.

The petitions were organized by three-time Olympic gold medalist, and the founder of Champion Women, Nancy Hogshead. According to Champion Women, the petitions were signed by nearly 300 Olympians, Paralympians, and U.S. national team members, as well as over 2,500 athletes who have competed at the high school, club, or collegiate levels.

This is why Congress must act to pass the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act of 2021.

Allowing biological males to compete in women's athletics threatens—threatens—to undo all progress that has been made under title IX.

Title IX has provided women and girls the long-denied platform that had always been afforded just to men and boys. It ensures female athletes had the same access to funding, facilities, and athletic scholarships. Before title IX, female athletes received less than 2 percent of the college athletic budget—only 2 percent—and athletic scholarships for women were virtually nonexistent.

And since the 1970s, when I first started coaching, female participation at the college level has risen by more than 600 percent.

So this week, the NCAA championship will once again emphasize that the debate is not limited just to the Halls of Congress, but one that we are seeing play out across the country.

It is an undeniable fact that biological males have a physiological advantage over females—a fact. So let me be clear: The question here is not should we be inclusive and supportive of all athletes; it is how.

The first step the Senate can take to address the wrong that the NCAA has allowed to happen is to pass S. 251.

There is an attack on women's sports. In the long run, there is an attack on women in this country. It has to stop, and it has to stop now.

So I ask my colleagues to stand up for America's female athletes and women all throughout this country and support these efforts to preserve women's sports.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 643, Laura S. H. Holgate, to be Representative of the United States of America to the International Atomic Energy Agency, with the rank of Ambassador; that the nomination be confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any related statements be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Madam President, reserving the right to object, the Biden administration has failed to properly oversee the Pan American Health Organization, or PAHO.

President Biden and Secretary Blinken know that PAHO has cooperated with the communist regime in Cuba to traffic doctors overseas, and they know there are Cuban doctors who are trying to sue PAHO and hold traffickers accountable.

Here are the facts. In July 2013, the Cuban Ministry of Health signed an agreement with the Brazilian Ministry of Health to formalize an arrangement for Cuban doctors to provide medical services in Brazil.

That agreement required the administration of former Brazilian President Dilma Rousseff to transmit a monthly payment through PAHO to the Cuban Ministry of Health for the medical services provided by each Cuban doctor serving in Brazil.

It also prevented Cuban doctors from seeking employment in Brazil outside

of the formal structure of the arrangement.

More than 20,000 Cuban medical professionals serving in Brazil under the Mais Medicos Program had their wages stolen by the Cuban Government and received only a small fraction of what they earned, and that was with the support of PAHO.

Their family members were prohibited from accompanying them, and many had their passports confiscated.

Cuban doctors were the only medical professionals participating in the program who had their salaries directly garnished by their government. Meanwhile, doctors from other countries, serving in Brazil, received their full wages for their medical services.

Other Cuban doctors have suffered similar abuses in Angola, Guatemala, Mexico, Qatar, and Venezuela.

For example, in 2019, a group of Cuban doctors reported they had been directed and often coerced to use their medical services to influence votes in favor of the Maduro regime, including by denying medical treatment to opposition supporters and by giving precise voting instructions to elderly patients.

This gross program is a huge money-maker for the communist thugs ruling Cuba.

In 2018 alone, they pocketed more than \$6.3 billion from exporting Cuban professionals to work overseas. This is clearly human trafficking, and medical missions by Cuban doctors represent a majority of those profits.

Since I have been in the Senate, since 2019, I have been fighting for these Cuban doctors and against human trafficking. But actually nothing has been done to hold PAHO accountable. PAHO is hiding behind legal immunity. President Biden has the power to lift their immunity, and I have requested his administration do so multiple times, but they have shamefully declined. It is wrong.

Victims of human trafficking deserve to see their alleged abusers in court, and PAHO should never be able to hide behind claims of immunity to avoid accountability for their role in facilitating those abuses.

I have informed Secretary Blinken that until substantial steps toward fulfilling this request are made, I will be blocking all relevant State Department nominees.

Americans deserve qualified and competent people in positions of power who put American interests first. If this administration wants to appease dictators like the Castro and Diaz-Canel regimes and go to Venezuela and try to buy oil, I am going to hold them accountable.

Therefore, Madam President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, I appreciate the concerns that my friend from Florida has raised. However, I am just struggling to see how the safety

and security of Ukraine's 15 nuclear reactors, in the midst of the largest recurrence of warfare on the European Continent since World War II, has any relationship to the issue which he raised.

Russia is blocking International Atomic Energy Agency access into Ukraine. The proper response by the Senate—by the Senator from Florida—is not to block our Ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency at a time when Putin, at a time when Lavrov, are talking about nuclear weapons.

We need a representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency. That is what the Senator from Florida is blocking right now on the floor—just did it.

All across our country Americans are right now wondering, is a nuclear war once again possible? What if the Russians launch a tactical nuclear weapon into Ukraine against a nonarticle 5 country; what is our response?

They are wondering, does the IAEA have access to the 15 Ukrainian nuclear powerplants that the Russians, with military force, are taking over?

What are the protections that are going to be put in place in order to ensure that we, in fact, have done everything that we can do to avoid a nuclear accident, either a nuclear weapon or a nuclear powerplant accident?

That is where we are right now, and what I hear from the Senator from Florida is a disposition on a subject completely unrelated to those issues, as Americans are all tuned in on a daily basis in a way that they have not since 1962 to the very real potential that there could be a nuclear exchange—nuclear weapons exchange—between Russia and the West.

So, from my perspective, this is a historic moment that we have to come together in a bipartisan way to provide a response—a response to Russia, a response to their allies—that we are deadly serious. Instead, what the Senator from Florida has done is to arrive to object to the confirmation of Laura Holgate so that she can be there.

She is fully qualified. She is an all-star in her knowledge of all of these issues, but she won't be on duty. She won't be there with our allies, with the technical experts on all nuclear issues, because of this objection which we just heard.

From my perspective, we are at a pretty big turning point here. We need to be talking to everyone. We are either going to know each other or we are going to exterminate each other. That is the point in time at which we are at. We are either going to talk to each other or we could potentially slip into an accidental nuclear catastrophe that historians and future generations of young people will look back and say: How did that happen?

Well, one of the reasons why it can happen is we can't even get an American to be confirmed by the Senate at this time of great crisis because of an

objection from the Republican Party. I mean, partisanship should stop at the water's edge, but when you are talking about nuclear weapons, there shouldn't even be a discussion about it. We should just let this highly qualified woman get on the job to use her expertise in defense of our country and in defense of everyone on the planet because this could quickly—quickly—trigger accidents that escalate, and then the unimaginable could happen.

So that is where we are right now. We need an ambassador to draw attention to the danger of Russian forces, especially holding Ukraine's nuclear operations at gunpoint. We need an ambassador to demand that Russia accept the IAEA's offer to establish a presence in Ukraine to ensure the continued safe operation of Ukraine's nuclear facilities.

Russia knows from the aftermath of the Chernobyl nuclear accident, the worst in history, that deadly radioactive fallout does not respect borders.

And we need an ambassador at the IAEA to perform a wide array of duties outside of the Ukraine crisis, from keeping nonnuclear weapon countries nonnuclear and making sure that this doesn't trigger attempts by other countries to gain access to nuclear materials and then nuclear weapons. And we have to make sure, ultimately, that we confirm Laura Holgate.

First, she served the same role in the Obama administration. She hits the ground running. She knows these issues. Second, she is a protege of Senator Sam Nunn and Senator Richard Lugar, and like that legendary bipartisan duo, she has devoted her career to dismantling weapons of mass destruction and materials that could be used by terrorists as dirty bombs.

So how is it that we still don't have an ambassador seated at the International Atomic Energy Agency's meetings on Ukraine, given this body unanimously confirmed Ambassador Holgate in December to be our representative to the other U.N. organizations based in Vienna?

That is a good question and it has no good answer and we did not hear that answer on floor of the U.S. Senate just 5 minutes ago, when the Senator from Florida objected. We didn't hear a word about their objections.

I will tell you what, they are creating very risky conditions for all Americans when they deny our country a seat at the table at the International Atomic Energy Agency at this time in history.

I was the same age as the pages on the floor today when the Cuban missile crisis cast a shadow over our Nation. I remember what that was like.

We are slipping day by day into a situation where we could be confronted with similar conditions, and the least that we should be able to say is we tried, we really tried, to avoid that nuclear catastrophe. And the minimum that we should do is have an ambassador who is at the table who is talking

to all of our allies and the rest of the world about these issues right now.

Ukraine and the whole of Europe averted disaster when a Russian munition fell just short of Ukraine's nuclear reactors just a couple of weeks ago. We may not be so lucky the next time if Russian forces move on the country's other facilities with the same reckless abandon.

What possible benefit is derived from keeping our ambassadorial post at the IAEA unfilled at a time like this? We make nuclear safety and nuclear security a partisan issue at our own peril and at the peril of every family in our country as well as Europe.

It is just absolutely irresponsible, for unrelated reasons, to deny our country that kind of protection right now.

So we are going to keep coming back with this, and the reason we are is that we can see a continued escalation. We can see, in Putin's own words, reckless intent. And it is not for us to judge whether he is sincere or not in terms of his consideration of the use of nuclear weapons or his lack of full consideration of what the consequences are of having armed attacks on nuclear powerplant facilities all over Ukraine.

We can't get inside of his brain, but the least we can do is have someone go to the table from America, someone who has dedicated her life—Ambassador Holgate—to this work.

That is what happened here on the floor right now. It was a partisan politicization of nuclear proliferation, of nuclear safety, at a time where we are seeing a peril that we have not seen in 50 years in the United States or the planet.

All I can tell you is history will not come back and well receive the partisan objection for the completely unrelated reasons for not allowing us to have that kind of representation at the nuclear table at this particular point in time.

I intend to return on this subject, as many times as it takes, so that we can have someone who is there protecting every family in our country.

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

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

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete my remarks before the next vote.

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

UKRAINE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, since Vladimir Putin's invasion of Ukraine, we have all been inspired by the courage and leadership of Ukrainian President Volodymyr Zelenskyy.

As Russian troops invaded and brutally attacked his country, President

Zelenskyy did not do as others have done in the past. He didn't run; he didn't hide; and he didn't give in. President Zelenskyy did what every leader hopes to have the courage to do in times of crisis: He stood his ground, spoke out, and rallied the rest of the world to get behind him.

Yesterday, as we all know, Members of Congress had a chance to hear directly from President Zelenskyy.

First, he expressed his gratitude to the United States for the support we have provided so far to his country, but he also issued an urgent plea for more defense articles. He showed us a videotape of devastating photos and videos coming out of Ukraine, demonstrating what the Ukrainian people are being subjected to every day by Putin's cruel and unprovoked war against innocent civilians.

Ukrainian troops need more arms. They need anti-tank capabilities, and they need additional aircraft. As President Zelenskyy put it, the destiny of Ukraine is being decided now, as we speak.

I believe we have a moral obligation—not necessarily a treaty obligation since Ukraine isn't part of NATO, but we have a moral obligation as the leader of the free world—and I am talking about the United States as a whole—to support Ukraine and help them defend their sovereignty and their people.

For example, Poland, a member of NATO, offered to transfer an entire fleet of MiG-29 fighters to the United States for delivery to Ukraine. Ukrainian forces already know how to fly those Russian aircraft, and President Zelenskyy assured us that they are desperately needed, but the Biden administration rejected the offer out of fear that it might provoke Mr. Putin or, in terms of war, might escalate the conflict.

Winston Churchill, another great wartime leader, aptly said:

An appeaser is one who feeds a crocodile, hoping it will eat him last.

This cannot be the policy of the United States. We cannot appease Vladimir Putin, and we can't afford to be timid in the face of the greatest threat to world peace since World War II.

Here on the Senate floor, several weeks ago, I shared a maxim of another Russian leader, Vladimir Lenin, the leader of the Soviet Union, of course, at the time. This is something I would suspect that Mr. Putin agrees with.

Lenin said:

You probe with bayonets. If you find mush, you push. If you find steel, you withdraw.

In short, if people like Vladimir Lenin and Vladimir Putin are met with weakness, they are going to keep coming; if they are met with strength, they may withdraw.

President Putin clearly subscribes to this world view. He doesn't respect weakness. In fact, weakness is a provocation; it encourages him. A weak opponent is Putin's greatest desire. Presi-

dent Biden, unfortunately, in not acting more forcefully and taking the initiative as only leaders can do, is playing into his hand.

The Biden administration has time and time again eventually come around to doing the right thing when it comes to arming the Ukrainians. Unfortunately, it has only been after there has been a public outcry or more pressure from Congress or President Zelenskyy.

Last year, President Biden waived sanctions on the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline. This, of course, is a natural gas pipeline that goes from Russia to Germany. One of the things, even now, the Germans have recognized is their vulnerability to the monopoly that Russia has when it comes to providing oil and gas to Europe.

As Russia built up troops on Ukraine's border, President Biden suggested that some attacks on Ukrainian sovereignty would be "minor intrusions" and perhaps disregarded by the United States, he implied.

President Biden ignored the advice of virtually all of his advisers and missed the window to impose paralyzing sanctions on Russia before the invasion, and now the administration continues to refuse to facilitate the transfer of these Polish fighter jets.

In standard fashion, the administration seems to be a little confused by this crisis—afraid to say yes and too afraid to say no.

I am reminded of President Obama's statement of "leading from behind," which appears to be an approach embraced now by President Biden.

Strong words are important, but they don't defend against rockets or cruise missiles. Sanctions are important, but they won't take out a Russian tank. Humanitarian aid is important, but only if it is delivered on a timely basis and when it is needed. And waiting and seeing what will develop next and then responding after the fact rather than anticipating the need is not particularly effective.

As I said, I believe we have a moral obligation to stand with Ukraine and help its people defend their way of life. We should not be in a position of telling President Zelenskyy: Yes, you have asked us for these defensive arms. You have asked us for these airplanes. We are going to give you just what we think you need.

I don't think that should be our position. We ought to ask President Zelenskyy what he needs and provide it forthwith.

We want to help Ukraine defeat Russian forces and repel them from their territory entirely, not just extend the length of this terrible war. The most effective way to do that is to supply Ukraine with the assets they need as quickly as possible.

To start with, the Biden administration should reevaluate its decision to reject Poland's aircraft offer. These airplanes are needed for Ukraine to maintain air superiority over Russian forces, and they need them now and

not at some distant date in the future. And we need to continue to find ways to put American weaponry into the hands of Ukrainian soldiers.

Back in World War II, the United States was known as the arsenal of democracy. Again, in a bill that I have introduced called the Ukraine Democracy Defense Lend-Lease Act, we can do that again. I am proud to have worked with a group of bipartisan Senators, including Senators CARDIN, WICKER, and SHAHEEN, to produce this legislation.

This legislation authorizes the President to enter into lend-lease agreements like we did in World War II, which probably saved Britain from domination by Nazi Germany. We can do this again by providing Ukrainian forces with the weapons they need to defend their country.

This legislation was included in various packages designed to support Ukraine, but, unfortunately, those packages never made their way to the Senate floor.

There is broad bipartisan support for this lend-lease provision, and it will give the United States the ability to send the exact type of military support Ukraine needs without a lot of redtape or unnecessary delays.

Our support for Ukraine is not a provocation for Putin. It is a necessary show of strength, and it is a deterrence.

As we search for additional ways to support Ukraine, it was great to hear from President Zelenskyy. As I said earlier, his bravery and leadership have galvanized the world and have inspired all of us to take action. And I hope his plea for additional aid will persuade President Biden to act with even greater dispatch.

This weekend, I will be traveling with a number of our colleagues to Poland to visit our friends and allies on the ground and to see for ourselves the sort of humanitarian crisis that Putin's invasion of Ukraine has created.

Poland, to its credit, has welcomed thousands of refugees—hundreds of thousands—and continues to deal with the Russian aggression along its borders.

I look forward to this opportunity to visit both Poland and Germany and learning more from our partners in Europe and eager to bring back their input to the Senate for further urgent action.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHATZ). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the Corley nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jacqueline Scott Corley, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

VOTE ON CORLEY NOMINATION

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

Mr. LEAHY. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 94 Ex.]

YEAS—63

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

NAYS—36

Barrasso	Fischer	Paul
Blackburn	Hagerty	Portman
Blunt	Hawley	Risch
Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Kennedy	Shelby
Crapo	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	Moran	Wicker

NOT VOTING—1

Shaheen

The nomination was confirmed.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Fred W. Slaughter, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

VOTE ON SLAUGHTER NOMINATION

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

Mr. WARNER. 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 Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) is necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 95 Ex.]

YEAS—57

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

NAYS—41

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

NOT VOTING—2

Shaheen Tillis

The nomination was confirmed.

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

AMERICA COMPETES ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have an announcement to make for the information of Senators. In a few moments, I will take the next procedural step to advance the jobs and competitiveness legislation so important to so many of us in this Chamber.

Last summer, the Senate passed an overwhelmingly bipartisan bill that will bring manufacturing jobs back to America, fix supply chains, fuel scientific research, and ultimately lower costs by a significant amount. The bipartisan bill will be great news for our economy, our entrepreneurs, our innovators, and especially families who are feeling the sting because of the chip shortage.

We all know the chip shortage is hurting so many people. It is hurting the auto industry that has had to temporarily shut down factories. It has hurt our tech industry, our healthcare

industry, and so many others. So let's solve this quickly.

In order to go to conference, the Senate needs to amend the House-passed COMPETES bill with the Senate-passed U.S. Innovation and Competition Act and send it back to the House. That is what we will aim to do next week as quickly as we can.

Again, this jobs and supply chains legislation will help lower costs. Let us have bipartisan cooperation on this bill. Now, despite cloture, it is far better for Democrats and Republicans to reach an agreement to vote on this bill quickly, and we will keep working on that over the next few days.

It is regrettable that a small band of Republicans are determined to stand in the way of quick action after all the good work we have done in recent weeks passing bipartisan legislation. Let's add to that tally by quickly passing this bill. Creating jobs, lowering costs, and fixing supply chains shouldn't be partisan, and I hope to see an agreement to expedite this process soon. In the meantime, the process is moving forward.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

AMERICA CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR MANUFACTURING, PRE-EMINENCE IN TECHNOLOGY, AND ECONOMIC STRENGTH ACT OF 2022—Motion to Proceed

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, a bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tammy Duckworth, Mark R. Warner, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Mazie Hirono, Mark Kelly, Tammy Baldwin, Jacky

Rosen, Ron Wyden, Margaret Wood Hassan, Maria Cantwell.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion filed today, March 17, be waived and that following the 1:45 p.m. vote, the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The Senator from Wyoming.

INFLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about America's inflation crisis. People in my home State are noticing it every day.

This morning, the majority leader came to the floor and expressed his shock that prices have gone up, but they have been going up for over a year now. Price increases last year on energy alone cost hard-working families over \$1,000 more last year—the first year that Joe Biden was President—compared to the previous year. This year, it is going to cost even more for energy—to drive, to heat, all of those things.

So I am glad that the Democrats now are—14 months into Joe Biden's Presidency—finally concerned about energy prices, but what we are seeing the Democrats offer are gimmicks.

Some Democrats want to call it a gas tax holiday. Of course, the gas tax is what is used to pay for our roads and bridges. So they want to defund—stop paying for roads and bridges but then put the gas tax back on right after the election. It is a cynical ploy.

Other Democrats say: No, no, let's not do that. Let's just send everybody more government checks.

Well, the Democrats have been doing that, and it is what has caused much of the inflation that we are facing today.

Still other Democrats say: No, no, let's clamp down on American energy even tighter.

These are nice sound bites. We are seeing them. We are hearing them. Those aren't solutions.

We know why prices are rising. Prices are rising because supply of American energy is down. We are actually 1.3 million barrels less energy producing now with oil in the United States than we were before the pandemic. So why is supply down? Well, the policies of the Democrats in the House and the Senate and the policies coming out of the White House. Democrats have been in charge of Washington now for a full year, and high prices are really the rotten fruit of Democrat rule.

As I said, we are at 1.3 million barrels of oil per day less than before the pandemic. People say: Well, what has caused it? Joe Biden was proud to talk about what has caused it. His first act as President was to stop oil and gas leases on Federal lands, kill the Keystone XL Pipeline, and it is one of his campaign promises. You can go back and look at the videos of Joe Biden as a campaigner saying: I promise you

there will be no new oil and gas in the United States. That is actually what the video says, and that is what he says. They are his own words, his own promises. Then he went back to try to clarify that and clean it up a little bit, and he said: Well, not on public lands.

This isn't a surprise that Biden has crushed U.S. production of oil and gas. This administration still has not held a single auction for oil and gas leases on Federal lands since the day he has taken office. How does that compare to other administrations? Well, under President Obama, there were more than 30 oil and gas lease sales on Federal lands that had been conducted in the auctions in this same period of time.

So has anybody said anything about it? Actually, yes. The courts have ruled. The courts said the President's executive office on Federal land leases is illegal. That is what the courts ruled. President Biden thumbed his nose at the Federal courts. The President has stubbornly refused to open up more Federal lands to American energy production, ignoring what the courts have said.

In Western States like Wyoming, where half of our land is owned by the Federal Government, and controlled, it is devastating. Half of Wyoming is Federal land. We are sitting on a treasure trove of American energy. We wouldn't have to be relying on Vladimir Putin or we wouldn't have to be relying on Iran or going hat in hand to Venezuela. We have it here in America, and we do it a lot cleaner than they do in any of these foreign countries run by dictators.

When we keep energy buried in the ground, American families get buried in costs.

The White House says we don't need to open up Federal lands, no. The White House says there are oil and gas leases that are not being used—another sound bite. In reality, most of the leases that aren't being used—it is because they are tied up in Democrat red-tape or Democrat-run lawsuits.

There are some that aren't being used because the companies that have the leases can't get the funding to go and do the exploration. Why can't they get the funding? It is the cancel culture of the Democratic Party. We have seen it. Joe Biden's recent nominee to the Federal Reserve wrote in the New York Times that banks, she said, shouldn't lend money to oil and gas companies—shouldn't do it, period. These are businesses that get loans to do business, and she said: Nope, none for you. A lot of banks listened to her because they thought she was going to be confirmed. Thankfully, that nomination has been withdrawn.

Less investment means less production. It results in higher prices.

This morning, the majority leader, standing at that podium over there, also said gas prices had gone up "at a time when families are already struggling." Well, why do you think they

are already struggling? We know why they are struggling. It is because of the inflation caused by this administration and the policies that have been going on for a full year even though, month after month after month, the President of the United States said they would be transitory.

The price of gas has gone up. The price of heating in your home has gone up. The price of groceries has gone up. The price of nearly everything has gone up. Over the past year, prices have gone up 8 percent. We are at a 40-year high of inflation in this country. The average family's income cannot keep up with the price increases that we have been sustaining since the day Joe Biden took office. Just last month, some of the price increases were the biggest on record: chicken, lunch meat, baby food—things that people need to buy.

I am glad to hear that the Democrats are finally admitting the crisis is only going to get worse. Why do they say it is going to get worse? Because the cost of producing things has gone up. Energy prices are up; you use energy to produce things. The inflation cost for producing things now is actually higher based on—the price index for production is at 10 percent. So that says that prices are going to go up because if it costs more to produce things, the pricetag has to go up. Food costs continue to go up. Senator FISCHER, my colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska, pointed out that fertilizer costs have tripled.

Now Democrats want to make it worse. Democrats in the House—not in the Senate but Democrats in the House—are asking Joe Biden to declare a climate emergency and tighten his choke hold on American energy production. It is going to make inflation even worse.

In yesterday's Washington Post, Larry Summers warned that we might face something, I say to the Presiding Officer, that you and I remember, something from the Jimmy Carter days called stagflation. That is where you have inflation and stagnation at the same time. It is a terrible thing to happen to an economy.

The crisis is only going to get worse. We need to change course. We need to do it now. Stop the reckless spending, and above all, unleash American energy. Don't be a country that not too long ago was asking Russia to produce more, asking OPEC to produce more, asking Iran to sell us energy, asking Venezuela. Produce it here. We have it here. Open up these Federal lands. Approve the drilling permits—the 4,600 drilling permits that are stuck in limbo by this administration.

American families cannot afford 3 more years of Joe Biden.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the

Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 677, Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Brian Schatz, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Chris Van Hollen, Raphael G. Warnock, Jacky Rosen, Tim Kaine, Patty Murray, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tammy Duckworth, Alex Padilla, Tammy Baldwin, Mazie Hirono, Christopher A. Coons, Patrick J. Leahy.

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 Alison J. Nathan, of New York, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Second Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

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

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 96 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Grassley	Portman
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Blunt	Hawley	Romney
Boozman	Hoeben	Rounds
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Shelby
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—5

Burr	Scott (SC)	Tillis
Manchin	Shaheen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VAN HOLLEN). On this vote, the yeas are 51 the nays 44.

The motion is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

SENATOR PAUL SIMON WATER FOR THE WORLD ACT

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was fortunate early in my political life to meet several people who became my heroes and mentors and led me to take up public service as my life's calling.

The first was a Senator from Illinois named Paul Douglas, and I met him when I was a college intern in his office. And he introduced me to a man named Paul Simon; Simon, who was a Lieutenant Governor in our State, State legislator, Congressman, and, ultimately, the Senator who preceded me in this Senate seat.

After Paul Simon passed away, I approached his family and talked about a tribute to him, and they basically said: Well, you remember Paul. He would have been the last person in the world who ever wanted a statue and really didn't care much about having anything with his name on it. That just wasn't his approach to politics.

But I thought to myself there were some things that he valued that maybe I can try to help in my own way in his memory. And one of them was in 2014, when I introduced a bill called the Paul Simon Water for the World Act.

Simon had written a book that didn't make the New York Times best seller list. It was entitled "Tapped Out." He had a theory many years ago that the issue with the 21st century was going to be water. And he made a pretty convincing case, and, frankly, the events and evidence since then have backed him up.

So this bill, the Paul Simon Water for the World Act, was designed to build on the success of an earlier effort called Paul Simon's Water for the Poor, which had passed 10 years before and sought to bring clean water and sanitation programs to the world's poorest communities.

Today, as we mark World Water Day, I want to recognize what we have accomplished with these two pieces of legislation. They have helped provide, for the first time, access to clean drinking water and sanitation for more than 60 million additional people around the globe.

Those successes have also improved global health, economic development, and educational attainment. And they have proven how far just a little Federal funding invested in the right area can go.

Both of those laws were passed on a bipartisan basis, and in recognizing the compounding benefits of clean water and sanitation, Congress has sustained the programs.

My staff has traveled to countries like Kenya, Ghana, Senegal to see

these programs in action. They have shared stories and photos with me about schools and villages that, for the very first time, have access to clean, drinkable water.

In Ghana, for example, these laws have helped fund something called the Digni-Loo Program. It has provided rural villages with clean, sustainable toilets and helped eliminate water-borne diseases in entire districts of the country.

This World Water Day, I hope we can reaffirm our commitment in this Senate to supporting legislation in the name of my friend and mentor, the Senator Paul Simon Water for the World Act, that will help bring global health for years to come.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. President, in just a few days, America's eyes will turn to the Senate Judiciary Committee as we begin the process of considering Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson for her nomination to the Supreme Court.

It is going to be a historic moment on Monday as Judge Jackson appears before the Committee, and gaveling the hearing to order as chair of the committee will rank as one of the highest honors of my career in Congress.

Next week, the American people will have a chance to meet Judge Jackson, learn about her, her professional record, and her life experience. But, for now, let me briefly share a few things that have impressed me the most.

By now, I am sure, many have heard about her experience. Judge Jackson has clerked at every level of the Federal judiciary. Most lawyers would consider a clerkship in any court as an achievement that they could brag about for years. She served as a clerk at every level of the Federal judiciary, including the Supreme Court.

She served in many roles in the courtroom as a public defender, a lawyer in private practice, and a district and circuit court judge at the Federal level.

She was confirmed by the Senate unanimously to serve on the U.S. Sentencing Commission, and she would be the first Justice since Thurgood Marshall with considerable defense experience.

Her qualifications are exceptional. In every role she has held, she has earned a reputation for thoughtfulness, evenhandedness, and collegiality.

Just as impressive as Judge Jackson's record is her character and temperament—humble, personable. She has dedicated herself to making our legal system more understandable and more accessible for everyone who came into her courtroom.

Finally, of course, there is the perspective that Judge Jackson will bring to the High Court. Over the course of its history, 115 Justices have served on the Supreme Court. If she is confirmed, Judge Jackson will be the 116th, but she would be the first Supreme Court Justice who is the daughter of parents who felt the crushing oppression of segregation and the first Justice who has

represented an indigent as a public defender.

Judge Jackson comes from a law enforcement family and has a deep appreciation for the risk of police officers, like her brother and uncles. And I believe one served in the Baltimore Police Department.

Indeed, with Judge Jackson's confirmation, the Supreme Court would come closer to fully reflecting the diversity of America.

When Justice Breyer announced his retirement, I promised that the process for confirming his successor would be fair and timely. Well, it has been. For instance, the committee sent a bipartisan committee questionnaire to Judge Jackson. In response she provided materials which shed considerable light on her record, her accomplishments, her writings, and her legal reasoning. Notably, this included more than 12,000 pages of public records from Judge Jackson's time on the Sentencing Commission.

The committee also sent a bipartisan document request to the Obama Presidential Library. That request sought documents relating to Judge Jackson's nomination to both the Sentencing Commission and the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. In response to that request, the Obama Library produced more than 70,000 pages of material.

Additionally, Judge Jackson has written hundreds of opinions—almost 600 now—which provide extensive insight into her legal philosophy.

In short, the committee has all the information it needs to evaluate Judge Jackson's qualifications to sit on the Supreme Court.

We have sent a lot of followup requests for information, too, and she has always responded in a timely way.

So we are going to proceed with her hearing come Monday. This process will provide committee members an opportunity to question Judge Jackson to learn more about her approach to judicial decision making, her views on precedent, and her record on and off the bench.

Here is how the hearing is going to work. Each member of the committee will be allocated 10 minutes to make opening statements. Each member will have a total of 50 minutes to question Judge Jackson. There are 22 members on the committee. If you do the math, there is plenty of opportunity for questions to be asked and answered. I expect it to be a substantive hearing. I expect members on both sides of the aisle to ask tough but fair questions and to give her an appropriate time to respond, and I expect that the committee will diligently perform our role in the Senate's advice and consent function.

When the hearing is complete, I believe the American public will be keenly aware of just what an outstanding nominee Judge Jackson is. I will also get to see what I have seen in meeting with her personally. She is thoughtful,

brilliant, kind, and has a good sense of humor.

She has already inspired young people across the country—young people who are just beginning to discover their passion for law. You see, she graduated from Miami's Palmetto Senior High School, a public high school in Pinecrest, FL. Right now, the halls of Palmetto High are buzzing with pride in anticipation for next week's hearing.

One school administrator told my office that, even though students will be out on spring break next week during beach season in Florida, many will be coming together for a virtual watch party as Judge Jackson appears before our committee. The administrator said that many of these students see themselves in Judge Jackson, particularly the members of the speech and debate team, which Judge Jackson was once a member of herself. In fact, Judge Jackson has cited her time on the speech and debate team as one of the most formative experiences of her life. She described it as "the one activity that best prepared me for future success."

Well, today, Judge Jackson is more prepared than perhaps anyone to serve on the Supreme Court. So to all the students at Palmetto High who are following in her footsteps, working long hours to hone their rhetorical skills, you are on the right track. While Judge Jackson may be the first Palmetto Panther to serve on the Supreme Court, there is no reason she should be the last. Years from now, who knows, maybe one of you will be preparing for your hearing before the Senate committee. Until then, you should all be so proud of Judge Jackson.

I would like to add another element to this—a personal element. When I spoke to Judge Jackson about her family, she was naturally proud of her husband, who is a surgeon, but she talked about her two daughters and showed me pictures of them. They are teenagers and obviously good kids. She is so proud of them. She told the story that when there was a vacancy announced on the Supreme Court several years ago, one of her daughters picked up a pen and wrote a personal letter to President Obama and said: Why don't you pick my mom?

It is that kind of support every parent lives for, and I am sure it means a lot to her. She is a good person, a good mother, a good parent, and she will be a great member of the Supreme Court.

I also want to say that there are elements that obviously the public has paid attention to. This being the fourth time before the Senate Judiciary Committee, many people in America know Judge Jackson or they have heard about her or they have read about her. They believe in a positive way that she will bring diversity to the Court; that she has the experience that is necessary to serve effectively; that she will uphold our constitutional values of liberty, equality, and justice; and that she will protect the constitutional rights of everybody, not just the

wealthy and powerful. She has ethics and integrity, and she will place justice before politics.

I am looking forward to this hearing. I am happy that the Republicans have said publicly that they want to make it a respectful hearing, and I certainly hope they live up to it. I will do everything I can to convince the Democratic side to aspire to the same goal. This can be a historic moment for America in the selection of this Justice. I hope the Senate Judiciary Committee rises to the occasion, and I have confidence that it will.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

NOMINATIONS OF CRISTINA SILVA AND ANNE TRAUM

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the nominations of Judge Cristina Silva and Professor Anne Traum, nominees to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada. Both nominees have built tremendous careers and legal reputations, and, last night, cloture was invoked on both of these nominees with strong bipartisan support.

Judge Silva has spent the bulk of her career as a Federal prosecutor in the city of Las Vegas, where she served as chief of the criminal division. In this role, Judge Silva oversaw all criminal investigations and prosecutions in the Nevada U.S. Attorney's Office. She has gained vast experience dealing with Federal criminal trials, including violent criminal cases, civil rights violations, and cyber crime.

Since 2019, Judge Silva has served with distinction as a Nevada State court judge, where she has earned the respect and admiration of her colleagues, as well as those who have appeared before her in court. Colleagues have called her "intellectually gifted and extremely hard-working" and have commended her "deep commitment to the rule of law."

These are exactly the kinds of qualities we need in someone nominated to serve on the Federal Bench, and they are the qualities that Judge Silva exemplifies. I know she will serve with independence and integrity.

For her part, Professor Anne Traum has also developed a distinguished legal career, one rich with examples of her commitment to the law and to public service. She has litigated civil cases with the U.S. Attorney's office, served as a Department of Justice trial attorney, and has worked for years on criminal cases as a Federal public defender.

Since 2008, Professor Traum has dedicated her career to helping shape the minds of Nevada's future lawyers as a professor at the University of Nevada Las Vegas's Boyd School of Law.

A deeply admired teacher, Professor Traum has gone above and beyond, founding a clinic to provide legal services to parties in Las Vegas who lack resources and volunteering significant time to pro bono programs in Southern Nevada. Professor Anne Traum has

worked to ensure that all individuals have adequate representation to defend their rights and that all individuals have access to our justice system.

And there is no better way to judge a professor than by the opinion of her students. In Professor Traum's case, her students regularly credit her courses as the most important courses in their legal careers.

The bipartisan judicial selection committee that Senator CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO and I put together fully vetted both of these nominees, and we both worked hand in hand with the White House to ensure that they were chosen for their exemplary qualifications, intellect, and passion for the law.

I was glad to see that both Professor Traum's and Judge Silva's nominations received bipartisan support—both as they advanced through the Senate Judiciary Committee and during last night's cloture vote. These highly qualified nominees for the U.S. district court are fully deserving of your support now, and I urge each of my colleagues to vote for their confirmation next week.

Nevada's Federal district court has been under enormous strain, with delays driving up the costs to businesses and individuals pursuing their claims in court. Filling the vacancies with these nominees would ensure that Nevadans have fair and reasonable access to the Federal courts.

It is time to confirm these nominees, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of Judge Cristina Silva and Professor Anne Traum.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

PROXY WARS

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, one of the challenges we face in this era of great power competition is identifying unique threats before they escalate.

When it comes to Russia and Ukraine, these threats have come into full focus. Vladimir Putin took off his statesman costume and declared a war of choice on Ukraine. Last week, we received the first public allegations of his intent to unleash Syrian proxies on anyone still standing between his war machine and the territory he covets.

I am glad to hear more of my colleagues speaking up about the unique dangers of proxy wars. Last week, I laid out in detail how Putin has used proxies to install himself in countries that are leadership poor but resource rich.

We know that fighters from the Kremlin-backed Wagner Group have slaughtered their way through Africa and the Middle East on behalf of Putin's grand Soviet ambition. And now he is going to do the very same thing in Ukraine.

We have also seen Iran unleash proxies and State-sponsored terror organizations in Iraq, against American Armed Forces and against civilian populations in Lebanon, Yemen, and Gaza.

In their 2022 threat assessment, the intelligence community stated:

We assess that Iran will threaten U.S. persons directly and via proxy attacks, particularly in the Middle East.

This is a public statement. This is the Annual Threat Assessment. It is backed by years of evidence, proving that Iran has done this before and they are going to try to do it again.

President Biden should be doing everything in his power to keep this threat as far away from American citizens as he can—but no such luck. The impending nuclear deal he is trying to hand Tehran unlocks billions of dollars for Iranian banks, companies, and other entities that finance violence.

Where does the White House think that money will end up?

We know there is nothing Tehran loves more than a power vacuum. They have invested heavily in Hezbollah, the Houthis, and Hamas—all terrorist organizations hunkered down in some of the world's most unstable regions. Over the past decade, the Iranians have spent more than \$16 billion on carefully targeted bloodshed. That is right—Iran alone, the largest state sponsor of terrorism.

The landscape is chaos, and, still, the Biden administration is pushing the world toward a sanctions relief scheme that would empower the Iranians to terrorize and subjugate even more people.

The regime in Tehran is a menace. This week, incoming CENTCOM commander, General Kurilla, said as much in his confirmation hearing when we asked him how sanctions relief would affect the Iranian influence.

I am quoting him:

[T]here is a risk with sanctions relief that Iran would use some of that money to support its proxies and terrorism in the region, and if it did, it could increase risk to our forces in the region.

In this week's CENTCOM posture review before the Armed Services Committee, outgoing commander, General McKenzie, acknowledged these concerns about sanctions relief, saying:

[T]here is a risk that they could use that money in ways that we would not want them to use that money.

That is right. We certainly don't want them to put one more penny toward these proxy wars, for good reasons.

First, proxies don't just parachute in and declare victory. They brutalize entire populations and use weapons that these hostile regimes wouldn't normally have access to.

Second, because proxies operate outside the law, the rogue regimes that hire them maintain plausible deniability.

Third, this plausible deniability creates a false sense of security that allows hostile governments to pull up a chair to the negotiating table and pretend to fit in with normal countries, all the while denying the United States access and placement.

We have a limited number of ways to deter hostile regimes from waging war

on the civilized world. The West failed the people of Ukraine in this regard, but it is not too late to change course.

Ronald Reagan once said:

[W]ar comes not when the forces of freedom are strong, but when they are weak. It is then that tyrants are tempted.

He believed in achieving peace through strength, and so do I.

It is pretty simple. If you don't stand up for yourself, you will get run over, and if you don't stand up for your friends, there may not be anyone left to help them when the wolves are actually at the door.

When I talk to Tennesseans about this, the one thing they want to know is why President Biden makes decisions that make this country more vulnerable and less safe. Whether through lifting sanctions on Iran, slow-walking sanctions on Russia, or keeping our economy entangled with China's, Biden has refused to lead. Forget doing what needs to be done; he won't even say what needs to be said. He is fearful. He is scared to anger the new Axis of Evil. He is scared to anger our more timid allies in Europe. He is scared to anger the radical left here at home.

Is there anything that he is not afraid of?

He is so weak-kneed in the face of adversity that he can't even bring himself to finish building the fence that would secure our southern border.

I want to focus on that border security for just a few minutes because, while Russia and Iran might dominate headlines, for Tennesseans, our wide-open southern border is a perfect example of what can happen when a President concedes national security to score points on his political rivals.

Border encounters were up 2 percent in February. That is almost 165,000 people trying to enter the country unnoticed; 76 percent of the people the Border Patrol caught were single adults; cocaine seizures increased 83 percent; meth, 97 percent; heroin, 173 percent.

We know for a fact that terrorists and members of international criminal organizations cross our border with impunity. Over the course of 3 days last December, the Border Patrol arrested a guerrilla member of the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia, four MS-13 gang members, and an 18th Street gang member—six—six—distinguished representatives from the most dangerous gangs in the entire world and they almost disappeared into the country undetected. Thank goodness for law enforcement because these are not ordinary criminals.

In January of 2021, the Department of Justice indicted the 14 most senior members of MS-13 on charges of conspiracy to support, finance, and commit acts of terrorism.

Is this the Biden doctrine—choosing vulnerability over security and annihilation through weakness?

Who exactly does the President intend to win over with this approach?

Ukraine will find no peace in the easing of diplomatic tensions on some

U.N. panel. Children in Africa won't have a future if we start writing checks to proxy fighters. The people of El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras won't be better off if we enable the drug dealers and sex traffickers who make a living exploiting their families. No matter where in the world you look, you can see the costs of Joe Biden's willful blindness to danger.

He has the tools he needs to protect the United States from these threats. Now, he needs to use them.

It is time to stop relying on foreign oil and make the country energy independent again: Finish the Keystone Pipeline. Do an Operation Warp Speed for energy. Allow oil and gas exploration on Federal land.

We have to stop leading from behind when it comes to preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

President Biden must submit to Congress any deal with Iran; and rest assured, we will block the implementation of anything the White House tries to sneak under the radar. We must pay attention to the flow of money and power in proxy hotbeds and recognize the danger posed by these terrorists for hire. We can't neglect security threats close to home. It is time to secure the border and give our law enforcement officials the resources they need to catch terrorists and gang members before they disappear into the country.

Tennesseans can't identify with the President's refusal to lead. They are confused and frightened, but they also have faith in our ability as a country to pull out of this skid. They believe in the promise of America. All they want is for their President and elected leaders to prove that they also believe in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The Senator from Nebraska.

UKRAINE

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, I want to talk about three things.

First, Ukraine.

What do they need? How much aid? What kind, and how urgently can and should we get it to them?

Second, omnis.

Does the way the Congress spends money make any sense right now?

And, third, political grandstanding.

In particular, can politicians resist the short-term political crack that is social media?

First, Ukraine.

How much aid do they need? What kind and how urgently? The answer is they need everything, and they need it yesterday.

If they can shoot it, we should ship it. Ukrainians are fighting for freedom, and we should be doing more to help: Javelins, Stingers, lethal drones like Switchblades, surface-to-air missiles like the S-300s, coastal defense missiles, machine guns, ammo, grenade launchers, night vision goggles, and, yes, planes—more and more of them faster.

I applaud the President for some of what he has done, for sending some of this, but I would also note that there are really important weapons that are not yet in Ukrainian hands, like the S-300s.

I would also note that it takes time to cross the border, and we should be sending this stuff as fast as possible, not having the administration's lawyers debate how many angels can dance on the tip of a SAM or debate which weapons should be considered offensive versus defensive.

Look, the Ukrainians are the people who are being victimized; they are the people who have been invaded. Every weapon we give them right now is a defensive weapon. It is Russia that has invaded Ukraine, and these lawyerly distinctions don't really make a bit of difference to a Russian invading pilot. If he gets shot down, which weapons system it came from is not really the concern he is going to have at that moment.

So the answer to the question "What kind of aid does Ukraine need?" is more and faster.

Second, omnis.

Does the way the Congress works right now—does the way that we manage the power of the purse, does the way the appropriations process works—make any sense?

Can any of us go home and explain it to our constituents as the cautious, careful, prudent, adult management of the FISC? Obviously not. This process doesn't work.

I am 50 years old, and in the last 46 years—I think the current number is four times in the last 46 years that the Congress has spent at least 30 percent of its money under regular order on a regular appropriations process—four times in 46 years. This doesn't make sense. It is not prudent. It doesn't work.

For weeks, I have been calling on the President and his administration to submit an emergency supplemental to Congress so we can send Ukraine all of the aid they need faster.

Look, I am a fiscal hawk, but I am also a defense hawk, a security hawk, and I am A-OK with our spending a bunch of money fighting for the defense of freedom as long as the Ukrainians have fight in them. They are fighting not just for their kids and their future; they are fighting for free peoples. Putin will not be stopped until someone stops him. So the Ukrainians are doing a service to us—they are willing to fight. We should be willing to fund and to resupply them.

The reality is that my calls for an emergency supplemental were ignored. The administration didn't make any emergency supplemental request. The Congress's hands are not guilt-free either. We didn't even vote on an aid package for the Ukrainians until more than 2 weeks after the invasion.

Why the wait?

Washington did what it always does and decided it would just add the de-

fense money to the orgy of spending and pet projects and bureaucracy—that we spend every year—in the middle of the night in a thousands-and-thousands-paged bill that not a single Member who voted on it here had actually read.

So what did we do with the Ukrainian aid?

The reality is there was some important aid in the omni, but we should talk about how much it was. We spent \$13 billion on Ukrainian aid out of a total appropriations package of \$1.5 trillion. For those of you doing math at home, that is less than 1 percent of what we passed in the middle of the night last week that was actually Ukrainian aid.

Here is a depiction: This is the aid bill, and this tiny, little subpiece of 1 percent is the portion that was Ukrainian aid.

The reality is that the bill we voted on last week wasn't really about Ukrainian aid. Ukrainian aid was a little bit of sugar on the larger medicine of a \$1.5 trillion bill that nobody would actually want to go home and defend to the voters and to the taxpayers of America was well thought out.

So why does this happen?

Well, the American people aren't stupid. A lot of politicians think voters are stupid. They think you can jingle a shiny thing over here and then make up any claim you want, but the reality is voters aren't stupid. Voters are distracted, and they are busy, but they are not unaware of what is happening here.

They know why politicians talk like this—why they say that if you didn't vote for a \$1.5 trillion bill, you were against puppies; you were against food for children; and you were against all of these really great "mom and apple pie" kinds of things when the reality is you probably voted against the bill because there was a whole bunch of schlock in it that was unvetted, not because you said: Hey, I don't want the Ukrainian freedom fighters to have the military aid that they need. People talk like this so that they can bully the other side.

This is, quite frankly, a boring speech. It is not a speech that I want to be giving. But the truth is, if you allow liars to constantly lie, and they can get away with it, then they just keep doing it. So it is probably useful for us more often to take people's nonsense tweets, which they do for a bizarre audience of political weirdoes on Twitter, and they should have to defend these statements in public.

It is transparently obvious that if you vote against a \$1.5 trillion bill, that doesn't mean you were trying to vote against everything particularly in it; that you were against those kinds of funding. It might be because you were against lots of things in it that are indefensible before the voters. It is transparently stupid, and the voters get it.

So to the question of do omnis make sense? The answer is, no, we should do better.

But the question that our Republic is partly going to have to resolve if we are going to get healthy again as a polity is, Will politicians be able to resist the short-term crack of social media?

It doesn't look like very many of us in this body are interested in trying to speak to 70 and 75 and 80 percent of the electorate, but rather that lots and lots of politicians are completely happy to speak to the very narrow range of fan service that they do on Twitter.

Many politicians are addicted to Twitter. They want their sick burns and their retweets and their likes. It is crack and they have an addiction and it is sad.

The truth is that the folks who do this kind of garbage are hopelessly out of touch with the reality of the people's lives that we are actually supposed to be serving. It is not useful to drink your own bath water.

Twitter isn't real life, so it is probably useful for us to pause more often and try to make sure we have some common facts about the connection between political Twitter and reality.

First, only 20 percent of Americans are on Twitter—19 or 20 percent of Americans are on Twitter. Political Twitter is something like the ninth most watched portion of Twitter; sports Twitter, a foretaste of Heaven, unlike political Twitter, a foretaste of Hell. Sports Twitter is much bigger than political Twitter. Hollywood Twitter is bigger than political Twitter. K-pop Twitter is much, much bigger than political Twitter. So let's just start by recognizing that only 20 percent of Americans are on Twitter, and politics isn't a top five subportion of Twitter.

Of those who are on Twitter, only about 40 percent say they ever use Twitter for politics. But for the small minority of Americans who do pay attention to political Twitter—again, 40 percent of 20 percent—if you are doing math at home, we are now in single digits here. So 40 percent of 20 percent is 8 percent of Americans. For those who do pay attention to political Twitter, the political tweets are dominated by a very, very, very, very small share of American adults. Something like 80 percent of all tweets come from 10 percent of Twitter users. But this is the audience that politicians are playing for when they grandstand on Twitter.

Let's be clear, this happens all over the political continuum. This isn't chiefly on the right or chiefly on the left.

If you ever wonder why are politicians such weirdoes, it is mostly because they are grandstanding for a very, very narrow niche audience of weirdoes on Twitter, and so we should actually ask if it is healthy to continue doing that.

So to our core questions, the Ukrainians, do they need aid? Yes, they do. We should fund freedom fighters.

To the question of do omnis work? No, they don't, and everybody knows it.

But to the question of should we continue doing political discourse like this? Should we say that someone who had concerns about this was trying to kill off babies and puppies? No, we shouldn't lie like this. We shouldn't do that.

We owe the voters better than that. We should tell the truth, and we should try to talk to voters like you are actually talking to a room of regular people who have jobs and who are actually trying to put bread on the table for their kids and probably are pretty grateful for the inheritance that is the American Republic and our leadership on the global stage for freedom lovers.

The Ukrainians are that. We should fund the Ukrainians. We should have funded them in a more prudent way than an omni.

But if you voted for an omni when I voted against it, I am not going to attack you for voting for the omni. But don't go out there and lie and pretend that somebody who voted against the omni was against all the stuff in it, some of which is pretty decent.

We can do better. We should.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

REMEMBERING SONNY RUNDLELL

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I rise this afternoon here among my colleagues and those back home in Kansas to pay tribute to a Kansan, Sonny Rundell.

Sonny passed away this past Friday at the age of 89, and I want to take a moment to recognize his life and his service. A moment is insufficient, certainly, to pay the tribute that this gentleman and his family deserve.

Sonny was born in Pierceville, KS, a little town in Southwest Kansas. In places as rural as Pierceville, people are sparse, and so you quickly learn what is important. And Sonny learned that in his life, family, church, community were the important things.

Sonny embodied qualities that fostered his community: hard work and generosity. And like so many young men of his generation, he was called to service to his country. In 1953, he answered that call and left to serve in Korea.

When he returned home to Kansas in 1956, he finished his degree at Kansas State University, earning a degree in agriculture. He went on to farm land in Hamilton, Stanton, and Finney Counties for more than 30 years.

Sonny was involved in so many ways. He was a churchgoer, and he cared about education advocacy throughout our State. He was a member of the State board of education and was an advocate for education for all kids in our State.

He had preceded that by being a member of the Syracuse, KS, Board of Education, the High Plains Special Education Cooperative. He was a founding member of Garden City Community College Board of Trustees, a founding member of the Education Eq-

uity Advisory Council, the Education Commission of the States, the Kansas Commission on Teaching and America's Future, and the National Association of State Boards of Education, and that is only to name a few.

Sonny recognized, as I hope we all do, that education is the great equalizing opportunity for Americans, for Kansans. It allows us to pursue what we call the American dream.

He received lots of recognitions during his life. He received those for his advocacy, and in 2003 Sonny was awarded the Governor's Award for Distinguished Service to Secondary Education in Kansas.

From 2000 to 2003, our country recognized 50 years since the Korean war. And during this time, the Republic of Korea issued a service medal and awarded those to veterans who had served, coordinating with congressional offices like mine. I was pleased to be able to recognize Sonny's service to our Nation.

Particularly in these troubled times, these days in which we see the surge for support for freedom, Sonny committed to doing so and served his Nation and the world in that cause of freedom.

In 2002, while I was still a Member of the House of Representatives here in the Nation's Capitol, I was pleased to be able to honor Sonny for his recognition during the Korean war.

Then and now, I thank him for his dedication to our State, and I thank him for his service to our Nation.

My prayers are with his wife Verna and to his entire family and loved ones.

Robba joins me in expressing our sincere condolences and wish those who remain to look at the life of Sonny Rundell and recommit ourselves to service to our community, to our family, and to our church.

REMEMBERING DICK HEDGES

Madam President, this afternoon I rise to pay tribute to a Kansan, a champion of the Fort Scott community, Dick Hedges.

In Kansas, we talk often of community and how important it is to the fabric of small towns that dot the State.

There are small towns in Southwest Kansas, and there are small towns in Southeast Kansas because in Kansas, those communities matter so much. We grew up knowing our neighbors and making the effort to get involved with those around us that ensure our smalltown survival.

Dick Hedges was a man who took that need for a strong community to heart and helped build the fabric of Fort Scott in so, so many ways.

Last night, I was reading the Fort Scott Tribune, and I read an article in tribute to Dick. Its headline read: "Man who shared so much is remembered." It is a pretty good headline to have upon your death, "shared so much."

Dick was a coach, a teacher, a vice principal, a principal, a college president; he was a member of the community civic clubs and a churchgoer; he

served on local boards; he wrote for local papers; and he championed the arts in and around Fort Scott.

In 2018, he even opened a local book store because the community needed one. He was a man who shared so much of himself: his time, his love, his experience, his loyalty, and his commitment to others.

He was an advocate for athletics and sportsmanship and the way it could influence young students in a positive way. For 40 years, he shared his life with purpose and continually found new ways to do so.

But to Dick, I expect that was his definition of “community,” sharing oneself for the betterment of others with the expectation that they, too—the people whom you help—may pay it forward.

Dick has impacted the lives of so many, so many throughout his life, and his life gives me hope for others like him in towns across Kansas and around the country.

My prayers are with his wife Jan, the Fort Scott community, and his entire family and loved ones.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

UKRAINE

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I got the chance to hear some of Senator SASSE's remarks. I noted the floor chart with my name on it, accusing me of what he called tribal hackery.

I am not exactly sure what the rules of the Senate are. I am not sure that that is becoming of the U.S. Senate to use those terms about fellow Members, but let me come down to the floor to explain why I think we should have a legitimate debate in this Chamber about a phenomenon in which Republicans very often are not willing to cast their vote in a way that is aligned with their voice.

Yes, I noted this morning—as was displayed on Senator SASSE's chart—that this week, of the Republicans who stood up at a press conference and eviscerated President Biden's handling of the Ukraine crisis, two-thirds of them voted against the budget that included \$14 billion of aid to Ukraine. I see a fundamental inconsistency in criticizing an administration for not doing enough but then not being willing to cast a vote to get aid to the people of Ukraine.

Senator SASSE's second chart—the one that didn't accuse me of tribal hackery—laid out a very true statement, in which a small percentage of the overall budget is dedicated to Ukraine aid. That is, of course, true.

But the reason why I find it concerning that Members of the Senate who, I take their word for it, are genuinely interested in getting help to the people of Ukraine are then voting against the budget that delivers it, is because it speaks to a broader problem in the Senate today, which is a lack of interest in compromise, a lack of interest in finding a result—a fealty to the perfect and an antagonism to the good.

Mr. SASSE. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. MURPHY. Sure, I would be happy to yield.

Senator SASSE, I was going to try to respond to your critique, but I am happy to yield at this point.

Mr. SASSE. So let me just see if I understand what you just said.

Eight-tenths of 1 percent of the bill that was passed in the middle of the night last week is about Ukraine aid. Do you believe that the people who voted against it voted against it because they were against Ukrainian aid?

Mr. MURPHY. So every one of us approaches a big—

Mr. SASSE. I am asking a really simple question: Do you think a single person that your Twitter self-pleasuring was for—do you think a single person that voted against it voted against it because they were against Ukrainian aid?

Mr. MURPHY. Absolutely not.

Mr. SASSE. So, then, what is the point of the tweet?

Mr. MURPHY. The point is that the only way that this place passes legislation is compromise, is voting on pieces of legislation that have in it things that—

Mr. SASSE. What are the pieces, dude? It is \$1.5 trillion.

Mr. MURPHY. Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I would ask the Senators to direct their questioning to the President and give the Senators the decorum to respond.

Mr. MURPHY. So inside every piece of legislation are elements that many of us disagree with, right? Inside that budget that you voted against are all sorts of things that I disagree with. But, in the end, in order to govern the country, you have to be able to find a path to compromise.

And what I have found, over the time that I have been here, is that there is a pathway to getting things done. It generally involves 90 to 100 percent of Democrats and a small slice of Republicans. It is increasingly hard to find compromise that involves more than 10 or 15 Republicans because, as you state, inside these pieces of legislation there are things to disagree with, right? There are things that you find objectionable.

So while, in the past, I think people would set aside some of the things that they weren't happy about in the interest of the greater good, today there seems to be a higher bar, and the result is that it is just a lot harder to get things done.

Now, on the budget, luckily there were enough of us that were willing to celebrate the good, as opposed to the perfect, in order to get that budget passed and significant aid to the Ukrainian people across the finish line.

My worry is that, as time goes on, there will be an inability to find those coalitions and that we will be stuck in a world in which you can't get Federal budgets done, you can't get big pieces of legislation done because there isn't that interest in compromise that is

necessary sometimes to get passed a big package like the one that we passed earlier this week.

Mr. SASSE. When you are willing, if I may.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes, Senator SASSE.

Mr. SASSE. I think there are three topics. Argue with me if I misread the three topics before us.

One is Ukrainian aid. I don't think we differ. And the reason I came to make a speech—and you and I have talked about this offline multiple times in the past. Let me name the three: One, there is Ukrainian aid. Two, there is the budgeting and appropriations process. And, three, there is the grandstanding that happens for audiences that don't have anything to do with persuading a single human being that is called to work in this space.

In bucket one, I think you know that not a person who voted against it—the omni—voted against it because of the Ukrainian aid. So I think it is a dishonest argument.

In bucket two, which—well, I am jumping in and you have the floor; so I will give it back to you. But, in bucket two, you have repeatedly used the term “people won't vote for something because it is not perfect.” I think that, if we could put the appropriations process of the U.S. Congress up to the American people for a referendum, the idea that you want to give it a B-plus or an A-minus, I submit you should take that to the voters of Connecticut and try to persuade them of that, because I am going to guess that, whatever the overall approval rating is of Congress, it bounces around between like 9 and 15 percent. My guess is, the way we spend money, it is lower than that. So I don't think you want to give yourself an 86 or a 92 or a 95 percent because it is not perfect. It is obviously an F. The way that we spend money here is not deliberative; it is not thought out. It is always thousands of pages that come out in the middle of the night, and it always votes.

So to your point, that you said budgets pass around here with 50 of 50 Democrats and 10 or 12 of 50 Republicans, that is true. We do have a philosophical difference about whether or not the appropriations process works.

I think you are the one voting on the side that is misaligned with both fiscal reality and the role of the American people. But I didn't come to beat you up about voting.

I am supposed to direct it to the President.

Madam President, I don't think the Senator from Connecticut is on the floor because I came to attack him for voting for the omni. I didn't. He misrepresented why some people who voted against the omni were dishonest by saying they were for more Ukrainian aid when there was Ukrainian aid in this budget.

But the real thing we are talking about is grandstanding, because there is not a person on Earth who is persuaded by that kind of tweet. You

didn't move anybody. You are doing fan service for a subset of people who like CHRIS MURPHY. I get why some people would like things that you stand for and advocate for. I get it.

But there is not a person who disagreed with you who is moved because of a tweet like that. There is not an uninformed American who became informed. But there is a subset of the people who already like you that you got to grandstand for. That is all that happened with that tweet. The Republic got dumber because of that tweet. Nobody learned anything.

Mr. MURPHY. Reclaiming my time. Listen, I understand that Republicans would love for this inconvenient truth not to be pointed out for them—right?—the fact that they are eviscerating the President at press conferences for the crisis in Ukraine. There were Members at that press conference that Senator SASSE attended that said, if not for President Biden, this invasion would have never happened; that it was his fault.

Mr. SASSE. Not my view.

Mr. MURPHY. That might not have come from Senator SASSE's mouth, but there were others at that press conference—right?—who have repeatedly blamed this entire crisis not on Vladimir Putin but on Joe Biden's policies. And I do think it is convenient for Republicans to consistently eviscerate the President for his conduct but then not be willing to cast the difficult votes necessary to help the President effectuate a policy there.

The consequence of a "no" vote on that budget, whether you like it or not, was that assistance money not getting to Ukraine. There wasn't another vote in front of us. The only choice that this Senate had was, Do we support a piece of legislation that includes necessary money—

Mr. SASSE. Will the gentleman yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is out of order.

Mr. MURPHY. I let the Senator finish.

The choice before this Senate was, Are we going to support a piece of legislation that includes the necessary money in order to allow for Ukraine to defend itself and for this administration to get emergency resources, or are we going to vote it down?

And I understand that the American public are rightly upset about the way in which we budget. But, on that day, there was one choice before this body.

So I do see that there is an inherent contradiction between Republicans standing up at press conferences, which, frankly, are speaking most often to the same audience that you believe that my tweets are speaking to, right? Most often, these press conferences are designed to rally the faithful.

So I think it is a bit sanctimonious to suggest that only one of us in this Chamber is involved in preaching to the choir. Much of the engagement in

press conferences here, around this issue of Ukraine, ends up speaking to base audiences, and the message being sent to that audience is that President Biden isn't doing enough.

And then, when we had an opportunity to pass bipartisan legislation to give him the tools to do more, the same Republicans that were at that press conference criticizing the President decided—and, I submit to you, for legitimate reasons having nothing to do with the Ukraine money—to cast a vote that had the consequence, if it was the majority position in this body, to disapprove of that money, to reject that money.

Mr. SASSE. Will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator yield his time—

Mr. MURPHY. I would.

Mr. SASSE. I would direct a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER.—for a question?

The Senator from Nebraska.

And I would ask both Senators to direct their remarks to the President, please.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, I would ask the Senator from Connecticut to explain to me why the only choice was \$1.5 trillion or zero. The Senate could work its will and have passed the \$13.6 billion of aid money 10 minutes later.

Madam President, could the Senator from Connecticut explain to me this apparent—to me, false—choice between \$1.5 trillion and zero. Why were there no other options?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut wish to respond to the question?

Mr. MURPHY. I will. Thank you, Madam President.

The Senator is exactly right. Not only was there another option—pass the Ukraine supplemental on its own—there were a million other options. Right? There are always different ways that we can do things, and that is always a reason to vote no.

I could always choose to vote no on a measure before us because I can dream up of a scenario in which the outcome would be better aligned with my priorities. I think that is a very convenient reason to defend a "no" vote: that there is a theoretical outcome that would be more in alignment with your beliefs.

That is not how things work here, right? We are presented with pieces of legislation we all have input into. This was not a Democratic bill. This was a bill worked out with many Republicans as well. And ultimately we had a choice. We had a choice.

And, again, I think it is a lot easier to just come down here to vote no on everything. But when life and death are at stake in a place like Ukraine, I think, on the willingness to support a piece of legislation that maybe has some things in it you don't like, the bar may be a little bit higher.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield his time for a question?

Mr. MURPHY. I don't think I have anybody seeking to yield at this point.

Let me say this. I take Senator SASSE's position seriously, and I want him to take my position seriously, as well, because I object to the idea of my effort to draw attention to the fact that Republicans voted against a bill that includes significant money for Ukraine as political hackery. I object to that characterization because I do think I am speaking to a broader trend line in this body, in which it is seemingly harder than ever to get both sides to the table to agree to big things that change people's lives or change realities overseas.

I think Senator SASSE makes an important point, which is the way we are doing things right now with respect to the budget is insanity. I agree with that. The lack of transparency, the fact that all of this work is shopped to the majority and the minority leaders—that is not good for government; that is not good for transparency. I think there are legitimate reasons why Members of this body would vote against the budget.

But that is not what my statement was about. It was about trying to juxtapose that vote to this criticism of the President. I do think those two things are relevant because the American public is being given the impression by many Republicans that the President isn't being serious enough about this crisis or isn't working hard enough at this crisis.

And I do think it is legitimate to put on the table for a discussion the fact that the very people who are criticizing the President's conduct are often not willing to support the funding necessary for him to carry out that mission—for reasons that have nothing to do with Ukraine but have, in the end, the effect of denying the President, if this position was the majority—it was not last week—given that the consequence of voting down the budget would have been to ultimately deny that funding to the President and to the people of Ukraine.

I think this is a legitimate topic for discussion, and I will continue to raise it. I will take the Senator's word seriously and try to raise it in a way that is constructive, but I think this is a legitimate topic for discussion in the U.S. Senate.

This is not about rallying the base. This is about trying to promote a discussion about how we make this place more functional and how these press conferences that Republicans are doing end up having some connection to the reality of the votes that happen on the floor of the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SASSE. Madam President, in the interest of comity, I will underscore three points of agreement from Senator MURPHY's last few minutes there, as well, just as a way to close us out.

No. 1, I agree with the Senator that there is a lot of grandstanding all over

political theater right now, and that certainly includes people on my side of the aisle who have tried to imply that pieces of this are President Biden's fault; that the evildoer here is Vladimir Putin, who is targeting women and children; and Americans should be on the same team against that evil.

So to the degree that the Senator is partly motivated by frustration with some grandstanding that he has seen by people who have an "R" behind their name, I agree.

Second point: I am for this funding, and my criticism of the Biden administration has not been because they wouldn't support funding. In the intel space, there are a whole bunch of arguments and fights we have been having that we can't talk about in this setting but where I just want them to go faster.

But the idea that the problem with the administration, from my point of view, is an unwillingness to fund—that isn't my position, and so the Senator and I are united that that would be an unfair criticism of the Biden administration.

And third and finally, he called our budgeting and appropriations process "insanity." Let's put a pin in that because what I was voting against last week was not done for the purposes of saying the Ukrainian aid money shouldn't move, but it is saying that an insane budget process shouldn't work this way, where the American people can't get access into other monies being spent. And we have 12 or 13 subcommittees of the appropriations process, and we almost never get to vote bill by bill.

I would gladly have us stay here 24/7 for 2, 3, 4 weeks—however long it took. And if we had to cast not just 12 or 13 subcommittee approps packages, but if we had to vote on hundreds or thousands of things item by item—it is a pretty clunky process but a much better process than we have right now, which the Senator from Connecticut rightly described is "insane." On that we agree. Thank you for engaging.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The Senator from Nevada.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 794, 795, 796, and 797; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc, without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Bidtah N. Becker, of Arizona, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022 (New Position); Gretchen Gonzalez Davidson, of Michigan, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2022; Vanessa Northington Gamble, of the District of Columbia, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2026; and David Anthony Hajdu, of New York, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for a term expiring January 26, 2026?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

SAFE CONNECTIONS ACT OF 2021

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 193, S. 120.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 120) to prevent and respond to the misuse of communications services that facilitates domestic violence and other crimes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Safe Connections Act of 2021".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, terms used in this Act that are defined in section 344(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, have the meanings given those terms in such section 344(a).

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, human trafficking, and related crimes are life-threatening issues and have lasting and harmful effects on individuals, families, and entire communities.

(2) Survivors often lack meaningful support and options when establishing independence from an abuser, including barriers such as financial insecurity and limited access to reliable communications tools to maintain essential connections with family, social safety networks, employers, and support services.

(3) Perpetrators of violence and abuse described in paragraph (1) increasingly use technological and communications tools to exercise control over, monitor, and abuse their victims.

(4) Communications law can play a public interest role in the promotion of safety, life, and property with respect to the types of violence and abuse described in paragraph (1). For example, independent access to a wireless phone plan

can assist survivors in establishing security and autonomy.

(5) Safeguards within communications services can serve a role in preventing abuse and narrowing the digital divide experienced by survivors of abuse.

SEC. 4. PROTECTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVORS WITHIN COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.

Part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 344. PROTECTION OF SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, HUMAN TRAFFICKING, AND RELATED CRIMES.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(1) ABUSER.—The term 'abuser' means an individual who has committed or allegedly committed a covered act against—

"(A) an individual who seeks relief under subsection (b); or

"(B) an individual in the care of an individual who seeks relief under subsection (b).

"(2) COVERED ACT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered act' means conduct that constitutes—

"(i) a crime described in section 4002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(a)), including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking;

"(ii) an act or practice described in paragraph (11) or (12) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102) (relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons and sex trafficking, respectively); or

"(iii) an act under State law, Tribal law, or the Uniform Code of Military Justice that is similar to an offense described in clause (i) or (ii).

"(B) CONVICTION NOT REQUIRED.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to require a criminal conviction or any other determination of a court in order for conduct to constitute a covered act.

"(3) COVERED PROVIDER.—The term 'covered provider' means a provider of a private mobile service or commercial mobile service, as those terms are defined in section 332(d).

"(4) PRIMARY ACCOUNT HOLDER.—The term 'primary account holder' means an individual who is a party to a mobile service contract with a covered provider.

"(5) SHARED MOBILE SERVICE CONTRACT.—The term 'shared mobile service contract'—

"(A) means a mobile service contract for an account that includes not less than 2 consumers; and

"(B) does not include enterprise services offered by a covered provider.

"(6) SURVIVOR.—The term 'survivor' means an individual who is not less than 18 years old and—

"(A) against whom a covered act has been committed or allegedly committed; or

"(B) who cares for another individual against whom a covered act has been committed or allegedly committed (provided that the individual providing care did not commit or allegedly commit the covered act).

"(b) SEPARATION OF LINES FROM SHARED MOBILE SERVICE CONTRACT.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 business days after receiving a completed line separation request from a survivor pursuant to subsection (c), a covered provider shall, as applicable, with respect to a shared mobile service contract under which the survivor and the abuser each use a line—

"(A) separate the line of the survivor, and the line of any individual in the care of the survivor, from the shared mobile service contract; or

"(B) separate the line of the abuser from the shared mobile service contract.

"(2) LIMITATIONS ON PENALTIES, FEES, AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—A covered provider may not make the separation of a line from a shared

mobile service contract under paragraph (1) contingent on any requirement other than the requirements under subsection (c), including—

“(A) payment of a fee, penalty, or other charge;

“(B) maintaining contractual or billing responsibility of a separated line with the provider;

“(C) approval of separation by the primary account holder, if the primary account holder is not the survivor;

“(D) a prohibition or limitation, including one described in subparagraph (A), on number portability, if such portability is technically feasible, or a request to change phone numbers;

“(E) a prohibition or limitation on the separation of lines as a result of arrears accrued by the account;

“(F) an increase in the rate charged for the mobile service plan of the primary account holder with respect to service on any remaining line or lines; or

“(G) any other limitation or requirement not listed under subsection (c).

“(3) RESPONSIBILITY FOR TRANSFERRED TELEPHONE NUMBERS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), beginning on the date on which a covered provider transfers billing responsibilities for and rights to a telephone number or numbers to a survivor under paragraph (1)(A) in response to a line separation request submitted by the survivor under subsection (c), the survivor shall assume financial responsibility, including for monthly service costs, for the transferred telephone number or numbers.

“(4) RESPONSIBILITY FOR TELEPHONE NUMBERS TRANSFERRED TO ANOTHER SERVICE PROVIDER.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), upon the transfer of a telephone number under paragraph (1)(B) in response to a line separation request submitted by a survivor under subsection (c), the survivor shall have no further financial responsibilities for the telephone number or for any mobile device associated with the telephone number.

“(5) NOTICE TO SURVIVOR.—If a covered provider separates a line from a shared mobile service contract under paragraph (1) and the primary account holder is not the survivor, the covered provider shall notify the survivor of the date on which the covered provider intends to give any formal notice to the primary account holder.

“(c) LINE SEPARATION REQUEST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A survivor seeking relief under subsection (b) shall submit to the covered provider a line separation request that—

“(A) verifies that an individual who uses a line under the shared mobile service contract has committed or allegedly committed a covered act against the survivor or an individual in the survivor’s care, by providing—

“(i) a copy of a signed affidavit from a licensed medical or mental health care provider, licensed military medical or mental health care provider, licensed social worker, licensed victim services provider, or licensed military victim services provider, or an employee of a court, acting within the scope of that person’s employment; or

“(ii) a copy of a police report, statements provided by police, including military police, to magistrates or judges, charging documents, protective or restraining orders, military protective orders, or any other official record that documents the covered act;

“(B) in the case of relief sought under subsection (b)(1)(A), with respect to—

“(i) a line used by the survivor that the survivor seeks to have separated, states that the survivor is the user of that specific line; and

“(ii) a line used by an individual in the care of the survivor that the survivor seeks to have separated—

“(I) includes an affidavit setting forth that the individual is in the care of the survivor; and

“(II) a statement that the individual is the user of that specific line; and

“(C) requests relief under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1) and identifies each line that should be separated.

“(2) REMOTE OPTION.—A covered provider shall offer a survivor the ability to submit a line separation request under paragraph (1) through secure remote means that are easily navigable.

“(3) ENHANCED PROTECTIONS UNDER STATE LAW.—This subsection shall not affect any law or regulation of a State providing communications protections for survivors (or any similar category of individuals) that has less stringent requirements for providing evidence of a covered act (or any similar category of conduct) than this subsection.

“(d) CONFIDENTIAL AND SECURE TREATMENT OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.—Notwithstanding section 222(b), a covered provider shall treat any information submitted by a survivor under subsection (c) as confidential and securely dispose of the information not later than 90 days after receiving the information.

“(e) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION TO CONSUMERS.—A covered provider shall make information about the options and process described in subsections (b) and (c) readily available to consumers—

“(1) on the website and any mobile application of the provider;

“(2) in physical stores; and

“(3) in other forms of public-facing consumer communication.

“(f) TECHNICAL INFEASIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The requirement to effectuate a line separation request pursuant to subsection (b)(1) shall not apply to a covered provider if the covered provider cannot operationally or technically effectuate the request.

“(2) NOTIFICATION.—If a covered provider cannot operationally or technically effectuate a line separation request as described in paragraph (1), the covered provider shall notify the individual who submitted the request of that infeasibility as soon as is reasonably possible, and in any event not later than 48 hours after receiving the request.

“(g) LIABILITY PROTECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered provider and any officer, director, employee, vendor, or agent thereof shall not be subject to liability to a survivor or any other person for any claims deriving from an action taken or omission made with respect to compliance with subsection (c).

“(2) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority of the Commission to prosecute violations of this section or any rules or regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to this section.”.

SEC. 5. RULEMAKING ON PROTECTIONS FOR SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(2) the term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission;

(3) the term “covered hotline” means a hotline related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, sex trafficking, severe forms of trafficking in persons, or any other similar act;

(4) the term “Lifeline program” means the program set forth in subpart E of part 54 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); and

(5) the term “text message” has the meaning given the term in section 227(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)).

(b) RULEMAKINGS.—

(1) HOTLINE CALLS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall commence a rulemaking to consider whether to—

(i) require providers of wireless communications services or wireline voice services to omit

from consumer-facing logs of calls or text messages any records of calls or text messages to covered hotlines, while maintaining internal records of those calls and messages; and

(ii) establish, and provide for updates on a quarterly basis of, a central database of covered hotlines to be used by providers of wireless communications services or wireline voice services in complying with the rule described in clause (i).

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—The rulemaking conducted under subparagraph (A) shall include consideration of—

(i) the ability of law enforcement agencies or survivors to access a log of calls or text messages in a criminal investigation or civil proceeding;

(ii) the ability of providers of wireless communications services or wireline voice services to—

(I) identify logs that are consumer-facing; and

(II) omit certain consumer-facing logs, while maintaining internal records of such calls and text messages; and

(iii) any other factors associated with the implementation of clauses (i) and (ii) to protect survivors of domestic violence, including factors that may impact smaller providers.

(C) NO EFFECT ON LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to—

(i) limit or otherwise affect the ability of a law enforcement agency to access a log of calls or text messages in a criminal investigation; or

(ii) alter or otherwise expand provider requirements under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (Public Law 103-414; 108 Stat. 4279) or the amendments made by that Act.

(2) LINE SEPARATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall adopt rules to implement section 344 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In adopting rules under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consider—

(i) privacy protections;

(ii) account security and fraud detection;

(iii) account billing procedures;

(iv) liability;

(v) procedures for notification of survivors about line separation processes;

(vi) the requirements for remote submission of a line separation request, including how that option facilitates submission of verification information and meets the other requirements of section 344 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act;

(vii) implementation timelines, based on provider size and geographic reach;

(viii) notice to account holders;

(ix) situations in which a covered provider cannot operationally or technically separate a telephone number or numbers from a shared service plan such that the provider cannot effectuate a line separation request;

(x) financial responsibility for transferred telephone numbers; and

(xi) whether and how the survivor can elect to take financial responsibility for the mobile device associated with the separated line.

(3) LIFELINE PROGRAM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, or as part of a general rulemaking proceeding relating to the Lifeline program set forth in subpart E of part 54 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), whichever occurs earlier, the Commission shall adopt rules that allow a survivor suffering from financial hardship who meets the requirements under section 344(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, without regard to whether the survivor meets the otherwise applicable eligibility requirements of the Lifeline program, to—

(i) enroll in the Lifeline program as quickly as is feasible; and

(ii) participate in the Lifeline program based on such qualifications for not more than 6 months.

(B) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after completing the rulemaking under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall—

(i) evaluate the effectiveness of the Commission's provision of support to survivors through the Lifeline program;

(ii) assess the detection and elimination of fraud, waste, and abuse with respect to the support described in clause (i); and

(iii) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the evaluation and assessment described in clauses (i) and (ii), respectively.

(C) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the ability of a survivor who meets the requirements under section 344(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, to participate in the Lifeline program indefinitely if the individual otherwise qualifies for the Lifeline program under the rules of the program.

(D) NOTIFICATION.—A provider of wireless communications services that receives a line separation request pursuant to section 344 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, shall inform the individual who submitted the request of—

(i) the existence of the Lifeline program;

(ii) who qualifies to participate in the Lifeline program; and

(iii) how to participate in the Lifeline program.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The requirements under section 344 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, shall take effect 60 days after the date on which the Federal Communications Commission adopts the rules implementing that section pursuant to section 5(b)(2) of this Act.

SEC. 7. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to abrogate, limit, or otherwise affect the provisions set forth in the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (Public Law 103-414; 108 Stat. 4279) and the amendments made by that Act, any authority granted to the Commission pursuant to that Act or the amendments made by that Act, or any regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to that Act or the amendments made by that Act.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be withdrawn; that the substitute amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to; and that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 5001), in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

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

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I know of no further debate on the bill.

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

The bill (S. 120), as amended, was passed.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI AND AMERICORPS SENIORS VOLUNTEERS

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 551, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 551) recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States.

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

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on adoption of the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 551) was agreed to.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the preamble be agreed to and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

INCREASING MEMBERSHIP TO THE SENATE NATO OBSERVER GROUP

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, due to the current events happening in Europe, the Republican leader and I have agreed to increase the membership to the Senate NATO Observer Group by two additional Senators. The additional Democratic Senator will be named at a later date.

INCREASING MEMBERSHIP TO THE SENATE NATO OBSERVER GROUP

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, due to the current events happening in Europe, the Majority Leader and I have agreed to increase the membership of the Senate NATO Observer Group by two additional Senators. For the additional Republican Senator, I ask that Senator MORAN be added to participate in the group.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week, the Senate will consider 12 outstanding judicial nominees. These nominees represent the continued efforts of President Biden and Senate Democrats to bring much-needed professional and demographic diversity to the Federal bench.

This latest lineup of nominees include legal academics, public defenders, civil rights lawyers, sitting State and Federal judges, prosecutors, and private practitioners. Each of these nominees has the character, tempera-

ment, and qualifications to serve with distinction.

The first nominee is Judge Jacqueline Corley, nominated to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of California.

For more than a decade, Judge Corley has served as a Federal magistrate judge in the Northern District of California. She has handled cases implicating a variety of complex statutory and constitutional questions, from immigration to employment to national security matters. And in her time on the bench, she has amassed a record that reflects her evenhanded, impartial approach to the law. Earlier in her career, Judge Corley spent nearly two decades working in private legal practice and as a career law clerk to Judge Charles Breyer, who also serves on the Northern District of California.

Judge Corley received a unanimous rating of "Well Qualified" from the American Bar Association, has the strong support of Senators FEINSTEIN and PADILLA, and received overwhelming bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee.

Next, we have Fred Slaughter, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California.

Judge Slaughter currently serves as a judge on the California Superior Court for Orange County. In 2014, Governor Jerry Brown appointed him to this position, and since then, Judge Slaughter has presided over a wide variety of cases, including civil cases, felony criminal cases, and juvenile justice proceedings. After graduating from the UCLA School of Law, he started his career as a deputy city attorney with the Los Angeles City Attorney's office, before moving to the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Central District of California as an Assistant U.S. Attorney. He prosecuted a wide range of cases and developed a deep understanding of the district to which he has been nominated.

Judge Slaughter has the strong support of both his home-State Senators, Mrs. FEINSTEIN and Mr. PADILLA, and he was rated unanimously "Well Qualified" by the American Bar Association. His deep commitment to public service, coupled with his broad experience, makes him an excellent nominee to the Federal bench.

The Senate will also consider the nomination of Ruth Montenegro to the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California.

Since 2018, Judge Montenegro has served as a U.S. magistrate judge in the Southern District of California. Prior to that, she served as a State court judge. With her combined experience on federal and State courts, Judge Montenegro has been on the bench for nearly 8 years. She has presided over thousands of cases, including more than 30 jury trials and over 100 bench trials.

Judge Montenegro was unanimously rated "Qualified" by the American Bar

Association, and both Senators FEINSTEIN and PADILLA strongly support her nomination. A graduate of UCLA School of Law, Judge Montenegro worked as an attorney for more than 19 years before assuming the bench.

Judge Montenegro is also the child of immigrants and a first-generation college graduate. Throughout her career, she has made it a priority to give back to the community. In 2018, she served as chair of the California Bar Foundation's scholarship committee, and, for many years, she served as president and chair of the scholarships committee for the El Centro Education Foundation.

Judge Montenegro was voted out of the Judiciary Committee with bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to support her nomination.

Next is Victoria Calvert, nominated to be a judge on the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia. Ms. Calvert is a highly experienced litigator with a proven commitment to ensuring equal justice for all.

Ms. Calvert attended Duke University and received her law degree from the New York University School of Law. She then spent 6 years working in private practice before dedicating her career to public service. Currently, she serves as a staff attorney with the Federal defender program in the Northern District of Georgia, a position she has held since 2012. In this role, she has represented hundreds of indigent clients. Ms. Calvert has the strong support of her home-State Senators, Mr. OSSOFF and Mr. WARNOCK. And she received a unanimous "Well Qualified" rating from the ABA.

I have said many times that public defenders are vastly underrepresented on our Nation's courts, and I believe that Ms. Calvert will bring a valuable perspective to the bench, including an appreciation for the real world impact of judicial decisionmaking.

We also will be considering the nomination of Julie Rubin, who has been selected to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland.

For the past 8 years, she has served as an associate judge on the Circuit Court for Baltimore City. In this role, Judge Rubin has presided over nearly 950 civil and criminal cases that have gone to verdict or judgment, including 122 jury trials.

Prior to assuming the bench, Judge Rubin spent 15 years litigating in private practice and tried 17 cases to verdict or judgment. She also rose to become the vice president of her firm. Judge Rubin received her undergraduate degree from Mount Holyoke College and her law degree from the University of Maryland School of Law. And she received a unanimous "Well Qualified" rating from the American Bar Association.

Judge Rubin has the strong support of her home State Senators, Mr. CARDIN and Mr. VAN HOLLEN. She also received bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee. As a native Mary-

lander with a wealth of trial experience on and off the bench, Judge Rubin will make an excellent addition to the District Court.

Next we have Hector Gonzalez, nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

Mr. Gonzalez is an accomplished litigator. Over the course of his career, he has tried more than 20 civil and criminal cases, the majority of them as chief counsel. Mr. Gonzalez served as a prosecutor for almost 10 years, serving in both the Manhattan District Attorney's Office as well as the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Southern District of New York. In addition to the criminal law expertise he developed as a prosecutor, Mr. Gonzalez has also gained considerable civil litigation experience, managing complex litigation matters involving bankruptcy, anti-trust, and professional liability.

In recognition of his long career as an accomplished litigator, Mr. Gonzalez was inducted as a fellow into the American College of Trial Lawyers. The ABA found him unanimously "Well Qualified." In addition, he has the strong support of Senators SCHUMER and GILLIBRAND.

Next we have John Chun, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington.

Judge Chun has served on Washington State courts for the past 7 years, first as a judge on the King County Superior Court and currently as a judge on the Washington Court of Appeals. Throughout his time on the bench, he has presided over 90 civil and criminal cases that have gone to verdict or judgment. These cases have been almost evenly split between jury and bench trials.

Prior to his judicial appointment, Judge Chun spent 10 years as a commercial and employment litigation attorney. Practicing in both Federal and State court, he tried five cases to verdict or judgment and became partner at his firm in just 6 years. Judge Chun received his undergraduate degree from Columbia University and his law degree from Cornell Law School. He then began his legal career by clerking for the Honorable Eugene A. Wright on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

Judge Chun has the strong support of Senators MURRAY and CANTWELL. He received a bipartisan vote in the Senate Judiciary Committee. He also received a unanimous "Well Qualified" rating from the American Bar Association. Judge Chun's demonstrable commitment to justice and the rule of law will serve him well as a district court judge.

Next is Sarah Geraghty, nominated to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia.

Since 2003, Ms. Geraghty has been an attorney at the Southern Center for Human Rights, where she has advocated for the fair and equal treatment

of people in the criminal legal system, regardless of their ability to afford counsel. Ms. Geraghty has approximately 20 years of litigation experience, during which time she has handled every stage of the legal process, from pretrial investigations to briefing and arguing appeals.

Ms. Geraghty has been widely recognized for her work. In 2020, she was named Attorney of the Year by Georgia's primary legal publication, the Fulton County "Daily Report". In 2017, Emory University School of Law's public interest committee gave Ms. Geraghty its Unsung Devotion to Those Most in Need Award. Ms. Geraghty was rated "Qualified" by the American Bar Association, and both Senator OSSOFF and Senator WARNOCK strongly support her nomination.

In addition to her legal practice, Ms. Geraghty is a lecturer at Emory Law School and a part-time instructor at Georgia State University College of Law. Ms. Geraghty has received numerous letters of support, including from law enforcement officials and attorneys who have opposed her in litigation. These letters demonstrate that Ms. Geraghty's approach to resolving legal disputes has always been, as one letter put it, "collaborative rather than confrontational." Another letter stated that she has always "approached conflicts between the parties with flexibility and an open mind." These qualities will serve her well on the bench. Ms. Geraghty received bipartisan support in the Judiciary Committee. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of her nomination.

We will also consider Georgette Castner, who has been nominated to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of New Jersey.

She is an experienced litigator with a deep knowledge of the District of New Jersey. A graduate of the College of New Jersey and Rutgers Law School, Ms. Castner has spent almost 15 years in private practice, representing a range of individual and corporate clients. Over the course of her career, she has litigated matters spanning various areas of civil and criminal law.

Ms. Castner received a "Qualified" rating from the ABA and has the strong support of her home-State Senators, Mr. BOOKER and Mr. MENENDEZ.

Next is Judge Cristina Silva, nominated to the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

Judge Silva currently serves on Nevada's Eighth Judicial District Court, where she handles a mix of civil and criminal proceedings. In her time on the bench, Judge Silva has presided over 15 trials, the vast majority of which were jury trials. She has also remained active in the local legal community, including through service on the board of directors of the Nevada Latino Bar Association.

Before her appointment to the bench, Judge Silva served as both a local and Federal prosecutor. She helped lead the domestic violence unit of the Miami-

Dade State's Attorney's Office and then served for nearly a decade as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the District of Nevada, ultimately becoming the chief of that office's criminal division. Judge Silva received a unanimous rating of "Well Qualified" from the ABA and has the strong support of Senators CORTEZ MASTO and ROSEN.

We also will be considering the nomination of Anne Traum, who has likewise been chosen to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada.

Professor Traum is currently a professor of Law at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, William S. Boyd School of Law, a position she has held since 2014, and associate dean for experiential legal education. Her commitment to the university is admirable: She founded, and now leads, the appellate clinic, which allows students to brief and argue cases before the Ninth Circuit or the Nevada Supreme Court.

Additionally, she took 1-year leave of absence from the university from 2015 to 2016 to serve as special counsel with the U.S. Department of Justice's Office for Access to Justice. The breadth of her career does not stop there, though. She was an assistant federal public defender in the Federal public defender's office in Las Vegas from 2002 to 2008 and, prior to that, served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Civil Division of the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Nevada from 2000 to 2002.

Professor Traum has the strong support of her home-State Senators, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO and Ms. ROSEN, and was rated "Well Qualified" by the American Bar Association.

Finally, we will be considering Judge Alison Nathan, who has been nominated to serve on the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

Judge Nathan is an experienced litigator and an accomplished jurist. She has served on the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York since 2012. While on the bench, she has authored over 1,500 opinions and has presided over 45 trials that have gone to verdict or judgment. With that long record, her reversal rate is an impressive 1 percent. I have no doubt that she will be a valuable addition to the Second Circuit. After attending Cornell University and Cornell Law School, Judge Nathan clerked for Judge Betty B. Fletcher on the Ninth Circuit and for Justice John Paul Stevens of the U.S. Supreme Court. From there, she began her legal practice, where she specialized in civil litigation and developed a large pro bono practice focused on LGBTQ rights and appeals for inmates on death row. She also held positions in government and academia.

Judge Nathan has the strong support of Senator SCHUMER and Senator GILLIBRAND, and she was unanimously rated "Well Qualified" by the American Bar Association. Her record on the bench is deeply impressive. She has proven, without a doubt, that she understands the difference between a policy advo-

cate and a judge, and I am certain that she will continue to administer justice in a thoughtful, evenhanded manner.

I support all of these outstanding nominees and encourage my colleagues to join me in voting for their confirmation.

TRIBUTE TO RAY DRAKE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank Raymond "Ray" Drake for his extraordinary service to the United Parcel Service, UPS. Earlier this year, Ray announced that after 46 years at the UPS, including 11 years as vice president of UPS State Public Affairs, he will be retiring this April.

Ray has a profound record of service to UPS, rising through the ranks and serving with a deep sense of loyalty and respect. In 1976, Ray was first hired at UPS as a package handler while attending the College of New Jersey. While balancing his studies, Ray was promoted to part-time hub supervisor. Upon graduating with a degree in political science, he moved to the metro New York district to become a package car driver.

Just 2 years after his graduation from college, Ray was promoted to a full-time management position, joining engineering and operations, where he spent 35 years of his career. Working in engineering and operations, Ray took on a number of assignments, holding positions in three UPS districts and numerous package and air divisions. In these roles, Ray utilized his strong leadership, technical, and analytical skills to develop and deploy operational practices throughout UPS. For the last 11 years, Ray brought his talents in leadership and advocacy to the UPS's State public affairs team, where he worked tirelessly with key policymakers in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and Wisconsin.

In Illinois, Ray has served far beyond his responsibilities with the UPS. Ray was deeply involved with the State chambers of commerce and is the former commerce chairman, the only UPS manager to chair a State chamber. Ray currently serves on several boards and committees, including the Illinois Chamber Foundation Board, the Chicagoland Chamber Board of Directors, the Chicagoland Chamber's Public Policy Committee, and the Board of Directors of Illinois' Civic Federation. In support of UPS's international initiatives, Ray serves on the Illinois advisory council for the U.S. Global Leadership Coalition and the advisory council for North Rhein Westphalia-Invest, and previously served as vice chairman of the Illinois International Business Council, an organization he helped found. In this role, Ray has used his decades of experience in transportation and operational leadership to educate and engage community leaders on investments in development and diplomacy and has used these relationships to help strengthen Illinois' economy.

In the true spirit of his own legacy at UPS, Ray was a leader in developing the wildly successful Chicagoland Regional Education Programs, which has allowed thousands of young Illinois residents the opportunity to go to college while working at UPS.

I want to close by congratulating Ray Drake on his distinguished career with the UPS and thank him for all he has done and all he will continue to do to serve communities in Illinois and across the world. Chicago is grateful for all of his service and sacrifice. Now, as he enters the next chapter in his life, I want to wish Ray and his family the very best in a long and happy retirement.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications which have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD-423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

Hon. ROBERT MENENDEZ,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 22-10, concerning the Missile Defense Agency's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the United Kingdom for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$700 million. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

JEDIDIAH P. ROYAL,
(For James A. Hursch, Director.)

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22-10

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of the United Kingdom.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment* \$400 million.
Other \$300 million.

Total \$700 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:

Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One (1) Ballistic Missile Defense Radar (BMDR).

Two (2) Command and Control Battle Management and Communications.

(C2BMC) User Nodes (with network capability required to connect to the C2BMC System to support radar operations).

Non-MOE: Also included are design and construction of a combined radar-equipment shelter; encryption devices, secure communication equipment, and other required COMSEC equipment to support radar operations; spare and repair parts, support and testing equipment, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Missile Defense Agency (UK-1-ZAB).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: UK-1-ZAA.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: March 17, 2022.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

United Kingdom—Ballistic Missile Defense Radar (BMDR) and Command and Control Battle Management and Communications (C2BMC)

The Government of the United Kingdom (UK) has requested to buy one (1) Ballistic Missile Defense Radar (BMDR); and two (2) Command and Control Battle Management and Communications (C2BMC) user nodes (with network capability required to connect to the C2BMC System to support radar operations). Also included are design and construction of a combined radar-equipment shelter; encryption devices, secure communication equipment, and other required COMSEC equipment to support radar operations; spare and repair parts, support and testing equipment, publications and technical documentation, personnel training and training equipment, U.S. Government and contractor engineering, technical and logistics support services, and other related elements of logistical and program support. The total estimated program cost is \$700 million.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a NATO Ally that is a force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

The proposed sale will improve UK's ability to meet current and future ballistic missile threats to the UK and NATO by improving the effectiveness of NATO BMD systems. The United Kingdom will have no difficulty absorbing the BMD Radar into its armed forces.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be Lockheed Martin, Moorestown, NJ. There are no known offset agreements proposed in connection with this potential sale.

Implementation of this proposed sale may require the assignment of approximately 15 U.S. Government and up to 100 contractor representatives to the UK, at any given time, during the construction, installation, integration and testing of the BMDR and C2BMC capability.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22-10

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The United Kingdom (UK) Ballistic Missile Defense Radar (BMDR) is a scaled version of the U.S. Long Range Discrimination Radar. It will provide continuous and precise tracking and discrimination of missile threats, persistent long-range midcourse discrimination, precision tracking and hit assessment. Discrimination is a critical capability of missile defense, which will provide data to distinguish lethal objects from debris and decoys around the lethal object. The UK will use the Command and Control, Battle Management, and Communications (C2BMC) system to integrate the UK BMDR. This will improve the effectiveness of North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) missile defenses.

2. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures or equivalent systems, which might reduce system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that the United Kingdom can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of the United Kingdom.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, on March 14, 2022, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote No. 79, the motion to invoke cloture on Executive Calendar No. 726, the nomination of Shalanda D. Young of Louisiana, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget. I was on a bipartisan congressional delegation visit to Poland, meeting with refugees displaced by the violence caused by the current, illegal invasion of Ukraine.

Had I been present, I would have voted yes to proceed with her nomination as Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

TRIBUTE TO DAN CNOSSEN

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a truly incredible and historic individual.

Dan Cnossen is a textbook definition of honor and bravery. His story began when he was accepted into the U.S. Naval Academy after high school. In 2003, he completed the grueling process. Over the course of the next 6 years, Dan was deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan where he rose in rank to becoming the officer in charge of an 18-man SEAL platoon. In 2009, late on a night mission in the mountains, Dan stepped

on an improvised explosive device and lost both of his legs. Later, he was awarded a Purple Heart and a Bronze Star with Valor. Over the next 2 years, Dan fought for his life. He endured 40 different surgeries, while simultaneously reintroducing himself into civilian life—neither an easy task on their own, but coupled together creates one extraordinary obstacle.

While Dan was in rehab, though, he was introduced to the sport of cross-country skiing and biathlon. Dan pushed himself and was dedicated to earning a spot in the 2014 U.S. Paralympic Team, leading to an incredible—and ongoing—career. In 2018, Dan outstandingly won a gold medal, four silvers, and one bronze. In addition to his 2018 medals, he also earned the honor of Best Male Athlete of the Games. Most recently, at the 2022 Winter Paralympic Games, Dan made his country proud once again by winning gold in Cross Country Skiing Mixed Relay.

I think his motto “keep going, keep covering ground” beautifully sums up his journey so far and should serve as an inspiration for those who get to hear his story. His Paralympic career has been remarkable to see, and it is with great pride that I get to share Kansas as a home to such an outstanding individual and athlete. I ask my colleagues now to join me in recognizing Dan and his unbelievable story.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING SEASONAL SHOPPE

• Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize an outstanding Kentucky small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit. This week, it is my privilege to recognize the small business, Seasonal Shoppe of Salyersville, KY, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

Bekah Frazier Rudd, owner of Seasonal Shoppe, will tell you herself that retail runs in her blood. Bekah inherited her knack for running a business from her mother and father, who owned Frazier's Prater Drug Store, the longest continuously operating business in Salyersville. Bekah's mother, Patricia Frazier, started off with a little corner in her husband's store selling arts and crafts items. Throughout the years in the drug store, the popularity of Patricia's corner eventually led her to start a business of her own, just a few doors down from her husband's pharmacy. Thus, Seasonal Shoppe was born and has been operating since 1997. Eight years later, when Patricia left to take over Frazier's Prater Drug Store, Bekah stepped in to fill her mother's shoes as owner and operator of Seasonal Shoppe.

Though Seasonal Shoppe has since shifted towards selling more clothes and general home goods than arts and

crafts, little else about the store or its quality of service has changed. Bekah continues the same friendly atmosphere created by her mother, by bringing her family around to lend a hand in the store. Bekah works alongside her sister-in-law, as well two full-time staff and two local high school students who work part-time for Seasonal Shoppe. And just how Bekah used to work inside her father's drug store, her two children are common faces at Seasonal Shoppe, helping out with merchandise sales and with seasonal events.

Bekah not only perpetuates the same family-friendly atmosphere created by her mother, she pays mind to the traditions passed down to her by her father. Mr. Frazier always said that it was their duty as Main Street mainstays to support the community. Bekah continues this tradition by sponsoring the local high school sports teams, community churches, and most recently helping out the local fire department with their annual fundraiser. This charitable spirit instilled in her by her parents comes in addition to the good business sense she inherited from them, and it is this special combination of devotion to the community and to the livelihood of the store that has kept Seasonal Shoppe running these past 25 years.

Small businesses like Seasonal Shoppe are the lifeblood of small towns across Kentucky, and they serve as an inspiring example of how the entrepreneurial spirit transcends multiple generations. Moreover, the story of Seasonal Shoppe illustrates that sometimes it takes an existing business to start a new business, in that Patricia reached her customer base through her husband's drug store. Seasonal Shoppe and their role in the Salyersville community demonstrates how small businesses are an integral part of the daily life of small towns across the country, and I am thankful for the chance to honor these entrepreneurs and what they represent.

Congratulations to Bekah and the entire Seasonal Shoppe team. I wish them the best of luck and look forward to watching their continued growth and success in Kentucky. ●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:18 a.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. 3197. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the City of Eunice, Louisiana, certain Federal land in Louisiana, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4380. An act to designate the El Paso Community Healing Garden National Memorial, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6434. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish, within the National Park Service, the Japanese American World War II History Network, and for other purposes.

At 3:46 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 7108. An act to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, 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. 4380. An act to designate the El Paso Community Healing Garden National Memorial, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 6434. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to establish, within the National Park Service, the Japanese American World War II History Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3197. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the City of Eunice, Louisiana, certain Federal land in Louisiana, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

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

EC-3439. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of Executive Order on Access to Affordable Life-Saving Medications" (RIN0906-AB25) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 9, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3440. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tobacco Products; Required Warnings for Cigarette Packages and Advertisements; Delay of Effective Date" (RIN0910-A139) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3441. A communication from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2022-05, Introduction" (FAC 2022-05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 9, 2022; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-3442. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bureau's fiscal year 2021 annual report relative to the Notification and

Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3443. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from April 1, 2021 through September 30, 2021 and the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the report; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-3444. A communication from the Associate Administrator for Policy, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Parts and Accessories Necessary for Safe Operation; Authorized Windshield Area for the Installation of Vehicle Safety Technology" (RIN2126-AC42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3445. A communication from the Associate Administrator for Policy, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Record of Violations" (RIN2126-AC15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3446. A communication from the Attorney Advisor, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Improving Competitive Broadband Access to Multiple Tenant Environments" ((GN Docket No. 17-142) (FCC 22-12)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 10, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3447. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Television Broadcasting Services; Toledo, Ohio" (MB Docket No. 21-73) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 8, 2022; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3448. A message from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the issuance of an Executive Order declaring additional steps to be taken concerning the national emergency with respect to the unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States posed by specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation declared in Executive Order 14024 of April 15, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-3449. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Child Welfare Outcomes 2019"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3450. A communication from the Chairman, Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "March 2022 Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-3451. A communication from the Chief of the Regulatory Coordination Division, Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Immigrant Juvenile Petitions" (RIN1615-AB81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 14, 2022; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-116. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nebraska applying to the United States Congress, pursuant to Article V of the United States Constitution, to call a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the United States Constitution that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION NO. 14

Now, Therefore, be it Resolved by the Members of the One Hundred Seventh Legislature of Nebraska, Second Session:

1. The Legislature of the State of Nebraska hereby applies to Congress, under the provisions of Article V of the Constitution of the United States, for the calling of a convention of the states limited to proposing amendments to the constitution of the United States that impose fiscal restraints on the federal government, limit the power and jurisdiction of the federal government, and limit the terms of office for its officials and for members of Congress.

2. The Clerk of the Legislature shall transmit copies of this application to the President and Secretary of the United States Senate, to the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to the members of the Senate and House of Representatives from this state, and to the presiding officers of each of the legislative houses in the several states, requesting their cooperation.

3. This application constitutes a continuing application in accordance with Article V of the Constitution of the United States until the legislatures of at least two-thirds of the several states have made applications on the same subject.

4. This application will be rescinded as of February 1, 2027.

POM-117. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of Rockland County, New York, urging the New York State Legislature and the United States Congress to pass legislation that will address the negative impact that "flushable" wipes have on Rockland County Sewer District No. 1 and other Sewer Treatment Plant Operators in New York State are facing; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-118. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to opposing legislation granting amnesty to persons entering the United States in violation of the laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POM-119. A petition from a citizen of the State of Texas relative to enactment of federal legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3859. A bill to control the export of electronic waste in order to ensure that such waste does not become the source of counterfeit goods that may reenter military and ci-

vilian electronics supply chains in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. WARNOCK, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 3860. A bill to establish a grant program to provide assistance to local governments with fewer than 200 law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 3861. A bill to require the Secretary of State to submit annual reports to Congress on the assistance provided to Somaliland and to conduct a feasibility study, in coordination with the Secretary of Defense, on establishing a security partnership with Somaliland, without recognizing Somaliland as an independent state; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. HASSAN):

S. 3862. A bill to authorize the Department of Education in coordination with other relevant Federal agencies, to include a longitudinal component on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on student outcomes and well-being on an existing longitudinal educational study; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 3863. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to obtain an independent cybersecurity assessment of information systems of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

S. 3864. A bill to improve the pediatric mental health care access grant program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ERNST (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 3865. A bill to require disclosure of the total amount of interest that would be paid over the life of a loan for certain Federal students loans; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3866. A bill to establish Ocean Innovation Clusters to strengthen the coastal communities and ocean economy of the United States through technological research and development, job training, and cross-sector partnerships, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. REED, Mr. WARNER, Mr. TESTER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SMITH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3867. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the use of cryptocurrency to facilitate transactions by Russian persons subject to sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

S. 3868. A bill to correct the inequitable denial of enhanced retirement and annuity benefits to certain U.S. Customs and Border Protection Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 3869. A bill to add Ireland to the E-3 nonimmigrant visa program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. WYDEN, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 3870. A bill to establish the Office of the Special Investigator for Competition Matters within the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3871. A bill to provide a means for Congress to prevent an organization's designation as a foreign terrorist organization from being revoked by the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 3872. A bill to clarify the jurisdiction of the Special Inspector General for Pandemic Recovery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

S. 3873. A bill to designate the outdoor amphitheater at the Blue Ridge Music Center in Galax, Virginia, as the "Rock Boucher Amphitheater"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. KELLY):

S. 3874. A bill to amend section 7 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to ensure appropriate compensation for certain hours of overtime work by border patrol agents; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 3875. A bill to require the President to develop and maintain products that show the risk of natural hazards across the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER:

S. 3876. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to place prohibitions or conditions on certain transmittals of funds in connection with jurisdictions, financial institutions, international transactions, or types of accounts of primary money laundering concern; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3877. A bill to require the imposition of sanctions with respect to Chinese financial institutions that clear, verify, or settle transactions with Russian or Russian-controlled financial institutions; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 3878. A bill to require the establishment of defender organizations by Federal judicial districts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 3879. A bill to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to promulgate regulations on regional and interregional transmission planning, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 3880. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to define and provide for accommodation and designation of technical measures to identify, protect, or manage copyrighted works, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

S. 3881. A bill to direct the Secretary of Education to award grants to eligible entities to carry out teacher leadership programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 3882. A bill to require the End-User Review Committee to conduct quarterly reviews with respect to the inclusion of certain Russian energy entities on the Entity List; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S.J. Res. 42. A joint resolution proposing a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. Res. 550. A resolution recognizing the value of the Older Americans Act Nutrition Program in addressing hunger, malnutrition, food insecurity, and social or geographic isolation and improving the health and quality of life for millions of older individuals in the United States each year; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASIDY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 551. A resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KELLY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. Res. 552. A resolution designating March 2022 as "Irish-American Heritage Month" and honoring the significance of Irish-Americans in the history and progress of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGERTY:

S. Res. 553. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that, since January 20, 2021, President Biden has implemented policies impeding domestic energy production and gas prices have steadily increased; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 79

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr.

MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 79, a bill to eliminate the disparity in sentencing for cocaine offenses, and for other purposes.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 596, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 642

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to protect the rights of passengers with disabilities in air transportation, and for other purposes.

S. 1079

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

S. 1089

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1089, a bill to direct the Government Accountability Office to evaluate appropriate coverage of assistive technologies provided to patients who experience amputation or live with limb difference.

S. 1233

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1233, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify reporting requirements, promote tax compliance, and reduce tip reporting compliance burdens in the beauty service industry.

S. 1312

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1312, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the waiting periods for disability insurance benefits and Medicare coverage for individuals with metastatic breast cancer and for other purposes.

S. 1489

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1489, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to establish an Inspector General of the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and for other purposes.

S. 1888

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1888, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to include certain Federal

positions within the definition of law enforcement officer for retirement purposes, and for other purposes.

S. 2565

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2565, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for the testing of a community-based palliative care model.

S. 2677

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2677, a bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to limit overdraft fees and establish fair and transparent practices related to the marketing and provision of overdraft coverage programs at depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 2706

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2706, a bill to improve diversity in clinical trials and data collection for COVID-19 and future public health threats to address social determinants of health.

S. 2743

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 2743, a bill to make companies that support venues and events eligible for grants under the shuttered venue operators grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 2956

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2956, a bill to advance targeted, high-impact, and evidence-based inventions for the prevention and treatment of global malnutrition, to improve the coordination of such programs, and for other purposes.

S. 3325

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3325, a bill to make companies that support venues and events eligible for grants under the shuttered venue operators grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 3421

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3421, a bill to clarify that section 107 of the Countering America's Adversaries Through Sanctions Act applies sanctions with respect to unmanned combat aerial vehicles following a 2019 change by the United Nations providing additional clarity to the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms.

S. 3569

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Michigan

(Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3569, a bill to extend the program to provide liability protections for volunteer practitioners at certain health centers.

S. 3700

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3700, a bill to provide for appropriate cost-sharing for insulin products covered under Medicare part D and private health plans.

S. 3802

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3802, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a windfall profits excise tax on crude oil and to rebate the tax collected back to individual taxpayers, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 41

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 41, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Health and Human Services relating to "Ensuring Access to Equitable, Affordable, Client-Centered, Quality Family Planning Services".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. 3869. A bill to add Ireland to the E-3 nonimmigrant visa program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. 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. 3869

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

SECTION 1. E-3 VISAS FOR IRISH NATIONALS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(a)(15)(E)(iii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(E)(iii)) is amended by inserting "or, on a basis of reciprocity as determined by the Secretary of State, a national of Ireland," after "Australia".

(b) EMPLOYER REQUIREMENTS.—Section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended—

(1) by redesignating the second subsection (t) (as added by section 1(b)(2)(B) of Public Law 108-449 (118 Stat. 3470)) as subsection (u); and

(2) by adding at the end of subsection (t)(1) (as added by section 402(b)(2) of Public Law 108-77 (117 Stat. 941)) the following:

"(E) In the case of an attestation filed with respect to a national of Ireland described in section 101(a)(15)(E)(iii), the employer is, and will remain during the period of authorized employment of such Irish national, a participant in good standing in the E-Verify program described in section 403(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note)."

(c) APPLICATION ALLOCATION.—Paragraph (11) of section 214(g) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)(11)) is amended to read as follows:

"(11)(A) The Secretary of State may approve initial applications submitted for aliens described in section 101(a)(15)(E)(iii) only as follows:

"(i) For applicants who are nationals of the Commonwealth of Australia, not more than 10,500 for a fiscal year.

"(ii) For applicants who are nationals of Ireland, not more than a number equal to the difference between 10,500 and the number of applications approved in the prior fiscal year for aliens who are nationals of the Commonwealth of Australia.

"(B) The approval of an application described under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be deemed for numerical control purposes to have occurred on September 30 of the prior fiscal year.

"(C) The numerical limitation under subparagraph (A) shall only apply to principal aliens and not to the spouses or children of such aliens."

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 550—RECOGNIZING THE VALUE OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT NUTRITION PROGRAM IN ADDRESSING HUNGER, MALNUTRITION, FOOD INSECURITY, AND SOCIAL OR GEOGRAPHIC ISOLATION AND IMPROVING THE HEALTH AND QUALITY OF LIFE FOR MILLIONS OF OLDER INDIVIDUALS IN THE UNITED STATES EACH YEAR

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 550

Whereas thousands of local nutrition programs supported by part C of title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030d-21 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as the "OAA Nutrition Program"), both congregate and home-delivered programs, provide a vital lifeline to millions of individuals 60 years of age or older in communities across the United States who may be homebound and socially or geographically isolated, and struggling with hunger, food insecurity, or malnutrition;

Whereas local nutrition programs supported by the OAA Nutrition Program provide nutritious meals, socialization, friendly visits, and wellness and safety checks through volunteers and staff to individuals who may suffer from long-term chronic conditions, as well as to those who live in the community and have the greatest social or economic need;

Whereas the official purposes of the OAA Nutrition Program are to reduce hunger, food insecurity, and malnutrition, to promote socialization of older individuals, and to promote the health and well-being of older individuals by assisting such individuals in gaining access to nutrition and other disease prevention and health promotion services in order to delay the onset of adverse health conditions resulting from poor nutritional health or sedentary behavior;

Whereas the OAA Nutrition Program saves significant taxpayer dollars and reduces health care expenditures, often paid through Medicare or Medicaid, by helping to reduce

falls, avoid unnecessary trips, admissions, and readmissions to the hospital, expedite recovery from illness, and enable older individuals to live independently for longer;

Whereas local nutrition programs supported by the OAA Nutrition Program are proven, valuable, and effective public-private partnerships that benefit from non-Federal private, corporate, and individual funding and donations to operate their services efficiently and effectively;

Whereas the population of individuals in the United States who are 60 years of age or older is rapidly growing and projected to increase dramatically each year over the next several decades;

Whereas, on March 22, 1972, President Richard Nixon signed into law Public Law 92-258, which amended the Older Americans Act of 1965 and established a national nutrition program for individuals 60 years of age or older; and

Whereas this 50th anniversary of the OAA Nutrition Program provides an opportunity to celebrate and honor community-based organizations that deliver vital and critical services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and values the important work of local nutrition programs supported by part C of title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3030d-21 et seq.) (referred to in this resolution as the "OAA Nutrition Program") nationwide in giving voice to and addressing senior hunger, malnutrition, and isolation, and improving the quality of life of millions of older individuals in the United States each year;

(2) recognizes and values the important role that local nutrition programs supported by the OAA Nutrition Program and national organizations play in increasing awareness of the growing unmet need for these programs and in raising additional non-Federal funds and soliciting volunteers to support and assist these programs' important missions;

(3) recognizes and values volunteers as the backbone of the OAA Nutrition Program, noting that they deliver nutritious meals to older individuals who are at significant risk of hunger, malnutrition, and isolation, and provide caring concern and attention to the welfare of program participants; and

(4) encourages members of Congress to support their local nutrition programs supported by the OAA Nutrition Program by participating in 50th anniversary events, delivering meals to homebound older individuals or serving them in a congregate setting with a program in their district or State, and working to ensure sustained Federal funding for the OAA Nutrition Program.

SENATE RESOLUTION 551—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF AMERICORPS MEMBERS AND ALUMNI AND AMERICORPS SENIORS VOLUNTEERS TO THE LIVES OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARPER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WYDEN,

and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 551

Whereas, since their inception, each of the AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors national service programs have proven to be a highly effective way—

(1) to engage the people of the United States in meeting a wide range of local and national needs; and

(2) to promote the ethics of service and volunteerism;

Whereas, each year, more than 250,000 individuals serve in AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors at more than 40,000 locations across the United States to give back in an intensive way to communities, States, Tribal nations, and the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors funds have been invested in nonprofit, community, educational, and faith-based groups, and those funds leverage hundreds of millions of dollars in outside funding and in-kind donations each year;

Whereas AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers have provided millions of hours of service nationwide, helping—

(1) to improve the lives of the most vulnerable people of the United States;

(2) to protect the environment;

(3) to contribute to public safety;

(4) to respond to disasters and public health emergencies;

(5) to strengthen the educational system of the United States; and

(6) to expand economic opportunity;

Whereas AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers recruit and supervise millions of community volunteers, demonstrating the value of AmeriCorps as a powerful force for encouraging people to become involved in volunteering and community service;

Whereas, for more than 5 decades, millions of AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers in the RSVP, Foster Grandparent, and Senior Companion programs have played an important role in strengthening communities by sharing their experience, knowledge, and accomplishments with the individuals they serve;

Whereas, since 1994, more than 1,200,000 individuals have taken the AmeriCorps pledge to “get things done for America” by becoming AmeriCorps members through the AmeriCorps State and National, AmeriCorps VISTA, and AmeriCorps NCCC programs;

Whereas AmeriCorps members nationwide, in return for the service of those members, have earned more than \$4,000,000,000 to use to further their own educational advancement at colleges and universities across the United States;

Whereas AmeriCorps is a proven pathway to employment, providing members with valuable career skills, experience, and contacts to prepare them for the 21st century workforce;

Whereas, in 2009, Congress passed the bipartisan Serve America Act (Public Law 111–13; 123 Stat. 1460), which authorized the expansion of national service, expanded opportunities to serve, increased efficiency and accountability, and strengthened the capacity of organizations and communities to solve problems;

Whereas national service programs have engaged millions of people in the United States in results-driven service in the most vulnerable communities of the United States, providing hope and help to individuals with economic and social needs;

Whereas national service and volunteerism demonstrate the best of the spirit of the United States, bringing people together to address the most pressing challenges in their communities; and

Whereas AmeriCorps Week, observed in 2022 from March 13 through March 19, is an appropriate time for the people of the United States—

(1) to salute current and former AmeriCorps members and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers for their positive impact on the lives of people in the United States;

(2) to thank the community partners of AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors for making the programs possible; and

(3) to encourage more people in the United States to become involved in service and volunteering: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) encourages the people of the United States to join in a national effort—

(A) to salute AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers; and

(B) to raise awareness about the importance of national and community service;

(2) acknowledges the significant accomplishments of the volunteers, members, alumni, and community partners of AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors;

(3) recognizes the important contributions made by AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers to the lives of the people of the United States; and

(4) encourages individuals of all ages to consider opportunities to serve in AmeriCorps and AmeriCorps Seniors.

SENATE RESOLUTION 552—DESIGNATING MARCH 2022 AS “IRISH-AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH” AND HONORING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF IRISH-AMERICANS IN THE HISTORY AND PROGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KELLY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 552

Whereas, from the earliest days of the United States, the United States has inspired the hopes and dreams of countless individuals from around the world in search of a better life for themselves and their children;

Whereas more than 31,500,000 United States citizens trace their ancestry to Ireland;

Whereas, since before the United States was founded, Irish men and women undertook the perilous journey across the Atlantic Ocean to make a home in the United States, a place of hope and promise, and made inestimable contributions to the United States, both during the struggle for independence and after the founding of the republic;

Whereas 9 of the 56 signatories of the Declaration of Independence, 4 associate justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and 22 Presidents proudly claim Irish heritage.

Whereas Irish immigrants who came to the United States during the Great Famine of the 1840s helped transform cities in the United States, building them into dynamic centers of commerce and industry;

Whereas the cultural, economic, and spiritual contributions of Irish immigrants continue to be evident today throughout the United States;

Whereas Irish Americans have become deeply integrated into communities with strength, courage, wit, and creativity, making significant contributions in all areas of life;

Whereas Irish-American writers such as Eugene O’Neill, John O’Hara, and F. Scott Fitzgerald transformed literature in the United States, entrepreneurs like Chuck Feeney helped revolutionize industry and philanthropy in the United States, performers such as Gregory Peck, Lucille Ball, and Gene Kelly enriched the arts, and social reformers such as suffragist Leonora Barry and labor organizer Mary Kenney O’Sullivan fought for the rights of others;

Whereas Irish-Americans have served ably in communities in numerous capacities, including in public safety and government at the Federal, State, and local level, and in the Armed Forces in every war in which the United States has fought since the Revolutionary War, including patriots such as Audie Murphy, the most decorated soldier of World War II;

Whereas, more than 200 years ago, John Barry, who was born in Ireland, was the first naval hero of the Revolutionary War and became known as the Father of the Navy;

Whereas the United States played a prominent role in support of negotiations of the Good Friday Agreement (also known as the Belfast Agreement), done at Belfast, April 10, 1998, and has taken a leading role in promoting peace on the island of Ireland more broadly;

Whereas Congress greatly values the close relationships the United States shares with both the United Kingdom and Ireland and is steadfastly committed to supporting the peaceful resolution of any and all political challenges in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas, on February 28, 2022, President Joseph R. Biden, Jr., proclaimed March 2022 as Irish-American Heritage Month: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 2022 as “Irish-American Heritage Month”;

(2) recognizes the significant contributions of Irish-Americans in the history and progress of United States; and

(3) supports the full implementation of the Good Friday Agreement (also known as the Belfast Agreement) and subsequent agreements or arrangements for implementation of that Agreement to support peace on the island of Ireland.

SENATE RESOLUTION 553—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT, SINCE JANUARY 20, 2021, PRESIDENT BIDEN HAS IMPLEMENTED POLICIES IMPEDING DOMESTIC ENERGY PRODUCTION AND GAS PRICES HAVE STEADILY INCREASED

Mr. HAGERTY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

S. RES. 553

Whereas, on Election Day 2020, the average price of gas in the United States was \$2.11 per gallon;

Whereas, on January 20, 2021, the inauguration day of President Joseph R. Biden, Jr., while the average gas price was \$2.38 per gallon, President Biden—

(1) through Executive Order 13990 (86 Fed. Reg. 7037; relating to public health and the environment)—

(A) revoked the Keystone XL pipeline permit;

(B) paused oil-and-gas leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge; and

(C) placed new regulations on oil-and-gas production in the United States, including directing agencies to assess a “social cost

of carbon” on producers in the United States;

(2) rejoined the Paris Climate Agreement, a landmark international fossil-fuel suppression mandate; and

(3) through Executive Order 13992 (86 Fed. Reg. 7049; relating to federal regulation), repealed several executive orders issued by President Donald J. Trump that reduced Federal regulation and increased regulatory transparency, in order to facilitate “robust regulatory action” to address climate change;

Whereas, during President Biden’s second week in office, President Biden issued Executive Order 14008 (86 Fed. Reg. 7619; relating to climate change), which stopped new oil and natural gas leases on public lands and offshore waters, where approximately a quarter of United States oil-and-gas production occurs;

Whereas, in the first week of May 2021, President Biden issued Executive Order 14027 (86 Fed. Reg. 25947; relating to establishment of the Climate Change Support Office), which established the Climate Change Support Office to support efforts by the Biden Administration “to elevate and underscore the commitment the Administration will make towards addressing the global climate crisis”;

Whereas, by mid-May 2021, the average price of gas had climbed to \$3.02 per gallon, at which point President Biden signed Executive Order 14030 (86 Fed. Reg. 27967; relating to climate-related financial risk), which directed financial regulators to take actions to discourage financing of United States oil-and-gas production in order to “mitigate climate-related financial risk”;

Whereas, by early September 2021, the average price of gas rose to \$3.17 per gallon after President Biden signed Executive Order 14037 (86 Fed. Reg. 43583; relating to clean cars and trucks), which requires at least 50 percent of new sales of passenger cars and light-duty trucks in the United States to be zero-emission vehicles by 2030;

Whereas, by early January 2022—

(1) the Environmental Protection Agency had proposed a denial of all pending exemptions to small refineries for compliance years 2019 through 2021 and the reversal of the decision to grant exemptions for the 2018 compliance year, meaning that small refineries, which are normally exempt from annual renewable fuel standard (RFS) obligations, will owe 5 years’ worth of RFS compliance costs in a single calendar year;

(2) President Biden signed Executive Order 14057 (86 Fed. Reg. 70935; relating to clean energy industries and jobs), which called for the Federal Government to achieve a carbon-free electricity sector by 2035 and net-zero emissions economy-wide by 2050; and

(3) the average price of gas was \$3.28 per gallon; and

Whereas, 2 days before the Russian Federation invaded Ukraine and nearly a week before President Biden banned oil and energy imports from the Russian Federation, the average price of gas was \$3.61 per gallon: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that President Joseph R. Biden, Jr., has implemented policies impeding domestic energy production and gas prices have steadily increased throughout his presidency.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5001. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 120, to prevent and respond to the misuse of communications services that facilitates domestic violence and other crimes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5001. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 120, to prevent and respond to the misuse of communications services that facilitates domestic violence and other crimes; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Safe Connections Act of 2022”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, terms used in this Act that are defined in section 345(a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, have the meanings given those terms in such section 345(a).

SEC. 3. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Domestic violence, dating violence, stalking, sexual assault, human trafficking, and related crimes are life-threatening issues and have lasting and harmful effects on individuals, families, and entire communities.

(2) Survivors often lack meaningful support and options when establishing independence from an abuser, including barriers such as financial insecurity and limited access to reliable communications tools to maintain essential connections with family, social safety networks, employers, and support services.

(3) Perpetrators of violence and abuse described in paragraph (1) increasingly use technological and communications tools to exercise control over, monitor, and abuse their victims.

(4) Communications law can play a public interest role in the promotion of safety, life, and property with respect to the types of violence and abuse described in paragraph (1). For example, independent access to a wireless phone plan can assist survivors in establishing security and autonomy.

(5) Safeguards within communications services can serve a role in preventing abuse and narrowing the digital divide experienced by survivors of abuse.

SEC. 4. PROTECTION OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE SURVIVORS WITHIN COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES.

Part I of title III of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 301 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 345. PROTECTION OF SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, HUMAN TRAFFICKING, AND RELATED CRIMES.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

“(1) **ABUSER.**—The term ‘abuser’ means an individual who has committed or allegedly committed a covered act against—

“(A) an individual who seeks relief under subsection (b); or

“(B) an individual in the care of an individual who seeks relief under subsection (b).

“(2) **COVERED ACT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term ‘covered act’ means conduct that constitutes—

“(i) a crime described in section 40002(a) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(a)), including domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, and sex trafficking;

“(ii) an act or practice described in paragraph (11) or (12) of section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102) (relating to severe forms of trafficking in persons and sex trafficking, respectively); or

“(iii) an act under State law, Tribal law, or the Uniform Code of Military Justice that is

similar to an offense described in clause (i) or (ii).

“(B) **CONVICTION NOT REQUIRED.**—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to require a criminal conviction or any other determination of a court in order for conduct to constitute a covered act.

“(3) **COVERED PROVIDER.**—The term ‘covered provider’ means a provider of a private mobile service or commercial mobile service, as those terms are defined in section 332(d).

“(4) **PRIMARY ACCOUNT HOLDER.**—The term ‘primary account holder’ means an individual who is a party to a mobile service contract with a covered provider.

“(5) **SHARED MOBILE SERVICE CONTRACT.**—The term ‘shared mobile service contract’—

“(A) means a mobile service contract for an account that includes not less than 2 consumers; and

“(B) does not include enterprise services offered by a covered provider.

“(6) **SURVIVOR.**—The term ‘survivor’ means an individual who is not less than 18 years old and—

“(A) against whom a covered act has been committed or allegedly committed; or

“(B) who cares for another individual against whom a covered act has been committed or allegedly committed (provided that the individual providing care did not commit or allegedly commit the covered act).

“(b) **SEPARATION OF LINES FROM SHARED MOBILE SERVICE CONTRACT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 business days after receiving a completed line separation request from a survivor pursuant to subsection (c), a covered provider shall, as applicable, with respect to a shared mobile service contract under which the survivor and the abuser each use a line—

“(A) separate the line of the survivor, and the line of any individual in the care of the survivor, from the shared mobile service contract; or

“(B) separate the line of the abuser from the shared mobile service contract.

“(2) **LIMITATIONS ON PENALTIES, FEES, AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS.**—Except as provided in paragraphs (5) through (8), a covered provider may not make separation of a line from a shared mobile service contract under paragraph (1) contingent on any requirement other than the requirements under subsection (c), including—

“(A) payment of a fee, penalty, or other charge;

“(B) maintaining contractual or billing responsibility of a separated line with the provider;

“(C) approval of separation by the primary account holder, if the primary account holder is not the survivor;

“(D) a prohibition or limitation, including one described in subparagraph (A), on number portability, provided such portability is technically feasible, or a request to change phone numbers;

“(E) a prohibition or limitation on the separation of lines as a result of arrears accrued by the account;

“(F) an increase in the rate charged for the mobile service plan of the primary account holder with respect to service on any remaining line or lines; or

“(G) any other limitation or requirement not listed under subsection (c).

“(3) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in paragraph (2) shall be construed to require a covered provider to provide a rate plan for the primary account holder that is not otherwise commercially available.

“(4) **REMOTE OPTION.**—A covered provider shall offer a survivor the ability to submit a line separation request under subsection (c) through secure remote means that are easily navigable, provided that remote options are

commercially available and technically feasible.

“(5) RESPONSIBILITY FOR TRANSFERRED TELEPHONE NUMBERS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), beginning on the date on which a covered provider transfers billing responsibilities for and rights to a telephone number or numbers to a survivor under paragraph (1)(A) in response to a line separation request submitted by the survivor under subsection (c), unless ordered otherwise by a court, the survivor shall assume financial responsibility, including for monthly service costs, for the transferred telephone number or numbers.

“(6) RESPONSIBILITY FOR TRANSFERRED TELEPHONE NUMBERS FROM A SURVIVOR’S ACCOUNT.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), upon the transfer of a telephone number under paragraph (1)(B) in response to a line separation request submitted by a survivor under subsection (c), the survivor shall have no further financial responsibilities to the transferring covered provider for the services provided by the transferring covered provider for the telephone number or for any mobile device associated with the telephone number.

“(7) RESPONSIBILITY FOR MOBILE DEVICE.—Notwithstanding paragraph (2), beginning on the date on which a covered provider transfers billing responsibilities for and rights to a telephone number or numbers to a survivor under paragraph (1)(A) in response to a line separation request submitted by the survivor under subsection (c), unless otherwise ordered by a court, the survivor shall not assume financial responsibility for any mobile device associated with the separated line, unless the survivor purchased the mobile device, or affirmatively elects to maintain possession of the mobile device.

“(8) NOTICE TO SURVIVOR.—If a covered provider separates a line from a shared mobile service contract under paragraph (1) and the primary account holder is not the survivor, the covered provider shall notify the survivor of the date on which the covered provider intends to give any formal notice to the primary account holder.

“(C) LINE SEPARATION REQUEST.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A survivor shall submit to the covered provider a line separation request that—

“(A) verifies that an individual who uses a line under the shared mobile service contract has committed or allegedly committed a covered act against the survivor or an individual in the survivor’s care, by providing—

“(i) a copy of a signed affidavit from a licensed medical or mental health care provider, licensed military medical or mental health care provider, licensed social worker, victim services provider, or licensed military victim services provider, or an employee of a court, acting within the scope of that person’s employment; or

“(ii) a copy of a police report, statements provided by police, including military police, to magistrates or judges, charging documents, protective or restraining orders, military protective orders, or any other official record that documents the covered act;

“(B) in the case of relief sought under subsection (b)(1)(A), with respect to—

“(i) a line used by the survivor that the survivor seeks to have separated, states that the survivor is the user of that specific line; and

“(ii) a line used by an individual in the care of the survivor that the survivor seeks to have separated, includes an affidavit setting forth that the individual—

“(I) is in the care of the survivor; and

“(II) is the user of that specific line; and

“(C) requests relief under subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(1) and identifies each line that should be separated.

“(2) COMMUNICATIONS FROM COVERED PROVIDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—A covered provider shall notify a survivor seeking relief under subsection (b) in clear and accessible language that the covered provider may contact the survivor, or designated representative of the survivor, to confirm the line separation, or if the covered provider is unable to complete the line separation for any reason, pursuant to subparagraphs (B) and (C).

“(B) REMOTE MEANS.—A covered provider shall notify a survivor under subparagraph (A) through remote means, provided that remote means are commercially available and technically feasible.

“(C) ELECTION OF MANNER OF CONTACT.—When completing a line separation request submitted by a survivor through remote means under paragraph (1), a covered provider shall allow the survivor to elect in the manner in which the covered provider may—

“(i) contact the survivor, or designated representative of the survivor, in response to the request, if necessary; or

“(ii) notify the survivor, or designated representative of the survivor, of the inability of the covered provider to complete the line separation.

“(3) ENHANCED PROTECTIONS UNDER STATE LAW.—This subsection shall not affect any law or regulation of a State providing communications protections for survivors (or any similar category of individuals) that has less stringent requirements for providing evidence of a covered act (or any similar category of conduct) than this subsection.

“(d) CONFIDENTIAL AND SECURE TREATMENT OF PERSONAL INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 222(c)(2), a covered provider and any officer, director, employee, vendor, or agent thereof shall treat any information submitted by a survivor under subsection (c) as confidential and securely dispose of the information not later than 90 days after receiving the information.

“(2) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to prohibit a covered provider from maintaining, for longer than the period specified in that paragraph, a record that verifies that a survivor fulfilled the conditions of a line separation request under subsection (c).

“(e) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION TO CONSUMERS.—A covered provider shall make information about the options and process described in subsections (b) and (c) readily available to consumers—

“(1) on the website and the mobile application of the provider;

“(2) in physical stores; and

“(3) in other forms of public-facing consumer communication.

“(f) TECHNICAL INFESIBILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The requirement to effectuate a line separation request pursuant to subsection (b)(1) shall not apply to a covered provider if the covered provider cannot operationally or technically effectuate the request.

“(2) NOTIFICATION.—If a covered provider cannot operationally or technically effectuate a line separation request as described in paragraph (1), the covered provider shall—

“(A) notify the survivor who submitted the request of that infeasibility—

“(i) at the time of the request; or

“(ii) in the case of a survivor who has submitted the request using remote means, not later than 2 business days after receiving the request; and

“(B) provide the survivor with information about other alternatives to submitting a line separation request, including starting a new line of service.

“(g) LIABILITY PROTECTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A covered provider and any officer, director, employee, vendor, or agent thereof shall not be subject to liability for any claims deriving from an action taken or omission made with respect to compliance with this section and the rules adopted to implement this section.

“(2) COMMISSION AUTHORITY.—Nothing in this subsection shall limit the authority of the Commission to enforce this section or any rules or regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to this section.”

SEC. 5. RULEMAKING ON PROTECTIONS FOR SURVIVORS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Affordable Connectivity Program” means the program established under section 904(b) of division N of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116-260), as amended by section 60502 of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (Public Law 117-58), or any successor program;

(2) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives;

(3) the term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission;

(4) the term “covered hotline” means a hotline related to domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, sex trafficking, severe forms of trafficking in persons, or any other similar act;

(5) the term “designated program” means the program designated by the Commission under subsection (c)(3)(A)(i) to provide emergency communications support to survivors;

(6) the term “Lifeline program” means the program set forth in subpart E of part 54 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation); and

(7) the term “text message” has the meaning given the term in section 227(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227(e)).

(b) RULEMAKINGS.—

(1) LINE SEPARATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall adopt rules to implement section 345 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In adopting rules under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consider—

(i) privacy protections;

(ii) account security and fraud detection;

(iii) account billing procedures;

(iv) procedures for notification of survivors about line separation processes;

(v) notice to account holders;

(vi) situations in which a covered provider cannot operationally or technically separate a telephone number or numbers from a shared service plan such that the provider cannot effectuate a line separation request;

(vii) the requirements for remote submission of a line separation request, including how that option facilitates submission of verification information and meets the other requirements of section 345 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act;

(viii) feasibility of remote options for small covered providers;

(ix) implementation timelines, including those for small covered providers;

(x) financial responsibility for transferred telephone numbers;

(xi) whether and how the survivor can affirmatively elect to take financial responsibility for the mobile device associated with the separated line;

(xii) compliance with subpart U of part 64 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or

any successor regulations (relating to customer proprietary network information) or any other legal or law enforcement requirements; and

(xiii) ensuring covered providers have the necessary account information to comply with the rules and with section 345 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act.

(2) EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS SUPPORT FOR SURVIVORS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, or as part of a general rulemaking proceeding relating to the Lifeline program or the Affordable Connectivity Program, whichever occurs earlier, the Commission shall adopt rules that—

(i) designate a single program, which shall be either the Lifeline program or the Affordable Connectivity Program, to provide emergency communications support to survivors in accordance with this paragraph; and

(ii) allow a survivor who is suffering from financial hardship and meets the requirements under section 345(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, without regard to whether the survivor meets the otherwise applicable eligibility requirements of the designated program, to—

(I) enroll in the designated program as quickly as is feasible; and

(II) participate in the designated program based on such qualifications for not more than 6 months.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—In adopting rules under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall consider—

(i) how survivors who are eligible for relief and elected to separate a line under section 345(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, but whose lines could not be separated due to operational or technical infeasibility, can participate in the designated program; and

(ii) confidentiality in the transfer and retention of any necessary documentation regarding the eligibility of a survivor to enroll in the designated program.

(C) EVALUATION.—Not later than 2 years after completing the rulemaking under subparagraph (A), the Commission shall—

(i) evaluate the effectiveness of the Commission's provision of support to survivors through the designated program;

(ii) assess the detection and elimination of fraud, waste, and abuse with respect to the support described in clause (i); and

(iii) submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the evaluation and assessment described in clauses (i) and (ii), respectively.

(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to limit the ability of a survivor who meets the requirements under section 345(c)(1) of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, to participate in the designated program indefinitely if the survivor otherwise qualifies for the designated program under the rules of the designated program.

(E) NOTIFICATION.—A provider of wireless communications services that receives a line separation request pursuant to section 345 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, shall inform the survivor who submitted the request of—

(i) the existence of the designated program;

(ii) who qualifies to participate in the designated program under the rules adopted under subparagraph (A) that are specially applicable to survivors; and

(iii) how to participate in the designated program under the rules described in clause (ii).

(3) HOTLINE CALLS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall commence a rulemaking proceeding to consider whether to, and how the Commission should—

(i) establish, and update on a monthly basis, a central database of covered hotlines to be used by providers of wireless communications services or wireline voice services; and

(ii) require providers of wireless communications services or wireline voice services to omit from consumer-facing logs of calls or text messages any records of calls or text messages to covered hotlines in the central database described in clause (i), while maintaining internal records of those calls and messages.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—The rulemaking conducted under subparagraph (A) shall include consideration of—

(i) the ability of law enforcement agencies or survivors to access a log of calls or text messages in a criminal investigation or civil proceeding;

(ii) the ability of providers of wireless communication services or wireline voice services to—

(I) identify logs that are consumer-facing; and

(II) omit certain consumer-facing logs, while maintaining internal records of such calls and text messages; and

(iii) any other factors associated with the implementation of clauses (i) and (ii) to protect survivors of domestic violence, including factors that may impact smaller providers.

(C) NO EFFECT ON LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to—

(i) limit or otherwise affect the ability of a law enforcement agency to access a log of calls or text messages in a criminal investigation; or

(ii) alter or otherwise expand provider requirements under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (Public Law 103-414; 108 Stat. 4279) or the amendments made by that Act.

(D) COMPLIANCE.—If the Commission establishes a central database through the rulemaking under subparagraph (A) and a covered provider updates its own databases to match the central database not less frequently than once every 30 days, no cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against the covered provider or its officers, employees, or agents for claims deriving from omission from consumer-facing logs of calls or text messages any records of calls or text messages to covered hotlines in the central database.

SEC. 6. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The requirements under section 345 of the Communications Act of 1934, as added by section 4 of this Act, shall take effect 60 days after the date on which the Federal Communications Commission adopts the rules implementing that section pursuant to section 5(b)(2) of this Act.

SEC. 7. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed to abrogate, limit, or otherwise affect the provisions set forth in the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (Public Law 103-414; 108 Stat. 4279) and the amendments made by that Act, any authority granted to the Commission pursuant to that Act or the amendments made by that Act, or any regulations promulgated by the Commission pursuant to that Act or the amendments made by that Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. CORTEZ-MASTO. Mr. President, I have six 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 ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 17, 2022, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my legislative fellows Nathan Lee, Laura Mosqueda, Sean Philbin, and Montreal Tennessee be granted floor privileges for the duration of their fellowships in my office.

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

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2022

Ms. CORTEZ-MASTO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 3 p.m. on Monday, March 21; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed

to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, America COMPETES Act; further, that the cloture motion filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m.

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

consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:07 p.m., adjourned until Monday, March 21, 2022, at 3:00 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 17, 2022:

THE JUDICIARY

JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

FRED W. SLAUGHTER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

BIDTAH N. BECKER, OF ARIZONA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022.

GRETCHEN GONZALEZ DAVIDSON, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2022.

VANESSA NORTINGTON GAMBLE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2026.

DAVID ANTHONY HAJDU, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2026.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 21, 2022, AT 3 P.M.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous