



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 2023

No. 108

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Most holy and gracious God, who turns the shadow of night into morning, satisfy our hearts with Your mercies, that we may rejoice and be glad all the day. Abide with the Members of this body, permitting the light of Your countenance to calm every troubled thought and to guide their feet in the way of peace. Lord, perfect Your strength in their weakness and help them to serve You and country to the glory of Your Name. In a world so uncertain about many things, make our Senators sure of no light that illuminates their pathway will lead them into darkness. Give our Senators the courage to see the truth and wisdom and to humbly follow where it leads.

We pray in Your precious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

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

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, June 21, 2023.

To the Senate:

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

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WELCH thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY RELATING TO "CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION FROM NEW MOTOR VEHICLES: HEAVY-DUTY ENGINE AND VEHICLE STANDARDS"—VETO

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the veto message with respect to S.J. Res. 11, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message to accompany S.J. Res. 11, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Control of Air Pollution From New Motor

Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards".

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

S.J. RES. 11

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this year, the Senate made use of the Congressional Review Act to push back on a particularly dangerous part of the Biden administration's radical approach to environmental policy.

Our colleague, the senior Senator from Nebraska, put forward a resolution that would prevent the administration from implementing even stricter emission standards on the trucks and heavy equipment that literally drive our economy.

The nitrogen oxide emissions of new trucks on the market today are already 98 to 99 percent lower than they were in the late 1990s. So we are talking about regulation in search of a problem.

In order to keep up with the rule President Biden's EPA released in December, heavy-auto manufacturers would be forced to add a dizzying array of new technologies to their products. By one estimate, the new regulations could raise the cost of a new truck by \$42,000—\$42,000, just to keep pace with the changing whims of unelected bureaucrats in Washington.

As truckers themselves have warned, the EPA's latest overreach would drive many of them to stick with "older, less-efficient trucks or leave the industry entirely." And, needless to say, higher costs for the men and women behind the wheel means higher costs for fuel, food, and other essentials at the store. But that didn't stop President Biden from vetoing Senator FISCHER's commonsense resolution.

Well, today, we will vote one more time, and we will find out, once and for all, whether Washington Democrats care more about keeping pace with leftwing climate activists than helping

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S2151

working families contend with the runaway inflation that they helped create.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. President, on another matter, as I have discussed at length, America's partners in the Indo-Pacific understand the link between Russian aggression in Europe and the threat of Chinese aggression closer to home. Japan and Taiwan have devoted serious resources to Ukraine's defense, but our friends are also wisely strengthening their own defenses.

Last year, Taiwan's government put forward its largest defense budget proposal ever—ever—a 14-percent increase in top-line spending, along with greater attention to territorial defense, longer service requirements for conscripts, and a focus on whole-of-government resilience.

Japan has a new transformational strategy. Prime Minister Kishida's government is pursuing new long-range strike capabilities, increasing defense spending, and buying SM-6 interceptors. In a sign of deepening cooperation with the United States, it has expanded its defense industrial capacity by building facilities to assemble F-35s in Japan.

South Korea is also deepening its security cooperation with the United States, expanding its defense industrial capacity and providing military capabilities to key American allies over in Europe.

President Yoon and Prime Minister Kishida have also worked to improve relations between their two countries and open the door for increased cooperation with America in the face of an increasingly belligerent North Korea.

The Philippines is engaging in regular joint exercises in the South China Sea and working closely with the United States on enhanced defense cooperation sites that improve our interoperability.

And, earlier this year, Australia reached an agreement with the United States and the United Kingdom to procure nuclear-powered conventional submarines—the biggest defense investment in the nation's entire history.

In other words, our friends are putting their money where their mouths are. That is important because so has the People's Republic of China.

Beijing has made historic investments in its own military modernization. PRC defense spending has grown every year for almost three decades, but in each of the last 2 years, it has jumped by at least 7 percent. And, needless to say, China's official statistics tend to be obscure as much as they reveal.

While our most hostile strategic adversary is accelerating its military investments, the Biden administration asked Congress to shrink—shrink—spending on America's Armed Forces in real dollars.

Today, our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee will mark up the

National Defense Authorization Act, beginning the Senate's annual work on tending to our Nation's common defense.

Facing down a common threat is a chance for the United States and our partners to grow the defense industrial base we will need to sustain effective deterrence in the Indo-Pacific. It is an opportunity to reform America's sluggish foreign military sales procedures, promote interoperability, and expand joint exercises and access agreements across the region.

If we are serious about deepening our defense industrial cooperation, America and our partners must make it easier to work together to share technology and intelligence and to align our defense investments. We need to streamline regulations that can prevent our partners from investing in their own defense bases in closer cooperation with the United States.

Of course, this is not a one-way street. America can also benefit from technologies our partners are developing, if our regulations and bureaucracies simply allow it. Our agreement with the UK and Australia could represent a transformational new approach to collective security.

If the Biden administration wants this partnership to succeed, it should consider providing broader country exemptions for defense trade licenses for those closest allies, similar to what we already do with Canada. Very simply, it is an opportunity we cannot afford to miss.

So China's bid for hegemony in the Indo-Pacific extends far beyond investments in naval vessels and new missile technologies.

The PRC has poured billions of dollars into development projects in vulnerable island nations out in the Pacific. So make no mistake, if the United States and our partners fail to work together to maintain robust deterrence on behalf of a free and open Indo-Pacific, China will be all too happy—all too happy—to fill the void.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, under Biden's leadership, the United States has experienced an unprecedented border crisis. That is not exactly news because for the last 2½ years, Customs and Border Protection has encountered more than 5.2 million migrants at the border, plus another 1½ million “got-aways.”

In other words, under our bizarre and broken immigration system, 5.2 million people basically were welcomed at the border, while another million and a half simply fled the Border Patrol and made their way into the interior of the United States.

Now, it is true out of the 5.2 million under title 42, the COVID-19 order, basically public health order, that 2.6 million of the 5.2 were returned to their country of origin or at least expelled out of the United States. That

was a public health order, but that is gone. That is expired. That has served its time.

So under any scenario, you can conclude that under President Biden's tenure, millions of people have made their way into the United States, not using the legal pathways that are designed to make our immigration system safe, orderly, and humane—something that I know we all support, legal immigration—instead, President Biden's failures, when it comes to border policy, has resulted in transnational criminal organizations controlling immigration, and they also control the drug trafficking that makes its way across the border.

And as was acknowledged by the Attorney General, Merrick Garland, when he was testifying before the Judiciary Committee, I believe he said he understood that this was part of the business model of these organizations, these criminal organizations. They would flood the border with people, and as the Border Patrol was diverted to try to deal with that mass of humanity, including unaccompanied children, that left huge gaps in the border which were then exploited by the drug cartels to move drugs into the interior of the United States.

Rather than secure the border or make any attempt to deter illegal immigration, the Biden administration has allowed the chaos to continue for nearly 2½ years.

Now, inexplicably, the President claims this is all part of his plan to promote safe, orderly, and humane migration, but there is nothing safe about the journey migrants take to the United States in the hands of cartels, coyotes, and ordinary criminals.

There is nothing orderly about migrants using inflatable rafts and ropes to cross the Rio Grande where some meet their death when they drown. And there is nothing humane about what is happening in the United States now as a result of the border crisis.

First, let's look at what happens to the children. Since President Biden took office, more than 300,000 unaccompanied children have been encountered at the border and then placed with a sponsor in the interior of the United States. To be clear, these children did not arrive in the United States with their parents. These children made the dangerous journey north with basically any adult who is willing to convey them from their home, across the border, into the United States.

But the truth is, these children are not unaccompanied. They are accompanied by the criminals who make this their business. The sad reality is that many come to the United States in the care of cartels, human smugglers, and coyotes, and parents pay smugglers thousands of dollars to bring their children to the United States.

I have no doubt that when those children reached the United States, their parents thought they would be safe. After all, this is the greatest country

in the world, a country that values freedom, justice, and opportunity. I am sure their parents expected they would live safe and happy lives while their asylum claims are being considered, but we know the ugly truth.

We know now that countless children have experienced a new hell right here in the United States. The New York Times, for example, published two bombshell investigative reports detailing widespread exploitation of migrant children here in our country. Some children are being forced to work in meatpacking plants, food processing facilities, and construction jobs—underage children. These are not part-time jobs after school; these are full-time jobs instead of going to school, in violation of many States' child labor laws.

They are being treated as indentured servants as they try to pay off the debts they owe to the traffickers who brought them here. And there is no question the Biden administration understands what is going on, and, yes, their silence is complicity. Once unaccompanied children are apprehended and processed at the border, the Department of Health and Human Services has the legal responsibility to place these children with a safe sponsor.

According to longstanding policy, the agent follows up with a phone call 30 days later to make sure that the child is safe. On both counts—the preplacement vetting and the post-placement wellness check—the Biden administration has completely fumbled its responsibilities.

Health and Human Services actually loosened the vetting requirements in order to get children out of shelters fast—as fast as possible—with little regard for the increased danger to these children.

The New York Times has documented that at least 85,000 of those 300,000 children cannot even be reached within 30 days. So the practice is to make a wellness call in 30 days, but 85,000 of those 300,000 children, there is no answer.

So the Biden administration can't tell you where these children are, whether they are being fed, whether they are going to school, whether they are being neglected or abused or forced into involuntary labor. President Biden's administration doesn't know, and I think the sad truth is they don't care—because if they did care, this would not be allowed to continue.

This isn't breaking news. This isn't something I am announcing here today for the first time. Two major investigative pieces by the New York Times has exposed this scandal.

Over the last couple years, the Department of Health and Human Services has received countless warnings that these children are in danger. Those warnings came through its own hotline, government contractors, and scores of employees who sounded the alarm. Not only did Health and Human

Services ignore the warnings of whistleblowers, it tried to silence them.

Department leadership retaliated against employees who shined a light on this massive abuse. As a result, countless children have remained in dangerous situations just so the administration could avoid an embarrassing PR headache.

As we know, the tens of thousands of migrant children who have been lost—literally lost—by the Biden administration are not the only victims of the border crisis.

Now, I sometimes ask myself, what is it going to take? How bad are things going to have to get before this situation registers with enough people of good conscience and good will that they are actually willing to do something about it? And I am constantly disappointed that in spite of the scandal, we can't find enough people of good will and good intentions here in the U.S. Senate to change this, to make it better, to throw a rescue line to these kids.

But the story gets worse. We know the fentanyl epidemic has killed more than 70,000 people a year in the United States just last year, making it the leading cause of death for Americans ages 18 to 49—the leading cause of death. We know that the fentanyl epidemic does not discriminate. It kills young people. It kills old people. It kills rich people. It kills poor people, both those living in major cities and those living in rural America.

And we know the overwhelming majority of this fentanyl comes across the U.S.-Mexico border. Again, this is not breaking news. This is something known to all of us, including the Biden administration.

We also know where the precursor chemicals come from. These are chemicals shipped from China, shipped to Mexico, where the drug cartels mix them up. They use industrial-sized pill presses to gin out hundreds of thousands of pills that are contaminated with fentanyl.

Now, most of the time people who get poisoned by fentanyl don't actually know they are taking fentanyl. They may think they are taking a Xanax or Percocet or some other more innocuous medication, something we would prefer our kids not to take, but we understand sometimes that happens.

But they have no idea that a tiny dose of fentanyl can kill them and that many of these pills ginned out by the drug cartels, using these precursor chemicals in Mexico, are then shipped across the border and, unfortunately, routinely, take the lives of young, bright children who have the best of their lives ahead of them.

Between October of last year and April of this year, Customs and Border Protection seized more than 12,000 pounds of fentanyl at the southern border. Again, if you have a pencil—and I don't have a pencil, but I have a pen—it is basically the part of the pen that sticks out of the end of the part you

hold onto. It takes that little amount of fentanyl to kill you. And last year, Customs and Border Protection seized 17,000 pounds of it.

Now, some people say: Well, that is great. We don't have a problem. The Border Patrol seized it. Well, you remember those "got-aways" I mentioned earlier, more than a million of them? They were running away from law enforcement, and I guarantee you it was for a reason. Either they knew that their criminal record and background would not make it possible for them to legally migrate into the United States or they were carrying drugs like this fentanyl. And we know a lot of it is getting through because we are seeing the devastation that it has wrought—again, with 71,000 fentanyl-related deaths last year alone. So we know CBP is not able to interdict every ounce of illicit drugs—far from it.

Over the past couple years, the unprecedented border crisis under the Biden administration has affected all of our missions at the border, including those that have nothing to do with immigration. Law enforcement has been shifted to the frontlines in order to process and care for the migrants. Instead of stopping dangerous drugs and criminals, many agents are pushing paper and changing diapers.

No one is happier with this situation than the drug cartels and the criminals who smuggle migrants for money. They are getting rich. What is not to love from their standpoint? With fewer agents on the frontline, they have a clear and easy path to move fentanyl, heroine, methamphetamine, and other deadly drugs into the United States, and our communities are being ravaged by the overdose epidemic. The administration has given the cartels clear and easy corridors to traffic even more of their poison into the United States, as I have described.

Well, this is hardly a picture of a humane response to the border crisis, as President Biden and his administration claim. This is not humane.

Well, as I said earlier, sometimes I ask myself, what will it take? What will it take to get the attention of the people who actually have the authority to change this, to make it better, to save lives? Because hearing about these crises is enough to make your blood boil.

The administration cut corners in order to place migrant children with sponsors. It exerted minimal effort to follow up with those children to ensure they are safe and healthy. At the same time, the chaos caused by the border crisis has led to a security breakdown which enables fentanyl and other dangerous drugs to pour into the United States, killing Americans—108,000 last year alone.

Despite the widespread suffering caused by the Biden administration's policies, the President and his senior officials just don't seem to care. They don't care. If they did care, they would

do something about it. So it is clear to me they don't care.

There is a clear need to secure the border and stop the unprecedented migration crisis, but the majority of our Democratic colleagues refuse to address the border crisis unless Congress passes what they call comprehensive immigration reform. So, in other words, they are holding these children, they are holding the rest of the country hostage in order to achieve a legislative goal which they know is not possible—one, because we have a divided government: a Republican-controlled House and a Democratic-controlled Senate and a Democrat sitting in the White House.

There is no question that America's immigration system is in need of modernization. It is outdated, inefficient, and crippled by backlogs. But, as everyone knows, immigration reform is a very, very difficult, thorny issue. For 2 years, our Democratic colleagues controlled all three branches of government, and they couldn't even pass a partisan immigration bill. Now that we are operating in divided government, that calculus becomes harder, not easier.

There is absolutely zero chance that the Democrat-led Senate and the Republican-led House will be able to reach an agreement on immigration reform anytime soon. I wish that were not true. It doesn't have to be true, but I think, unless attitudes change, that is a fact.

Still, this elusive idea of comprehensive immigration reform has become a holdup for other problems relating to the border and immigration. In other words, these emergencies occurring at the border are being held hostage to an impossible goal, which is passing bipartisan immigration reform as a demand for solving these other problems.

Right now, the major problem we need to address is the humanitarian crisis fallout from what is happening. We can't prolong the suffering caused by the border crisis while our Democratic colleagues try to build support for a massive immigration reform bill that many of them seem to have zero interest in, because if they had interest, I assume they would be rolling up their sleeves and doing the hard work, doing more than just talking about it.

For example, in the Senate, the Democratic chairman of the Judiciary Committee has jurisdiction to mark up and presumably pass with some combination of Republican and Democratic votes a bill to address the crisis that I mention. The Democratic majority leader has the authority to bring a bill to the floor, to open it to amendments so that all Senators can participate to try to find out if there is some path forward and some consensus. But in the 2 years our Democratic colleagues controlled all three branches of government, they did zero about it.

That means that the young adults who are in a box because of deferred action on childhood arrivals—this is an

illegal scheme that President Obama did unilaterally 10 years ago which has been tied up in litigation ever since and is likely to be held illegal by a court of last resort here very soon.

So trying to address that, trying to address the drug crisis, trying to protect these 300,000 children—all of that is being held hostage for our Democratic colleagues to pursue an unattainable goal given the current political environment.

Migrant children are being abused within our own borders. Drugs kill about 109,000 Americans a year. We cannot leverage these lives for unrelated and unattainable measures.

There is nothing safe, orderly, or humane about the Biden administration's response to the border crisis, and until something changes, more people will continue to suffer and die.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Republican whip.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this week, the Senate Armed Services Committee is marking up the fiscal year 2024 National Defense Authorization Act. The NDAA is one of the most important pieces of legislation we consider literally every year. It is a bill that authorizes funding for our men and women in uniform and our defense needs and lays out our defense priorities. Hopefully, it is one of the things that force us to sit down and seriously consider the state of our national defense and what we need both now and in the future to ensure that America's military is prepared to deter and if necessary confront any threat.

I like to say that if we don't get national security right, the rest is conversation. And it is true. All these other things we debate and talk about, if we can't protect the country, really end up being very secondary. The security of our Nation is the precondition for everything else—for the continued enjoyment of our freedoms, for a flourishing society, for a healthy economy, for the government's ability to do anything.

My Democratic colleagues these days often seem to think we can let defense spending take a back seat to the latest Big Government issue, but that betrays a fundamental lack of understanding of reality. We live in a fallen world, and as long as we live in a fallen world, there will be evil people bent on aggression. So our national defense is not something we can ever afford to minimize or take for granted. We have to be prepared at all times to deter and to meet any threat.

The United States has a reputation for having one of the strongest militaries in the world. While that reputation is deserved, the fact of the matter is that our military readiness is not where it needs to be. Thanks to budgetary impasses and increased operational demands, by 2018, our readiness had eroded to the point that the bipartisan National Defense Strategy Commission released a report warning that we might struggle to win a war against a major power like Russia or China.

While we have made progress since then, we are still a long way from where we need to be. Recent U.S. war games positing a U.S.-China conflict following an attack on Taiwan have had grim results, showing enormous military and economic costs on both sides. One news story on these war games noted, and I quote:

And while the ultimate outcome in these exercises is not always clear—the U.S. does better in some than others—the cost is [clear]. In every exercise the U.S. uses up all its long-range air-to-surface missiles in a few days, with a substantial portion of its planes destroyed on the ground.

Let me just repeat that line.

In every exercise the U.S. uses up all its long-range air-to-surface missiles in a few days, with a substantial portion of its planes destroyed on the ground.

That is not a promising scenario, and it points to serious readiness shortfalls, particularly deficiencies in our inventory of munitions. I don't need to tell anyone that the side that runs out of munitions first is likely to be the side that loses in any conflict, which is why we need sustained investments in rebuilding our supply chain—an effort that is reinforced by multiyear purchases.

China is flexing its power with increasingly aggressive actions in the Indo-Pacific. It is investing heavily—heavily—in its military. China's defense budget has doubled over the last decade, and this year it will increase by more than 7 percent for the second year in a row. That doesn't even count any additional defense funding that China hides. So it should come as no surprise that China is outpacing our military in modern capabilities like hypersonic missiles and has amassed a larger navy.

I said that China is growing increasingly aggressive in the Indo-Pacific, but China is also growing increasingly aggressive toward the United States. Everyone remembers the Chinese spy balloon that flew over our country earlier this year, but that is just the tip of the iceberg. Recent reports indicate that China is using Cuba as a base for intelligence gathering against the United States. Now it has emerged that China is in discussions with Havana to establish a new joint military training facility in Cuba. That is not even to mention the aggressive behavior of the Chinese military toward U.S. assets in the Indo-Pacific.

It is impossible to overstate the necessity of ensuring that we have the

military and economic strength necessary to deter attacks from China or, in the worst case, confront and defeat them.

While China is obviously a major focus, we cannot forget the threat posed by Russia, as we continue to see in Ukraine, which is why it is vital that the United States and the Western world continue to support Ukraine in its fight and that NATO members take seriously or exceed their commitment to spend 2 percent of their GDP on defense.

Outside of great power threats, there are rogue nations like Iran, which is deepening its ties with both Russia and China and is dangerously close to becoming a nuclear power.

The legislation the Senate Armed Services Committee is considering this week is vital, and I hope the markup will produce a strong bill that helps address the shortfalls in our readiness.

I put forward a number of proposals that I hope will be included in the final legislation, with full funding for development of the new B-21 bomber, which will be housed at Ellsworth Air Force Base in South Dakota, at the very top of my priority list.

I am also working to ensure that, in addition to funding for the B-21 and the necessary support facilities, the Ellsworth area gets the resources it needs to support the military personnel and their families who will be coming to the area with the arrival of the B-21s.

Ronald Reagan once said:

We know only too well that war comes not when the forces of freedom are strong, but when they are weak. It is then that tyrants are tempted.

Today, as ever, it is vital that we make sure the forces of freedom are strong, and I will do everything I can to help ensure that this year's National Defense Authorization Act advances our Nation's readiness so that we can be prepared to deter any threat or meet it if called upon.

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.

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

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

NOMINATION OF NATASHA C. MERLE

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I am honored to stand in support of Natasha Merle, whom I was proud to nominate for the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York.

Ms. Merle is a deeply experienced litigator. She has practiced at virtually every level of the legal system, and she has litigated in both State and Federal courts, handling both civil and criminal matters.

Ms. Merle doesn't just have the experience and training necessary for the Federal bench; she also brings a crucial

and unique perspective as a former public defender. If confirmed, she would not only be the fourth Black woman on the district court but also the first person with experience as a public defender to fill this role in nearly 30 years.

Ms. Merle has demonstrated fairness in the courtroom and will uphold the rule of law as a judge. Nineteen senior lawyers from prominent national and international law firms submitted a letter in support of her confirmation. And I can tell you that her high ethical standards and reputation for fairness will leave a powerful mark on our communities and on the Eastern District of New York.

I hope she will receive a swift confirmation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

S.J. RES. 11

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, in just a moment, the U.S. Senate will vote to override President Biden's veto of my legislation that would stop yet another aggressive environmental regulation.

This specific regulation is an EPA rule that would impose stricter emissions standards on heavy-duty vehicles. While this might sound well-intentioned, let's be very clear about the facts.

First, the EPA's own economic analysis projects that the cost to Americans associated with this new regulation could reach up to \$55 billion from 2027 to 2045. That is because, when you force truckers to purchase new, expensive equipment in the name of climate, you are asking the American people to foot the bill. Any product transported by trucks, whether that is food headed to your local grocery store or something that you bought off of Amazon, each one of these products will cost more due to massive inflationary burdens this rule will place on the trucking industry. That means every American consumer will feel the effects of this rule and its price increases.

Every agriculture producer and every local business will feel its effects. If you are an ag or an energy-heavy State like Texas, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Illinois, Nebraska, California, or Montana, your local economy will be especially impacted by these higher freight costs.

That is not to mention the 3 million Americans who work as commercial truckers. Many truckers work for mom-and-pop operations—small businesses that simply don't have the financial resources to handle a spike in cost. Many of these businesses and the good-paying jobs that they support won't survive this rule.

And do you know? The real irony here is that the way this "green" regulation is structured, it actually undermines its own stated goal of reducing emissions. Think about it. If the price of newer vehicles shoots up, the government is incentivizing businesses to hold on to their older, higher emitting trucks.

So let's tell it like it is. The Biden administration's emissions rule is a political move that won't even be effective. The administration is making an ineffective climate statement at the expense of millions of Americans' livelihoods.

We in the Senate should know that we are not playing a political game of chess. We are dealing with real people. We are not moving pawns. That is why my CRA passed the Senate and the House with bipartisan support, and that is why we need to push back against the President's insistence on playing these regulatory games, because working families don't have the luxury for these games. They are reeling from inflation and economic turmoil caused by this administration.

So I would encourage my colleagues to join me in choosing our economy, our truckers, and, ultimately, the American people over another politically charged mandate from a power-hungry White House.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

TAX CONVENTION WITH CHILE

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, this year marks the 20th anniversary of diplomatic ties between the United States and Chile and 20 years since Congress approved a free-trade agreement between our two countries.

In April, I led a codel to Chile. I had a chance to meet with Chile's leaders and American businesses operating there. We were a bipartisan group. I went with Senator KAINE, Senator HAGERTY, and Congressman TONY CÁRDENAS.

We met with tech companies. We met with insurance companies. We met with mining companies—you name it. Do you know what every single one of them said to us? Do you know what they all wanted from the U.S. Senate? To approve the Chile tax treaty.

They said, if the United States doesn't ratify the treaty, they will continue to be at a huge disadvantage. The world is changing—we are undergoing an energy transition—and without this treaty, we are going to fall behind on critical minerals and manufacturing of the future.

And they are right. China already has a tax treaty with Chile. If the United States wants to level the playing field for American businesses and deepen our ties with Chile, we need to act.

Chile is one of our strongest democratic partners in the Americas, and the Chileans want us to ratify the treaty as well. We heard that message loud and clear when we spoke to the President and senior Members of Chile's Senate. We heard it from the Speaker of the Chilean Congress, and we heard it directly from President Gabriel Boric, a strong democratic leader who seeks closer ties with the United States.

We live in a world with increased global competition and in a contest between democracy versus

authoritarianism. The United States needs to be strategic about how we deepen our relationships with key democratic partners like Chile and President Boric. We must avoid unnecessary delays that undercut our competitiveness.

Remember, we signed this agreement in 2010—that was 13 years ago—and this would be only our third bilateral tax treaty in all of Latin America. China is not waiting around. So, if we want to be competitive, we need to move forward with the same determination, and the Chile tax treaty is an incredible opportunity in that regard.

Chile is an important market for U.S. goods and manufacturing, including aircraft, vehicles, and machinery. Chile is a leading producer of copper, and Chile has the second largest lithium reserves in the world. This critical mineral is the building block for many modern technologies.

As global demands skyrocket in the coming years—by as much as nearly 4,000 percent—this tax treaty will make it easier for U.S. businesses to be competitive in this emerging sector.

U.S. businesses and their Chilean counterparts want predictability and consistency in tax treatment. As they continue to scale up operations and as the United States and Chile forge even stronger economic ties, they want to know that they won't be taxed twice on the same income in two different countries. That is why the Chile tax treaty has overwhelming support from the U.S. private sector.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has expressed its resounding support for the treaty. It has support from U.S. companies across a range of industries and sectors. And the treaty enjoys strong bipartisan support as is evidenced by the fact that it passed the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by a nearly unanimous vote of 20 to 1.

By approving this treaty, we not only give the Senate's stamp of approval right now, but we have high hopes for where this treaty will take our two nations in the future.

While we are debating this tax treaty, I do want to take a minute to speak about how we engage on treaties more broadly. Treaties are a shared constitutional responsibility of the Senate and the executive branch. Nonetheless, as we worked last year to move the Chile tax treaty through the Senate, the Biden administration withdrew from our tax treaty with Hungary without consulting with the Senate or providing advance notice, let alone having approval. It is deeply disappointing that Presidents of both parties have advanced these types of unilateral actions and omissions in the past.

Let me be clear. Such actions are completely inconsistent with our constitutional structure. I have asked the President to commit, at a minimum, to meaningful consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee prior to terminating any treaty. Without such a commitment, I will work to ad-

dress this issue in future resolutions of advice and consent, as well as in legislation, and I will continue to work to make sure the Senate protects our constitutional prerogative on treaties. Abiding by our Constitution—standing up for our democratic values and institutions—this is what binds us with close partners like Chile.

It was in 1823 that this very Senate confirmed our first diplomatic representative to Chile. This established, for the first time, official relations between our two young nations. We took that action then because our countries were determined that the rest of the world take us seriously as independent states.

Our shared values and ambitions have given us 200 fruitful years of working together—in science and technological innovation, on immigration visas and academic exchanges, and, yes, on the question of critical minerals and renewable energy, which this treaty will take to new heights.

This treaty will advance U.S. interests by building partnerships that will position our country, our economy, and our manufacturing sector for the future.

I appreciate the ranking member of the Senate Finance Committee. We had some issues originally. We worked together, and we came to a conclusion that is satisfactory to all. I urge my colleagues to vote to advance this treaty and to ultimately vote to provide advice and consent to its ratification.

With that, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON VETO MESSAGE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Shall the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 11) pass, the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding?

The yeas and nays are required under the Constitution.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 167 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

Baldwin	Cortez Masto	Kaine
Bennet	Duckworth	Kelly
Blumenthal	Durbin	King
Booker	Feinstein	Klobuchar
Brown	Fetterman	Lujan
Cantwell	Gillibrand	Markley
Cardin	Hassan	Menendez
Carper	Heinrich	Merkley
Casey	Hickenlooper	Murphy
Coons	Hirono	Murray

Ossoff	Schumer	Warner
Padilla	Shaheen	Warnock
Peters	Sinema	Warren
Reed	Smith	Welch
Rosen	Stabenow	Whitehouse
Sanders	Tester	Wyden
Schatz	Van Hollen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

Two-thirds of the Senators voting, a quorum being present, not having voted in the affirmative, the joint resolution on reconsideration fails to pass over the veto of the President of the United States.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Natasha C. Merle, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 30, Natasha C. Merle, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Tim Kaine, Margaret Wood Hassan, Ben Ray Lujan, Raphael G. Warnock, Tammy Duckworth, Jack Reed, John W. Hickenlooper, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Baldwin, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Tina Smith, Debbie Stabenow, Sheldon Whitehouse.

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 Natasha C. Merle, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of New York, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

(Ms. CORTEZ MASTO assumed the Chair.)

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or change their vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 168 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—50

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote, the yeas are 50, the nays are 50.

The Senate being equally divided, the Vice President votes in the affirmative.

The motion is agreed to.

RECESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:32 p.m. recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. FETTERMAN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

NOMINATION OF NATASHA C. MERLE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote to confirm Natasha Merle to the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. She is a highly skilled litigator who has practiced at virtually every level of the legal system. Ms. Merle received her undergraduate degree from the University of Texas at Austin and her law degree from New York University School of Law. She then completed two Federal clerkships, one in the Southern District of New York and another in the Eastern District of New York. Following her clerkships, Ms. Merle devoted her early career to representing indigent clients, particularly as an assistant Federal public defender. She has also spent time in private practice, where she represented individuals, companies, and financial institutions in commercial litigation.

Since 2016, Ms. Merle has worked at the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, where she has devoted her practice to ensuring equal justice under law. She has also taught at two

of the Nation's top law schools: Columbia Law School, as a lecturer in law, and New York University School of Law, as an adjunct professor of clinical law. Ms. Merle has significant experience in the courtroom at both the trial and appellate levels. She has litigated in State and Federal court on both civil and criminal matters, practiced before the U.S. Supreme Court, and successfully argued an appeal before the California Supreme Court. Ms. Merle's deep expertise, diversity of experience, and commitment to public service will make her an outstanding addition to the Eastern District of New York.

The American Bar Association rated Ms. Merle "well qualified," and she has the strong support of her home state Senators, Mr. SCHUMER and Mrs. GILLIBRAND. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Ms. Merle's nomination.

VOTE ON MERLE NOMINATION

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. 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. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

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

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 169 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

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 actions.

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 Calendar No. 1, Treaty Document No. 112-8, Tax Convention with Chile, and a resolution of advice and consent to ratification with 2 reservations and 2 declarations.

Charles E. Schumer, Robert Menendez, Margaret Wood Hassan, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Patty Murray, Thomas R. Carper, Christopher Murphy, Chris Van Hollen, Tammy Baldwin, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Tim Kaine, Jeanne Shaheen, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Cory A. Booker.

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on treaty document No. 112-8, Tax Convention with Chile, and a resolution of advice and consent to ratification with 2 reservations and 2 declarations, shall be brought to a close?

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 97, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 170 Ex.]

YEAS—97

Baldwin	Ernst	Merkley
Barrasso	Feinstein	Moran
Bennet	Fetterman	Mullin
Blackburn	Fischer	Murkowski
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Murphy
Booker	Grassley	Murray
Boozman	Hagerty	Ossoff
Braun	Hassan	Padilla
Britt	Heinrich	Peters
Brown	Hickenlooper	Reed
Budd	Hirono	Ricketts
Cantwell	Hoeben	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Cardin	Johnson	Rosen
Carper	Kaine	Rounds
Casey	Kelly	Rubio
Cassidy	Kennedy	Sanders
Collins	King	Schatz
Coons	Klobuchar	Schmitt
Cornyn	Lankford	Schumer
Cortez Masto	Lee	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Luján	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lummis	Shaheen
Crapo	Manchin	Sinema
Cruz	Markey	Smith
Daines	Marshall	Stabenow
Duckworth	McConnell	Sullivan
Durbin	Menendez	Tester

Thune	Warner	Wicker
Tillis	Warnock	Wyden
Tuberville	Warren	Young
Van Hollen	Welch	
Vance	Whitehouse	

NAYS—2

Hawley

Paul

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURPHY). On this vote, the yeas are 97, the nays are 2.

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

The motion was agreed to.

TAX CONVENTION WITH CHILE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty will be stated.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 112-8, TAX CONVENTION WITH CHILE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 136

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 136.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 136.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with further reading of the amendment.

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

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This resolution of ratification shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after ratification.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1999

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, 1 year ago, the rightwing majority of the U.S. Supreme Court overturned decades of established precedent and stripped away the right to abortion in the *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization* decision.

In this decision, the Supreme Court overturned the right of the American people to make decisions about their own bodies and their own health. That is why, 1 year ago, I filed the Right to Contraception Act with my colleagues Senators DUCKWORTH, HIRONO, BALDWIN, and MURRAY, and I stood here, much like I am today, to request unanimous consent to pass our legislation. The House of Representatives passed the bill by a bipartisan vote of 220 to 195 at that time. Unfortunately, the Republicans in this Chamber chose to block its passage.

Here is just a short list of what has befallen us since that time.

District court judges have blocked teens from accessing birth control at

federally funded clinics and taken aim at health insurance coverage for contraception. Extremist State legislators have restricted, criminalized, and stigmatized reproductive care, including by suspending payments for emergency contraception for survivors of sexual assault. And people are left paying more, traveling further, and working harder to get essential medication.

The threats to contraception are real and happening now. So I stand here today, once again, to invite every Member of the Senate to join me, Senator DUCKWORTH, Senator HIRONO, Senator BALDWIN, Senator MURRAY, and the 35 additional cosponsors to pass the Right to Contraception Act.

Cosponsoring this bill means that you support codifying the right to obtain and use contraception; enshrining Supreme Court precedent into Federal law, guaranteeing a healthcare provider's right to prescribe these products and services and to share information related to them; preventing the Federal Government and States from interfering with the right to contraception; and authorizing the U.S. Attorney General, healthcare providers, and all Americans harmed by unlawful restrictions to go to court to enforce the rights this bill establishes—because there is no right without a remedy.

Passing the Right to Contraception Act means setting the bare minimum standard that the right to contraception should be protected even if the Supreme Court, once again, overturns settled precedent.

Nine in ten Americans support the right to contraception. This is not just a moral duty but part of our duty to represent the will of the American people. The right to contraception is central to life, liberty, and freedom. This is for every person who wants to live without politicians in their homes and waiting rooms, especially women, Black, Brown, indigenous, LGBTQ+, rural, immigrant, low-income, and disabled Americans most impacted by the failures of this Supreme Court.

With the right to abortion stolen and the right to contraception now threatened, I urge my colleagues to stand with us and to pass today the Right to Contraception Act.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 1999 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this bill is not about contraception; it is about abortion.

The bill defines "contraception" as "any drug, device, or biological prod-

uct intended for use in the prevention of pregnancy, whether specifically intended to prevent pregnancy or for other health needs, that is approved by the FDA."

The FDA has approved dangerous chemical abortion drugs that can also be used as contraceptives off-label. There is a huge difference between a drug that blocks fertilization and a drug that can end a life.

This bill also includes a provision that would act as a guaranteed earmark for Planned Parenthood. Under the bill, the government could not directly fund a health organization unless it provides abortion drugs.

Finally, this bill does not respect freedom of conscience for healthcare providers. It would no longer allow for religious exemptions for organizations that have deeply held objections to providing abortions.

The bill uses intentionally vague language to hide its ulterior motive of protecting access to abortion drugs. For these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. This is an issue that we are going to return to. Justice Thomas, in his comments on the *Dobbs* decision, said that the decisions made by the Supreme Court that extended privacy rights were an overreach. This Supreme Court began with the *Dobbs* decision. It is very clear, because he mentioned it specifically, that the *Griswold* decision—the decision to, in fact, protect the right to contraception—is also now in the crosshairs of the Supreme Court. So it is imperative that we return to this law to begin the process of passing legislation to codify this protection for Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 2053

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, this Saturday marks 1 year since the Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade* at the urging of extremist politicians upending 50 years of precedent protecting women's right to healthcare.

In the year since that decision, half the States in our country have banned or effectively banned access to abortion. Women in those States have extremely limited options for getting the healthcare they need. Those who can afford to travel have no choice but to go to other States to receive critical reproductive care.

That is what happened to Lauren Hall. She and her husband were excited that she was pregnant for the first time. But then she learned that her fetus was developing without a skull—a condition that meant it wouldn't survive. This condition also increased Lauren's risk of hemorrhaging. Her doctors at home in Texas refused to help her terminate the pregnancy, so she had to travel to Seattle, where she was finally able to get the abortion care that she needed. She is currently

suing the State of Texas for refusing to give her potentially lifesaving medical care.

We knew that after the Dobbs decision, stories like Lauren's would only happen more often and millions of women would lose the healthcare they need. Even before Roe fell, healthcare organizations in Nevada were prepared for an influx of women from out of State who needed abortion services.

Justice Brett Kavanaugh recognized this too. In his concurring opinion, he indicated that women who have to leave their home State to get the care they need would be protected by the constitutional right to interstate travel.

But we could see from miles away in Nevada that the far right would never stop plotting to roll back women's rights even further. In the last year alone, we have seen extremist Republicans try to stop women in our military from getting the healthcare they need. They have come after safe and effective birth control, and they have even supported a Federal abortion ban to outlaw reproductive care in all 50 States. And now we are seeing far-right extremists actively work to bar women from seeking care in States outside their own.

Let's be clear: This is about controlling women. The far right doesn't trust women to make their own healthcare decisions, so they think those decisions should be made by politicians instead. Well, I don't know about some of my colleagues across the aisle, but I don't think elected officials should be telling women what to do with their bodies, and neither do the vast majority of Nevadans.

We are a proud pro-choice State. Back in 1990, Nevadans overwhelmingly voted to codify a woman's right to choose. And, today, over two-thirds of Nevadans believe that a woman's healthcare decisions are between her and her doctor, and that is across all parties—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents.

But even though Nevada is a safe place for women who need healthcare, far-right Republicans living outside my State are telling women: Oh, no, sorry. We are making it illegal for you to go there.

This April, Idaho became the first State to make it a criminal offense for someone to help an individual traveling out of State to seek an abortion. And elected officials in States like Tennessee, Texas, and Missouri are trying to punish women for leaving their State for reproductive care, as well as anyone who helps them, including their doctors or even their employers.

This is why my colleagues and I are reintroducing the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act. One year after Roe v. Wade was overturned, we need this bill more than ever. Our legislation reaffirms that women have a fundamental right to interstate travel and makes crystal clear that States cannot prosecute women—or anyone who helps

them—for going to another State to get the critical reproductive care that they need.

We are talking about upholding a constitutional right to allow women to travel outside their home State. Now, why do some of my anti-choice colleagues want to restrict women from moving freely between States? The answer is simple: They don't trust women to have control over their own bodies.

Well, I do. And I am going to keep doing everything in my power to protect women, not just in Nevada but in every State across the country. We must pass the Freedom to Travel for Health Care Act.

So, Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 2053 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Utah.

MR. LEE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, there is an obsession on the left with abortion. It is becoming all-encompassing, infecting conversations that we have in the Senate on everything from the military to the Department of Veterans Affairs to phantom State laws that don't even exist.

Judges have to bow their policy objectives if they want to be appointed in this administration. Or those who are already on the bench, if they don't bow their policy objectives, if they don't bow to the abortion-centric, abortion-obsessed culture on the left, then all of a sudden, they are going to face these baseless attacks to their credibility and even threats of violence.

This bill, properly understood, really should be called the "Freedom to Traffic Act." You see, to my knowledge, no State—not a single State—has enacted a law restricting an adult's right to travel across State lines for purposes of an abortion or otherwise. I am not even aware of a single State considering such a thing.

And if a State were to even consider it, they wouldn't do it. And if they did do it, social law would undoubtedly be struck down as unconstitutional on one of at least several grounds, including the fact that the commerce clause, article I, section 8, clause 3 of Constitution has interpreted by the Supreme Court—among other things—to prohibit any State from treating an article of commerce—including a good, a person, a thing—in interstate commerce differently based on its origin or designation, out of State or outside the United States.

States can't cabin their own residents or anyone inside their own State boundaries. That is well-understood. So they don't have that authority. But more importantly, we are dealing with

a phantom problem, a phantom law that does not exist. There is not a single State law out there that restricts an adult's right to travel out of State for an abortion or otherwise.

What some States do have, and perhaps that is what is causing the confusion here, are some laws to stop the trafficking of children across State lines to obtain an abortion without notifying their parents.

This is well-established. We have laws on the books prohibiting the trafficking of minors across State lines with good reason. This is very different than what was implied as a reason why we need to pass this bill here today. It just isn't true. Those laws don't exist. They are not on the books. They are not even being considered to be placed on the books.

These laws are aimed to stop the sexual abuse of children by prohibiting their adult abusers and those in the abortion industry to help facilitate that abuse by transporting them across State lines for the purpose of obtaining an abortion and thus hiding the fact that they got an abortion from their parents.

There are good reasons for these laws. In 2004, for example, the 14-year-old daughter of Marcia Carroll was taken by her boyfriend's family from their home in Pennsylvania, where they lived, to New Jersey—New Jersey, where parental consent for an abortion was not required at the time. There, once in New Jersey, they threatened to leave her in New Jersey unless she got an abortion, which she did, under duress, under coercion, afraid. The grief and devastation crushed this 14-year-old girl and her family, who had agreed to keep the baby.

This so-called Freedom to Traffic Act would hamper the ability of States to punish such criminal and cowardly actions. I don't think there is anyone here who can defend that—trafficking a child across State lines for purposes of obtaining an abortion.

Sadly, this is not an isolated incident—far from it. We know from undercover videos, testimony from other courageous victims and reports from former employees that Planned Parenthood actively works to hide these child sexual abuse instances—covering up for adult abusers by providing their child victims with abortions and failing to report abuse.

This, again, is another thing that happens. Not only do we distort the facts, not only do we distort the status quo of the law in this country, but we also distort key facts when people become obsessed with abortion, and they see abortion as if it were, somehow, an unmitigated good.

This bill was just barely introduced in the Senate—I believe as recently as yesterday. This bill has not been through any committee. It has not been marked up in the committee of jurisdiction—the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which I serve. But Democrats think we should just pass it

anyway. I guess maybe they are channeling the now infamous words of former Speaker of the House NANCY PELOSI when she said “We have to pass the bill so that you can find out what is in it.”

This isn’t how we legislate, and we certainly shouldn’t be legislating when we haven’t reviewed the bill, it hasn’t been through committee, we don’t know what it says, and the bill’s proponents are badly mischaracterizing what it does and why we need it.

On that basis, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, as was already pointed out, the Constitution does protect the right to travel in this country, and there is no doubt that the Supreme Court has made that precedent clear. But constitutional rights don’t enforce themselves. And my colleagues on the far right only cloak themselves in the Constitution when it suits them, and right now, it really doesn’t suit them. That is why far-right Republicans in State legislatures across the country are working on and passing laws specifically focused on restricting a woman’s right to travel for reproductive healthcare—something I noticed my colleague from Utah seemed to ignore—Tennessee, Texas, Missouri, or some of those States.

At the end of the day, let me just touch on this idea that somehow this legislation is focusing on trafficking of individuals for sexual exploitation. Now, again, this is a perfect example of some of the far-right Republicans—when they really can’t argue the facts and the law of something, then they just make things up or they throw inflammatory arguments out there to try to scare individuals.

But let me just make this clear. As a former attorney general who worked and continues to work on human trafficking issues that address the sexual exploitation of adults and minors, this is not trafficking. And I would say to my colleague in Utah, who knows better, that sexual exploitation of individuals that this country needs to address, along with many other countries—and we have passed laws to protect individuals—this is not it.

What I do know is, instead of addressing the true issue before us, which is, why can’t women be free to travel from a State that has restricted their right to abortion to my State, where we have chosen to allow them to get the healthcare they need, the essential healthcare—it is always fascinating to me that I hear, on the far right, my colleagues say it is always about States’ rights; it is about States’ rights; this is a States’ rights issue.

Dobbs basically said in its decision this is a States’ rights issue, but then, when it doesn’t suit what they care about, the far right says: Well, forget those States’ rights. Only listen to what we as elected officials determine

you should have. Ignore what Nevada has done. Ignore the Democrats, the Republicans, the Independents, the men and the women in Nevada who chose to codify the right of a woman to choose and seek essential healthcare. Ignore that completely.

That is what this legislation is about. It is about trusting women and giving them the ability to come to a State like Nevada to seek essential healthcare for their reproductive rights.

Again, I constantly hear this emotional argument about—and my colleague from Utah, whom I respect, but he said this—the left somehow has an obsession with abortion. It is outrageous, outrageous, inflammatory talk. What we do have an obsession with is freedom and that every American in this country, whether you are a man or a woman, should have that freedom, and it shouldn’t be taken away from you by elected officials who think they know better about your healthcare than you do, who think that they can restrict in their State your access to healthcare, that they can jeopardize your healthcare and your decisions about your family and your future because they think they know better.

Mr. President, I just think it is outrageous that one simple thing that we cannot agree to in this Congress in a bipartisan way is that women should have that fundamental freedom to travel for their healthcare needs without being restricted, without being called names, without being fearful, and we should be protecting those doctors and the healthcare decisions to do that.

I will say one final thing. We have worked hard in this country to evolve so that all our medical care is some of the best. We are fighting right now to make sure that we have access to technology, that we have access to medical care. We do the research. We do the development. We have the medical care of the 21st century.

What my far-right Republicans are telling women across this country is, you can’t access that medical care for the 21st century. Do you know why? Because we think that we should hold you back to the 19th century. We want to politicize this, and we want to take away your rights, and so we are going to take you back to the 19th century.

It is outrageous—outrageous that we have to be here in this day and age. Over 50 years of *Roe v. Wade* and not one issue that we can see impeding anybody’s rights here, for women across this country and this fundamental freedom about reproductive rights.

So I am disappointed, but I will tell you what, Mr. President, this is an issue you are going to see all of us, one after another, continue to fight. This is an essential fight for women in this country and their rights and their freedom to choose—the freedom to choose and not have somebody else dictate what they should or shouldn’t do with

their bodies; not to have somebody else dictate, based on whatever their religion is or their rights, that they know better than somebody living in an issue that is so personal to them, that they can be dictated to in this day and age.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, it is important to point out that this legislation makes no distinction between those covered by it, whether they are children or adults, and that is my whole point, is that one of the problems with this is that it would block the effectiveness of State statutes that are there to protect children against interstate trafficking for the purpose of getting them abortions in another State without the knowledge or consent of their parents. That is an issue.

Yes—and I do maintain—I am not aware of a single State law that prohibits a woman from traveling out of State, an adult woman from traveling out of State. If such a law exists, I am not aware of it, and if it exists despite my nonawareness of it, it is unenforceable. It would be deemed invalid instantaneously. You can’t do that.

But what this would do, since it makes no distinction between children and adults, is it would halt the operation of these States’ State laws designed to protect children from interstate trafficking for the purpose of obtaining an abortion, which is very often necessary in order to conceal child sex perpetrators and child traffickers and what they are doing.

Now, my colleague and friend from Nevada, the distinguished Senator from Nevada, referred to this—kept characterizing the “far right.” Now, to my knowledge, nearly every Republican in this Chamber is pro-life. There are a few variations along the way, but nearly all of us are pro-life. To call all of us far right is excessive, and it is unfair. It is unfair especially because there is a mischaracterization also of why we believe what we believe. At least I can tell you what I believe about this.

She refers to States’ rights. I never call it that. Why? Well, because States don’t have rights; States have authority. Authority is sort of the inverse polar opposite of a right. A right is something that you have that protects you from actions by the State, by the government, protects you from the authority of the collective, coercive force that is government. So they aren’t States’ rights; this is State authority. And that is really how we arrived here. That is really where we have been for the last half-century.

While people are, on the left, bemoaning the deprivation of a right, I challenge each of them to tell me where in the Constitution it talks about abortion. Of course, the word “abortion” doesn’t appear in the Constitution, but what part of the Constitution actually confers that right? That is the problem we are getting at

here, and that is what I would like to address here for a moment.

You see, because in Washington, it sometimes starts to feel like we are up against an immovable object and where progress is measured in inches and then victories are sparse and hard-fought, and occasionally the tides turn and something significant happens and there is a seismic shift.

One year ago, we experienced such a seismic shift when the Supreme Court issued its landmark decision in the case of *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health*. But to fully appreciate the significance of that historic moment and that decision, we must first understand the journey that got us to this point in the first place. So let's rewind the clock 50 years, all the way back to 1973, when the Supreme Court handed down its ruling in *Roe v. Wade*, a decision that—to say that it legalized abortion doesn't really capture the image. It centralized power in Washington, DC, over abortion policy decisions, and then it kept that power not in the legislative branch of the Federal Government based in Washington, DC, but across the street at the Supreme Court in nine lawyers wearing black robes who have been sworn in as Justices, by removing the American people's ability to make decisions through their duly-elected lawmakers regarding abortion. It was a moment that completely reshaped the American people's ability to impact abortion policy.

So for nearly five decades after that decision, this power to determine abortion policy rested ultimately with the Supreme Court. Sure, the Supreme Court would leave enough wiggle room to leave the impression that lawmakers—primarily at the State level, of course—could make law, but the Supreme Court was constantly inventing and reinventing what the standard was, what was and what was not a permissible restriction on abortion.

You see, this is what happens when you make up a nonexistent constitutional right, when you just decide that something is really important, that you feel so strongly about it that it must be in there, that it has to be in the Constitution because it is so important. When you take away the constitutional text from the words of the document, all of a sudden, you are left in this sort of no-man's land where you have to make things up as you go along.

The result was chaos—49½ years of chaotic manipulation at will of the law. A State would do one thing; the Supreme Court would strike it down. Another State would do something slightly different; the Supreme Court would uphold it, sometimes changing the standards along the way.

But in *Dobbs*, the Supreme Court recognized the constitutional importance of keeping the power with the people, affirming that they have a legitimate interest in protecting the lives of the unborn and that they possess the authority to enact laws that reflect their values.

You see, remember a moment ago when we talked about the difference between authority and rights. They are the opposite of each other. Rights protect you from authority.

So when the Supreme Court decided as a matter of policy that it was so passionate about abortion in 1973 that it had to be in the Constitution, they effectively wrote it into the Constitution even though it is not there. They made it utterly impossible for people's elected representatives—either in their State legislative bodies, entities of local government, or, where appropriate, in Congress—to make most of the laws, and ultimately those were all subject to the will and the whim and the caprice of the Supreme Court. They did that because they deemed it part of the Constitution. But when you just deem something a part of the Constitution, that doesn't make it a part of the Constitution.

I believe it was Abraham Lincoln who once asked rhetorically the question: If you call the tail of a dog a leg, how many legs does the dog have?

He asked the question.

Someone answered: Five.

He said: No. Wrong. It is still four. Just because you call the tail a leg doesn't make it a leg. The dog still has four legs.

This is still the Constitution. There still is nothing in here that says, by the way, that people can't make laws to protect the lives of the unborn unless the Supreme Court decides that they are permissible based on its own meandering standards ultimately untethered from the text of the Constitution or from 400 years of Anglo-American legal and jurisprudential tradition.

So in *Dobbs*, they restored this power back to the people. In *Dobbs*, it reaffirmed the fundamental belief that every human life is sacred, and every human life is deserving of protection. In *Dobbs*, the Court recognized the decisions of deeply personal and morally significant matters should be made closest to the people they affect.

Unfortunately, in the wake of *Roe*, we have witnessed a really dark chapter in our Nation's history. This decision wrongly declared that abortion was a right, despite no mention of it anywhere in the Constitution. A decision ushered in a new era, one that forced us to tolerate some of the most barbaric of practices: late-term abortions, gruesome procedures that practically no American supports became a stain on our society.

Even as those cases were litigated, the gruesome procedures were described, some of the most hardened lawyers could barely tolerate mentioning or even listening to the words describing the procedures.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Will the Senator yield for a question about how long he plans to speak, just for the convenience of others?

Mr. LEE. Sure. I anticipate I will be finished within 5 minutes.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I appreciate that very much. Thank you.

Mr. LEE. We refuse to accept this as the new status quo. We knew something had gone terribly, terribly wrong.

The *Dobbs* decision brought us a glimmer of hope. It reaffirmed the fundamental belief that every human life really is sacred and is deserving of protection and is capable of being protected within our constitutional system.

Finally, we are empowered to exercise our constitutional prerogative and resume our efforts to protect the lives of the unborn and end these unspeakable horrors.

And so this issue of States' rights—again, these are not States' rights. That is oxymoronic. And we call it federalism, State authority. So this victory of *Dobbs*, it is not just a victory for States' sovereign authority; it is also a victory for humanity because when we are told by the judicial branch of government, contrary to fact that the Constitution tells us that we cannot, may not, must not protect unborn human life, that really does grave damage to humanity.

The victory in *Dobbs* is a reminder that we can't afford to turn a blind eye to the moral and ethical implications of our laws. We must proceed in a way that protects the innocent and defend against the atrocities allowed under this lofty-sounding but ultimately barbaric platitude of choice.

Even with this victory, we still have a long way to go. Contrary to the assertions of many on the Democratic side of the aisle, the *Dobbs* decision did not make abortion illegal. It did nothing of the sort.

While many States have passed laws that protect preborn children—and I applaud them for doing so—others have expanded their abortion laws. Late-term and partial-birth abortions are still a reality in many States. This isn't something that I celebrate. I disagree with those laws. But I don't live in those States. And the important thing is that the people in those States are making those laws. And most of the time, it is in the States, and not here in Congress, where things not rendered Federal by the Constitution should be decided.

As we approach the 1-year anniversary of *Dobbs*, I believe we are dutybound to remember the millions upon millions of innocent lives lost, the pain and suffering endured, and the resilience of the men and women who fought for those who could not fight for themselves, who have no voice and therefore had to have others speak on their behalf.

We should be inspired to build a society where every life is cherished, where compassion triumphs over convenience and cowardice, and where the horrors of abortion become a distant memory, especially the horrors of abortion forced upon us by a judicial oligarchy utterly untethered from the text of the Constitution.

The Dobbs decision represented a turning point the moment when we said: Enough is enough. Now we are positioned to acknowledge that every life, from conception to natural birth, deserves our protection and our compassion and our care. And, yes, in some States they are going to do that differently than in others, but the fact that they are going to do it differently in one State or another doesn't mean that they don't deserve protection.

So as we celebrate this milestone, I hope we can remain committed to this cause. Let us never forget the horrors hoisted upon us by Roe and the significance of the Dobbs decision in restoring sanity and compassion to the laws that guide our Nation. Together we can forge our future, where the rights of the unborn are safeguarded, where the dignity of every human being is cherished, and where the dark days of the past remain only as reminders of our resolve to create a better world.

In the face of adversity, remember that change is possible. Remember that we possess the ability to achieve great things. Our Nation's health and strength lie in the people's hands, and together we can shape a future where every life is valued.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to support my colleague and friend Senator CORTEZ MASTO in her efforts to bring this legislation not only to the floor but to passage.

This has been a long, long trail of broken promises and false assertions. It began with the broken promises and false assertions of judicial nominees who came before the Judiciary Committee to assure us that the protections of Roe v. Wade were a precedent and that they would respect precedent. Of course, that all evaporated.

We then heard the argument that this was "States' rights." My friend from Utah may not like the phrase, but it is one that his side has used over and over again. Call it States' rights or call it federalism, the notion was that all we were doing was opening this up to States.

But you heard right here on the Senate floor that the notion that every pregnancy is subject to the control of the government from the moment of conception. That does not allow for a differentiation between one State and another.

And now that the States' rights assertion has been proven false, now that it is clear that there are many Members not only of Congress but of State legislatures who want a nationwide ban on women's ability to make these reproductive choices, it becomes clearer and clearer why this particular bill is so important. It is only a matter of time until we see those bills being voted on in legislatures, trying to criminalize a citizen of one State if they go to another State to get this kind of care or trying to create a nationwide abortion ban.

However you call it, it will intrude on the ability of women to go and seek this care. And what we are seeing already is women with troubled pregnancies, for whom there is an indicated treatment, unable to get the treatment that medical science knows is the right treatment, whether it is twins, one of whom isn't viable, or a woman's ability to have further pregnancies if this one is not terminated, or the ability of a woman to simply be treated for sepsis, for instance, before it turns to life-threatening and not have to wait and look at the watch and let her get sicker and sicker, knowing that the end is the same, in any event, but putting her life and health at risk in order to allow the will of a bunch of State legislators to turn up in the examination room or the treatment room with her and her family and her doctor. For all of these reasons—because the proponents of a nationwide abortion ban, because the proponents of undoing Roe v. Wade, have simply been incredible for too long—we simply have to assume the worst.

And this bill is an important and sensible way to make sure that if the Presiding Officer's State or my State want to allow that freedom for women, that women can come there and get the care that they need—very often, in a troubled pregnancy, for their own or their future children's or the siblings' well-being. So for all those reasons, I wish we had the chance to vote on this and look forward to future chances.

I yield the floor.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 631

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, as we know, this Saturday marks the 1-year anniversary of the day the U.S. Supreme Court decided to overturn half a century of precedent on a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions.

I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from Rhode Island and all of my colleagues who are here today.

When they made this decision, it went against the 70 to 80 percent of Americans who believe that this decision should be made by a woman and her family and her doctor and not by politicians. As a result, as we predicted that day, women across the country are at the mercy of a patchwork of State laws governing their ability to access reproductive care.

In States like Texas, women have been forced to carry pregnancies for days after learning that their baby would not survive because their doctors can't legally provide care unless their life is at risk.

And then there was the heart-breaking story about the 10-year-old girl in Ohio who had to go to Indiana to get an abortion after she was raped—10 years old. People said it was some kind of a hoax. It wasn't. It was real. And everyone in this Chamber knows it.

The Supreme Court's decision threatened women's health and freedom. And to this day, it demands a legislative response, not a response where the women of Texas are told that they have different rights. In fact, no rights compared to women in Minnesota or even in our next-door State of Wisconsin. Part of that is codifying Roe v. Wade into law. That is true.

We must also address the full scope that women are facing, the full scope of threats right now. Recent reports have illustrated how social media companies are collecting and data brokers are selling location data that could be used to identify women seeking reproductive healthcare services.

We know that the collection of this data, we know that people on both sides of the aisle understand that this has ramifications beyond women seeking abortion care. They could have anyone, man or woman, seeking a mental health provider, an addiction clinic, counseling therapy—all of it—the rules are murky, and the data is being collected and sold.

That is why I am leading the UP-HOLD Privacy Act with a number of our colleagues, including Senator WARREN and Senator HIRONO. And that is why I am seeking unanimous consent to pass this legislation.

Our bill sets commonsense limits on how companies can use people's personal data. First, it bans data brokers from selling location data. Women making their most personal healthcare decisions should be able to go to their doctors' appointments and consult specialists without worrying that the data about their location where they are going to be or are will be purchased or sold.

Second, it says you can't use health data for commercial advertising purposes, period. That means companies can't use data from fitness trackers or browser histories to sell ads, all healthcare data.

Third, it gives consumers more say over how their personal healthcare information is used by allowing them to request that their data be deleted.

It also places limits on what health data companies can collect about Americans. Consumers deserve to be in the driver's seat when it comes to determining how their personal health data is used. This legislation does just that.

It is past time that we update our privacy laws, in general, and I hope we get that done by the end of this year. But we must also update our health privacy laws to reflect the reality of how social media platforms and data brokers are profiting off our data.

In a world without Roe, this couldn't be more urgent. I supported, with a Republican, limits on this health data to begin with, and now, as we are in this post-Roe world, as I know, it becomes even more important.

I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in declaring that these Big Tech companies cannot sell

off, through data brokers, our private personal healthcare and that our decisions should never be a tool for profit. This is not a radical proposal. It is completely common sense.

As we get closer to marking a year without *Roe v. Wade*, I continue to stand with my colleagues in the fight for reproductive freedom. We stand firmly on the side of the American people who have come together, time and time again, in Kentucky, in Michigan, in Montana, and in the middle of the prairie in Kansas to defend reproductive rights. We will not settle for a reality in which our daughters have fewer rights than their mothers and their grandmothers.

As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be discharged from further consideration of S. 631 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Mississippi.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Madam President, this bill presents a solution in search of a problem. Unfortunately, it appears that the intent of this legislation is to treat abortion as healthcare, to prevent pro-life entities from sponsoring ads designed to help provide women and girls with trustworthy support during pregnancy, and to make it harder for States to enforce their own laws protecting life and the most vulnerable.

When it comes to ensuring patient privacy and healthcare, I believe there are bipartisan solutions to be found that we can all agree on. One-sided efforts to promote abortion are not the way for us to find common ground on this issue.

I would also like to point out that this bill has not received a hearing or markup in the Commerce Committee, which would be a great opportunity to have.

I would like to turn now to recognize that this Saturday will mark the first anniversary of the Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*. I am incredibly proud that this victory for the pro-life movement, reversing the moral stain of *Roe v. Wade*, came out of my State of Mississippi. I am amazed and grateful that in God's sovereign plan, a law introduced by my friend, Mississippi State Representative Becky Currie, ultimately achieved what I and so many have prayed for, for 50 years now, to restore the sanctity of life.

My friend, Mississippi Attorney General Lynn Fitch, our State's solicitor general, Scott Stewart, and the many others in the AG's office worked tirelessly to represent our State's direct challenge to *Roe*.

After a draft of the *Dobbs* majority opinion was shamefully leaked, the

conservative Justices resisted disgraceful intimidation tactics and threats to their own lives. They stayed true to their judicial oaths to uphold and defend the Constitution.

The Supreme Court recognized correctly in *Dobbs* that the Constitution does not confer a right to abortion and that *Roe* was "egregiously wrong and on a collision course with the Constitution from the day it was decided."

While the *Dobbs* decision did not end abortion in America, it took a monumental step in returning the issue back into the hands of the people and their elected representatives. Today, as a result, 14 States are protecting unborn children through all 9 months of pregnancy. Several others now protect babies at the point where they have a heartbeat, at 6 weeks, and still others at 12 weeks. One recent study found that there were more than 24,000 unborn children saved from abortion in the first 9 months since *Dobbs*. That is 24,000 miracles, because that is what a child is—a miracle.

But it is not just the States that can protect life after *Dobbs*. We in Congress also have a responsibility to protect life and stop the Democrats' extreme pro-abortion agenda.

It saddens me deeply that Democrats in Congress continue to advocate for appalling legislation that would impose legalized abortion on demand up until the moment of birth across all 50 States. Their legislation is even more radical than *Roe* was and would eliminate even the most modest pro-life protections, like parental involvement laws and bans on sex-selective abortions. Democrats cannot name a single limit on abortion they support—not one.

The American people, however, reject this extreme position. A new Tarrance Group poll this month found that three-fourths of voters oppose allowing abortions through all 9 months of pregnancy and support at least some limits to abortion.

More Americans continue to reject abortion when they learn more about the child in the womb—when they can hear the child's heartbeat, when they can see them suck their thumbs and yawn in an ultrasound, and when they learn that they can feel pain.

Despite this, the Biden administration's FDA and Department of Justice continue to allow the abortion industry to obstruct the will of pro-life States by illegally flooding the mail with do-it-yourself abortion pills, turning post offices into abortion centers. These actions not only endanger women's lives and their health, but they violate longstanding Federal laws that clearly prohibit the mailing of abortifacient drugs.

Finally, we also must advance policies to support pregnant mothers in choosing life. In particular, we need to support the work of pregnancy centers. More than 2,700 pregnancy centers across the country provide critical medical and material support for

women and families facing unplanned pregnancies to choose life rather than abortion.

This is the promise of the Declaration of Independence: that all men are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the inalienable right to life.

Thanks to the Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs*, 1 year ago this week, we can finally begin the hard work to make good on the promise for unborn Americans too.

Finally, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Just a few specific responses. First of all, this bill is very specific. It addresses health and location data, and, as I noted before, I continue to believe that we need Federal privacy legislation, in general, to address other privacy needs. But this bill is targeted at sensitive health data when it comes to location.

And I know it was the conservative members of the Supreme Court who actually issued the broad decision to overturn half a century of precedent on a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions. And this bill is a targeted response on one issue, and that is to set commonsense limits on how companies can use people's personal data.

I just also wanted to respond to the issue of mifepristone, which was temporarily thrown out by one judge in the State of Texas, and that is now pending before several different courts. A different decision was made in another court, in Washington State. But I will note that the statute referred to, which would somehow limit this drug that was approved by the FDA decades ago and has been found safe in dozens and dozens of countries across the globe—that law that was referred to was actually enacted, the Comstock Act in 1873—when they treated pneumonia with bloodletting, when the Pony Express existed, and, which I know, is 10 years before they even did the "Yellowstone" prequel.

So if my colleagues want to move backward to that time period, those are the laws they are citing. I believe the people of this country want to move forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1297

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, listening to this debate today, I can't believe we are having these debates in 2023. It is just stunning to me that we are having to debate privacy and the ability to make your own reproductive health decisions and all the ramifications for it. But here we are.

So I rise today to speak up for American women, the doctors who care for us, and our freedom to make our own healthcare decisions. What a novel idea that, in the United States of America, we would be able to make our own healthcare decisions.

But thanks to a radically conservative Supreme Court and radicals in State legislatures, reproductive freedom is no longer a constitutional right in the United States.

Roe v. Wade protected our freedoms for 50 years, until it didn't. Nearly half of the 50 States have already banned abortion or are likely to do that—half. And, sadly, this change is already making American healthcare worse. It just breaks my heart to hear about the individual situations of women.

In Michigan, fortunately, we are in a situation where the people of Michigan have stood up for reproductive freedom. But to see the women coming into Michigan, the people who are pregnant coming into Michigan, who are coming in to get help that they can't get in their own State, it just breaks my heart.

A poll of OB/GYNs released today by the independent health policy research organization KFF shows the effects. Sixty-four percent of OB/GYNs surveyed said that the Dobbs decision has increased pregnancy-related deaths. Now think about that: 64 percent of the doctors—of the OB/GYNs surveyed—said that this Supreme Court decision has increased pregnancy-related deaths.

Seventy percent of OB/GYNs said that the Dobbs decision has made racial and ethnic inequalities in healthcare worse. And 68 percent of OB/GYNs—the doctors serving women—say that the Dobbs decision has made it harder for them to manage their patients' pregnancy-related emergencies, including women who desperately want their babies. They are desperate for this. They want to have this child. And something comes up, and it breaks their heart and their family's hearts. And there is an emergency that may threaten their life, and doctors are saying that it is harder for them to respond in an emergency.

Just think about that: 68 percent of doctors say that this Supreme Court decision makes it harder for them to keep patients alive.

These doctors know what they need to do to save lives. In many States, they are just not allowed to do it. How could that be in America in 2023?

And even doctors in States like Michigan—and I am proud to say we now protect reproductive freedom in our constitution, voted on by the people of our State, overwhelmingly, last November. But even we aren't immune from that.

A State law in Texas allows vigilantes to sue doctors even in States where abortion is legal. So much for States' rights. And radicals in other States are scrambling to pass similar legislation.

That is why we need the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Healthcare Act. Thank you to Senators MURRAY and PADILLA and LUJÁN and ROSEN for leading this effort, and I am proud to be their partner, as we all are.

This bill would ensure that healthcare providers in States where

abortion is legal—States' rights; it is legal—can keep providing the reproductive healthcare their patients need. And it would help protect patients across the country who choose to access reproductive healthcare in a State where it is legal.

I trust Michigan doctors. Michigan doctors know what their patients need. What Michigan doctors and their patients don't need are Texas legislators standing in their exam rooms.

It is time to pass this legislation to protect doctors and to protect their patients. So, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1297 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I object to S. 1297 for a simple reason: It would make it easier for unborn life to be ended.

Last year's Dobbs decision brought renewed hope to Americans who believe in the sanctity of each and every life, including life in the womb. After 49 years, a new culture of life has begun to take hold across our country. But this bill would actually take us backwards.

This bill would allow abortion on demand in pro-life States so long as the patient is from another State. This bill would expose doctors and nurses who work in religious organizations, clinics, and hospitals—it would expose them to costly lawsuits if they stand by their deeply held beliefs. This bill would violate the spirit of bipartisan Hyde protections by providing 80 million taxpayer dollars to the abortion industry.

I was elected to save as many unborn lives as possible, and this bill puts more unborn lives in danger; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, let me say two points to my colleague. First, fundamentally, this is about who makes medical decisions. Do we trust women? Do we trust the person who is pregnant? Do we trust their ability to work with their doctor? Who makes the decision in the United States of America? We stand with the women of America.

The second thing I will say is that it is so difficult for me to hear over and over again about the sanctity of life when I lead the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Committee, where we have to fight every day to make sure food is available for children who are born.

The House of Representatives just passed an agriculture appropriations bill that gutted WIC, which is the

Women, Infants, and Children Program for newborn babies and moms, to get them started in a healthy life.

When we can't pass quality standards for Medicaid births, which are half the births of this country, because we have had objections on the other side of the aisle for years about somehow having quality standards for prenatal care and birth, it is very hard for me to listen to the idea that we ought to be protecting—it is not just the unborn. It is the born. It is the children. It is the moms. It is the quality of life that we fight for every day, for food, healthcare, and so on.

So I find it very hard to listen to that language.

I am very disappointed that there is an objection to a bill that would let doctors practice healthcare to protect women and babies.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, before she leaves the floor, let me say to my seatmate on the Senate Finance Committee how much I appreciate her passion and leadership on this critical issue.

I note that the Presiding Officer is also one of the outspoken members on the committee on this issue.

This has been a terrific debate coming from our side, and I thank my colleague for her comments.

It has been a year since the atrocious decision of Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization. I remember reading the leaked decision in the press early last May and realizing with dread that the Court was going to strike down Roe v. Wade. My first reaction was that the Court has set in motion a catastrophe for the health, safety, and privacy of American women. To the horror of the 36 million women living in States that have already banned abortion or are likely to ban access to abortion, unfortunately, my prediction was right.

The Supreme Court's decision in Dobbs tossed out half a century of legal precedent, curtailed the fundamental rights of women, and jeopardized the health and safety of millions across the country. The Court defied the American people, who are living with the grim reality that some of the Nation's most powerful people are eager to violate their privacy and their basic right to make their own decisions with respect to healthcare.

So the last year has been a nightmare for millions of women in America. It has been especially felt by those living in the more than 20 States that have passed laws banning or severely restricting access to abortion.

The personal stories that you hear if you spend time listening are gut-wrenching. Women in Texas who desperately wanted to be parents and suffered pregnancy complications nearly died trying to access lifesaving care. Yet they were told they weren't sick enough to get it. Far-right politicians

are suing healthcare providers for providing care to a 10-year-old who had been raped—raped—and was pregnant. The cruelty apparently is the point.

I am proud to be from Oregon, where abortion remains legal. We have some of the most pro-choice laws in the country for those seeking reproductive health care. That is because, in Oregon, we understand that people can make the best decisions for themselves and their families. But even in Oregon, you can't take freedom for granted. Extreme Republicans won't stop until they pass a national ban on abortion, and they are trying.

A national 6-week ban was introduced in Congress right after the Dobbs decision came out. Anti-abortion advocates sought out a lone judge in Amarillo, TX, to ban mifepristone, which is widely and safely used in medication abortions nationwide. The FDA approved the safe and effective medication for dispensation more than 20 years ago. I organized the first congressional hearings about this drug as a Member of the other body in 1990. This effort was never based on some extreme or some political agenda; it was based on one proposition—that science ought to be making the judgments and not politics.

I came to the Senate floor in February and called on the administration to do everything it could to keep the lifesaving medication on the market. Thankfully the far-right extremists haven't won yet, but, as a number of my colleagues have said today correctly, we are not home-free as that case moves through the courts.

Contrary to what Justice Kavanaugh told us in concurrence of Dobbs, anti-abortion zealots are not leaving these matters up to the States. Several States are trying to restrict freedom of movement, criminalizing women who travel to other States for an abortion or even the person who gives them a ride. Think about that. You can't sugarcoat that. They are talking about enacting laws that reach beyond State borders, and that harkens back to some very dark days in our history.

This has always been about control, and one speaker after another on our side has said that through the course of the day. This is about politicians inserting themselves in exam rooms and in the private decisions about whether and when to start a family.

I care about this issue for several reasons. Right at the heart of my concern is Americans' right to privacy. That right to privacy is what makes America, America.

As women grapple with the strictest State laws that threaten their health and take away their privacy, they also face a crisis of digital privacy and what we have come to call uterus surveillance. Governments are weaponizing the most personal and private data about women's bodies and healthcare and using it against them. I and a number of colleagues on our side have been sounding this alarm for years that lo-

cation data leached from phone apps is ripe for abuse. States where extremists have restricted or banned abortion—that goes straight to a five-alarm crisis.

We also know that shady data brokers have tracked women to and from Planned Parenthood centers. They have and will sell this information to anybody with a credit card. And in States where abortion is illegal, anything women say or read online can be used against them. Researching birth control online, updating a period tracking app, even just carrying a phone into the doctor's office—you name it—it is potential evidence for the prosecution. The possibilities are endless and frightening.

As to our laws governing women's sensitive private health data, as we think about what is ahead, we have to recognize that those laws have been outdated and weak for decades. I commend the administration for drawing attention to this issue and being interested in shoring up loopholes in our laws.

More has to be done. We have seen over this past year that Republican State attorneys general and Governors are ready and willing to discard women's privacy in their quest to prohibit access to reproductive health care.

This has been a horrific year, but as my colleagues have said on the floor this afternoon, we are going to be resolute. All the bills that the group led by Senator MURRAY, my colleague, the President of the Senate—they are common sense. They are common sense, the package that my colleagues have offered today for unanimous consent. They go a long way toward protecting women and healthcare providers.

I just want my constituents to know and I want my colleagues here in the Senate to know I am on the program. I don't think this is the time when we can even take for granted any of these concerns—not a one. The whole question of access to healthcare, the right to privacy, making sure that States' rights really mean States' rights and not tracking people down across the country—these are all priorities that my colleagues have laid out very, very well.

As long as I have the honor to represent Oregon in the U.S. Senate, I am going to be working with all of them.

The fact is, as we close—and it seems like we are getting ready to wrap up—I think it is clear that the American people are on the side of my colleagues over here who have spoken today.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, earlier this afternoon, my colleague Senator MARKEY asked unanimous consent to advance the Right to Contraception Act. There was an objection heard, but I wanted to come to the floor to voice my strong support as a cosponsor of the Right to Contraception Act.

Across the country, women are frightened. They are frightened that after decades of progress in advancing their rights and freedoms, they are watching an activist Supreme Court ignore precedent and strip away their rights and freedoms.

For nearly six decades, American women have come to rely on their right to control when and if they are going to have a family, including through the use of contraception. In fact, about 90 percent of women in the United States have used contraception.

In 1965, the Supreme Court correctly decided *Griswold v. Connecticut*, reaffirming that our Constitution guarantees the right to privacy. This particular case was over a Connecticut law that banned the use of contraception and imposed penalties, including up to 1 year in prison for doing so. The Supreme Court correctly overruled the law as an invasion of the right to privacy and determined that Americans could use contraception should they choose without government interference.

At the time, the majority opinion reasoned that there were many implied rights that Americans have within the Constitution. On a basic level, this is obvious. Not every single right we are due could be written into our Constitution. So this concept of "implied rights" is the foundation for various rights that Americans have come to rely on and, frankly, never think twice about, like the right to learn a foreign language or to travel across State lines or to live with your own family.

Famously, 8 years after *Griswold* was decided, the Supreme Court used a similar legal foundation—the constitutional right to privacy—to rightly decide in *Roe v. Wade* that women in the United States have the right to abortion care.

But, despite *Roe* being the law of the land for nearly 50 years and "settled as a precedent of the Supreme Court, entitled to respect under principles of stare decisis," according to Supreme Court Justice Brett Kavanaugh, it was thrown out the window.

This Saturday will mark the 1-year anniversary since this activist Supreme Court—crafted, of course, by anti-choice Republican politicians—stripped 22 million women and counting of their freedom to control their bodies, families, and futures; 1 year since women lost the right to an abortion nationwide; 1 year since women in my home State of Wisconsin were sent back to 1849—and I didn't misstate that, 1849—living under an archaic law that effectively criminalizes all abortion procedures; 1 year since women in America became second-class citizens.

Sadly, that fateful decision that overturned *Roe v. Wade* put more of Americans' rights on the chopping block.

In Justice Clarence Thomas's concurring opinion, he explicitly said that the rationale used to overturn *Roe* should be used to overturn cases establishing

the right to contraception, the right to same-sex consensual relations, and same-sex marriage. Justice Thomas wrote that the Court “should reconsider” all three of these decisions, saying the Supreme Court had a duty to correct the error in these decisions.

He was essentially providing an open invitation to litigators across the country to bring their cases to the Court, inevitably instilling fear among millions of Americans.

Let that sink in.

With the right to abortion care already ripped away from tens of millions of Americans, a Supreme Court Justice essentially asked for someone to bring him a case so he could rip away one of the only tools many women have left to control if and when to have a family—that being having access to contraception.

Americans have spoken loudly and clearly that they do not believe that a woman's right to control her own body is an error or that the freedom for someone to love whom they love is an error. We cannot rely on an activist Supreme Court to protect our rights and freedoms. Congress must act.

So I stand here, with the backing of 9 in 10 Americans who support access to all forms of birth control, to call for the Senate to listen to our constituents and pass the Right to Contraception Act. Our legislation is simple and common sense. It would guarantee the legal right for individuals to get and use contraception, and it would stop politicians or the government from trying to get in the way, and that is it.

Americans want the right and freedom to control their own reproductive healthcare without interference from judges or politicians. In my home State of Wisconsin, where women are already living under an 1849 criminal abortion ban, access to contraception is absolutely essential. Every person should have the right to control their own bodies, families, and futures no matter where they live. Former Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis, who advocated for the right to privacy, called it “the right to be left alone.”

So I stand here to reiterate this sentiment and to tell Washington to pass our legislation and give women the right to be left alone.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

ABORTION

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, 1 year ago, Americans lost a constitutional right for the first time in history, and they didn't just lose it—Republicans ripped it away.

Just 1 year now after the Dobbs decision, more than 22 million women have lost their right to an abortion, and no corner of our country has been spared from the fallout. Abortion providers in States where abortion is legal, like in my home State of Washington, are being overworked and just totally overwhelmed with patients who have had to wait weeks and travel hundreds of miles to get an abortion.

Then there is the wave of other appalling Republican attacks on abortion: proposals to charge grandmas and older sisters with human trafficking if they drive a minor out of State for an abortion, prosecute abortion providers—doctors—as criminals, ban emergency contraceptives like Plan B, and let's not forget the partisan lawsuit on mifepristone to rip safe medication abortion off the shelves in all 50 States.

You know, when you listen to patients about what this all means and when you hear the actual stories—the nightmares—that Republicans are putting women in this country through, they are heartbreaking: parents driving miles and miles because their child was raped, their child is pregnant, and abortion is banned in their State; doctors being forced to forgo providing lifesaving care because they fear Republican politicians will put them in jail for doing their jobs; women facing miscarriages, left bleeding, unable to get the care they need for days on end.

One woman learned that her fetus had no skull—had no chance of survival—and she still could not get abortion care in her State.

Another woman learned that she had an ectopic pregnancy—a serious, life-threatening condition. She was not able to get an abortion. Instead, when she was at death's door, she ended up having to get a hysterectomy. Why? Because Republican politicians decided that their views mattered more than her health and mattered more than her family.

Let's be clear. The vast, overwhelming majority of Americans stand with women and support the right to choose abortion. In every place abortion rights were on the ballot last November—every single place—abortion rights won. Still, the Republicans are ignoring their own constituents and doubling down on their extreme anti-abortion politics.

Just now, when we tried to pass other basic protections—and I mean the most simple, most straightforward protections imaginable, protections that just say, yes, you can travel to another State for an abortion; that, yes, doctors can provide an abortion in States where it is legal without fear of being thrown into prison; that, yes, we will protect the right to birth control; that, yes, we will keep your online health and location data private so it cannot be used against you—the Republicans said: No, we are not going to let you do that.

One Senator on the floor earlier said that legislation that restricts a woman's right to travel is really about protecting minors from trafficking. Seriously? That is outrageous, and I was absolutely—and I mean absolutely—outraged to hear him say that. I hope that the American people understand what those laws mean.

What it means is that a grandmother who is taking her 17-year-old granddaughter—who was raped or who,

maybe, just wants to make her own personal healthcare decision—to a State where abortion is legal could be jailed. States like Idaho have passed these laws that restrict travel. What they do is hold the young women captive in their own State and threaten anyone who might help them get the care they need with time in prison. Those kinds of laws and proposals in other States are an appalling attack on the rights of women and our most basic right as Americans to travel freely within our own country.

I absolutely refuse to let a Senator or anyone twist the reality of these truly heinous laws being passed to hold women captive and to force them to stay pregnant no matter what.

Now, Republicans have basically adopted two approaches to the healthcare crisis they have caused: one, to double down with increasingly extreme, dangerous proposals or, two, to stick their heads in the sand whether that means pretending this isn't a problem, pretending it is not really their fault, or hoping it will fade away.

But there is just no forgetting the unforgivable pain the Republicans' policies have caused.

There is no forgetting the fear of being pregnant when you don't want to be or the heartbreak of learning a pregnancy is not viable or the horror of learning it is life-threatening and knowing you have no control over your body.

There is no forgetting the panic of calculating how many thousands of miles you will have to travel to get care or how many days you will have to take off of work and wonder how you can possibly get the care you need and whether you will face legal action for doing so.

There is no forgetting being investigated for having a miscarriage or for driving your kid across State lines to get an abortion or hearing your doctor tell you they cannot act to save your life because they are afraid of going to jail.

People across this country are facing those realities every single day.

Women are heartbroken and terrified, but they are also mad. They are determined, and they are speaking out. They are not going to settle for a country where they don't have the fundamental freedom to decide what happens to their own bodies—where their daughters and granddaughters have fewer rights than they did just a few years ago—and neither am I.

We on the Democratic side are going to stand up and tell our stories. We are going to make our voices heard, and we are going to fight here, on this side, to restore the freedoms that Republicans took away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let me first salute my colleague from the State of Washington. She has really shown extraordinary leadership on this

and so many other issues. She asked us to gather today, on the first anniversary of the Dobbs decision, to really reflect on what has happened to America in 12 months.

I am saying that 2 months ago the Senate Judiciary Committee, which I chair, held a hearing on the devastating consequences of the Dobbs decision on the women and doctors who are affected by it. We did it 2 months ago because the news was pouring in of incidents which had to be told and shared with the American people. Growing reports of chaos and harm caused by that decision are so alarming that we decided to move up our fact-finding to 2 months ago.

There was one witness I will never forget. One of the people we heard from that day was Amanda Zurawski. She shared some of the most heartbreaking testimony I have ever heard, and I have heard a lot.

Last August, in the second trimester of her pregnancy, Amanda suffered a catastrophic medical condition which ensured that she would lose her much loved and much longed-for baby. What is more, without medical care to help manage her miscarriage, Amanda was in grave risk of dying herself. But she was denied that medical care for one reason—she lived in the wrong place—because Amanda Zurawski lived in Texas, which was one of the first States to impose a near-total ban of abortions after *Roe v. Wade* was overruled. So Amanda waited at home, in agony, for days. Then sepsis set in. Her husband rushed her to the hospital. Hours later, her daughter arrived still-born. Amanda spent the next 3 days in the ICU, fighting for her own life.

Amanda told our committee:

People have asked why we didn't get on a plane or in our car to go to a state where the laws aren't so restrictive. But we live in the middle of Texas, and the nearest "sanctuary" state is at least an eight-hour drive. Developing sepsis—which can kill [very] quickly—in a car in the middle of the West Texas desert, or 30,000 feet above the ground, is a death sentence. . . . So all we could do was wait.

This was Amanda's first baby. Tragically, because of the trauma her body endured, she may never have another.

And she is not alone. This is happening to women across America. Every day brings us another heartbreaking story of a woman who is denied healthcare, another story of a woman whose life was needlessly put at risk by the Dobbs decision.

According to a new survey, nearly two-thirds of OB/GYNs say the Dobbs ruling has worsened maternal mortality rates in the United States, which were already the worst of any developed nation, and 70 percent of these doctors say the ruling has deepened racial disparities in maternal and infant healthcare. These findings are from a survey released this week by KFF, known as Kaiser Family Foundation.

The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and the AMA both warned that the Dobbs case would

unleash an immediate healthcare crisis in our country. With the first anniversary of this ruling, those warnings, sadly, have come true.

Just 100 days after the Dobbs decision, 22 million Americans of reproductive age—almost one out of every three women in America—found themselves living in States where abortion is now illegal or highly restricted. Abortion is now completely banned in 14 States, leaving large swaths of the country without care. Some statewide bans include jail time for healthcare providers who perform abortions. And make no mistake: Unless we act, more and more severe restrictions are coming.

The last year has exposed the true aim of the anti-choice extremists. They want a national ban. Medication abortions account for more than half of all abortions in America. More than 20 years ago, the Food and Drug Administration approved the drug mifepristone as safe and effective for use in medication abortions. Yet anti-abortion groups are now seeking in Federal court to ban its use in every State in America.

The impact of abortion restrictions in any State are felt well beyond that State's borders. In my State, largely as a consequence of near-total bans in many surrounding States, the number of abortions performed by Planned Parenthood in Illinois increased by 54 percent last year. That increase was driven largely by women from out of State seeking access to abortion that is now outlawed in their home States. As a result, wait times to obtain abortions have increased dramatically in our State.

In addition, some anti-choice extremists are seeking to deny women's right to abortions through increased threats and violence against abortion clinics.

We saw this recently in Illinois, when a man rammed his car into a building that was being renovated to serve as an abortion clinic in the Danville area. He also tried to set fire to the clinic; but, thankfully, he was stopped.

According to the National Abortion Federation, last year saw a huge increase in violence at abortion clinics, and a disproportionate increase occurred in States like Illinois that protected women's rights to reproductive care.

Personal decisions about healthcare should be made by individuals and their doctors, not by politicians with an ideological agenda. That is why I strongly support the four measures that my Democratic colleagues have offered to today to protect women's rights to travel to receive healthcare, protect patients' data privacy, protect healthcare providers' ability to provide abortions in States where it is legal, and protect the right to contraception. It is hard to imagine that in 2023, we are actually facing the prospect of losing a woman's right to contraception, as well as access to reproductive healthcare.

The Dobbs ruling has sown chaos, fear, and division. It has usurped doc-

tors' rights to make the best healthcare decisions for their patients. Doctors live in fear of these new laws, whether they include criminal liability for what was good medical practice and still is. They have stripped women of their right to make healthcare decisions and given the power to politicians. It is now up to Congress to protect women and healthcare providers from the results of this disastrous ruling.

(Mr. OSSOFF assumed the Chair.)

Mr. President, you were at the Judiciary Committee today. We had a hearing on LGBTQ rights, and there was some extraordinary testimony. A 16-year-old came to us who has gone through a change to her status. This young woman, 16 years of age, explained how she realized at the age of 10 or 11 that she was really inclined toward being a woman and not a man. She sought counseling, through her understanding parents, sat down with doctors, and they began working through the psychology of that decision, the importance of it.

Fortunately for her—and she testified—her parents were supportive of her all the way. We were lucky to have Dr. Ximena Lopez at the hearing as well. She practices medicine in Texas. She is an endocrinologist who treats patients just like this young 16-year-old girl.

She disabused us of many of the myths which are outstanding when it comes to healthcare for those who are in a trans situation. No, there are no surgeries early in life on these children who are making this decision. Yes, medications are held back until puberty to make sure that they are doing the right thing at the right time. Yes, parents are consulted every step of the way.

These are important and critical decisions which parents and families make every day across America. Every day. They are decisions based on the advice of a doctor, as well as what is right for your child. They are decisions that parents will never forget. I know; I have been involved in them. And they are decisions which really would determine the future lives and the well-being of so many individuals.

To think that so many legislatures across the United States are now regulating and putting criminal penalties on the conduct of that doctor who was before us today is heartbreaking. It defies medicine. It defies science. It is politics, pure and simple. The same thing is true on this issue of women's reproductive healthcare.

We have got to leave these basic decisions, fundamental decisions, to the families who are affected by them directly, to the women who are affected by them directly. We have got to say to the doctors across America: Follow the science. Practice good medicine. Don't let a local legislature divert you from the best treatment of your patient to make sure that they come out of this process in a very positive way.

It is a sad moment in America that we are debating these things and debating whether or not to rely on sound medical judgment. In the end, that is the only thing we can count on.

I am glad that we had the hearing today, and I am glad that we gathered on the floor to make a record out of what is happening in our great Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations: all nominations placed on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Space Force; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN503 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning ANDREW K. BERKEY, and ending BRANDON WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN504 AIR FORCE nomination of Jacquelyn P. Smith, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN596 AIR FORCE nominations (16) beginning DAVID B. BARKER, and ending JOCELYN M. WHALEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN653 AIR FORCE nomination of Daniel J. Wittmer, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN654 AIR FORCE nomination of Marina F. Perez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN692 AIR FORCE nominations (265) beginning STEPHEN DAVID ALBERT, and ending JAMIE TAYLOR ZIMMERMANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN693 AIR FORCE nominations (135) beginning ROBERT D. ALLEN, and ending NICOLAS H. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN694 AIR FORCE nominations (600) beginning CHRISTOPHER K. ADAMS, and ending RAYMOND P. ZHANG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN695 AIR FORCE nominations (74) beginning NICHOLAS F. ALIOTTA, and ending JASON J. ZUMMO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN697 AIR FORCE nominations (52) beginning ANDREW D. AHN, and ending

OYUNCHIMEG YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN698 AIR FORCE nominations (14) beginning SARAH E. ABEL, and ending MICHELLE E. WYCHE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN699 AIR FORCE nominations (20) beginning MICHAEL J. ALFARO, and ending SARA M. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN700 AIR FORCE nomination of Candice L. Pipes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN701 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning MICHAEL A. GROWDEN, and ending HSIENLIANG R. TSENG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN745 AIR FORCE nomination of Craig A. Ambrose, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN746 AIR FORCE nomination of Bibek Joshi, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN747 AIR FORCE nomination of Adrian K. Williford, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN748 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning DANIEL D. COLE, and ending EDWARD F. LEONARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

IN THE ARMY

PN472 ARMY nominations (90) beginning KYLE D. AEMISEGGER, an ending DOI7212, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2023.

PN473 ARMY nominations (19) beginning AILEEN R. CABANADALOGAN, and ending JOHN F. UNDERWOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 27, 2023.

PN515 ARMY nominations (136) beginning HARRY T. AUBIN, and ending D016621, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN516 ARMY nominations (29) beginning JOSHUA A. AKERS, and ending SHENICE L. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN517 ARMY nomination (301) beginning ALEXANDRA M. ADAMS, and ending D016620, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN518 ARMY nominations (61) beginning ANDREA C. BAEDER, and ending PETERS. YOON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 17, 2023.

PN602 ARMY nominations (76) beginning HEATHER R. ALSUPMORTON, and ending JUDITH L. ZELAYA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN603 ARMY nominations (122) beginning BOMA O. AFIESIMAMA, and ending D016999, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN604 ARMY nominations (31) beginning JAMIE D. BELL, and ending JUSTIN ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN605 ARMY nominations (13) beginning RACHEL A. ACCIACCA, and ending LAURA

E. RIDDLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN606 ARMY nominations (33) beginning JAMILIA M. ADAMSHENDERSON, and ending JOHN E. WILSON, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN607 ARMY nominations (44) beginning COREBRIANS A. ABRAHAM, and ending CHRISTOPHER R. WILSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN608 ARMY nominations (10) beginning AARON CROMBIE, and ending LARRY A. WYATT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN609 ARMY nominations (7) beginning CHARLES E. BANE, and ending THOMAS R. TUCKER, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN643 ARMY nomination of Thomas A. Summers, which was received by the Congressional Record of May 9, 2023.

PN655 ARMY nomination of Nicholas J. Norton, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN656 ARMY nomination of Artrees R. Adams, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN657 ARMY nomination of Warren N. Washington, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN658 ARMY nomination of Jacob W. Cavender, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN659 ARMY nomination of Justin M. Fowler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN660 ARMY nomination of Jason P. Pancoe, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN661 ARMY nomination of Benjamin F. Iverson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN702 ARMY nomination of Mark G. Kappelmann, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN703 ARMY nomination of Leah H. Georgieva, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN704 ARMY nomination of Nicholas R. Yetman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN705 ARMY nomination of Kevin L. Montgomery, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN706 ARMY nominations (9) beginning DAVID J. BEDELLS, and ending MICHAEL D. ZULTAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN707 ARMY nominations (3) beginning MOLLY E. KEITH, and ending DALLAS D. MCMULLEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN749 ARMY nominations (14) beginning STEVEN D. BRYANT, and ending D011339, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN750 ARMY nomination of Joseph A. St Pierre, II, which was received by the Senate

and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN751 ARMY nominations (2) beginning JEFFREY BANKS, and ending JEFFREY R. WEINSTEIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN752 ARMY nomination of Isaac A. Gutierrez, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN753 ARMY nomination of Rick J. Mata, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN754 ARMY nomination of D016094, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN662 MARINE CORPS nomination of Dustin R. Kosar, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN709 MARINE CORPS nomination of Steven E. Anderson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

IN THE NAVY

PN559 NAVY nominations (206) beginning BRYCE D. ABBOTT, and ending MATTHEW A. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN560 NAVY nominations (13) beginning EDWARD A. CARLTON, and ending GENEVIEVE G. UBINA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN561 NAVY nominations (6) beginning ANDREA H. CAMERON, and ending WARREN W. TOMLINSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN562 NAVY nominations (14) beginning MYLENE R. ARVIZO, and ending ASHLEY S. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN563 NAVY nominations (10) beginning SARAH E. ABBOTT, and ending JOHN A. WALSH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN564 NAVY nominations (4) beginning CURTIS BROWN, and ending GARY M. SHELLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN565 NAVY nominations (3) beginning MARK K. CORBLISS and ending ANTOINE D. THORNTON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN566 NAVY nominations (18) beginning HANNAH L. BEALON, and ending STANLEY C. WARE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN567 NAVY nominations (14) beginning CAMERON M. BALMA, and ending MELINDA K. SCHRIVER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN568 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ALAN M. BRECHBILL, and ending DAVID J. TEBBE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN569 NAVY nominations (4) beginning ROSS M. ANDERSON, and ending ROGER D. HORNE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN570 NAVY nominations (4) beginning HOMER F. HENSY, and ending GREGORY F. NOTARO, which nominations were received

the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN571 NAVY nominations (5) beginning TOMMIE G. CRAWFORD, and ending SHANNON P. THOMPSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN572 NAVY nominations (4) beginning JOHN E. FAGE, and ending REBECCA L. REBARICH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN573 NAVY nominations (10) beginning GAVIN H. CLOUGH, and ending MATTHEW G. ZUBLIC, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN574 NAVY nominations (4) beginning JENNIFER J. LANDRY, and ending JONATHAN A. SAVAGE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN575 NAVY nominations (14) beginning BRADLEY H. ABRAMOWITZ, and ending CHELSEY L. ZWICKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 25, 2023.

PN619 NAVY nominations (63) beginning ERIC J. ADLER, and ending MATTHEW A. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN620 NAVY nominations (22) beginning LUCAS R. ARGOBRIGHT, and ending SARAH E. TURSE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN621 NAVY nomination of Patrick C. Lazzaretti, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN622 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ROBERT A. PAYNTER, JR., and ending TODD C. WINN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN623 NAVY nominations (6) beginning STANLEY J. BENES, IV, and ending MICHAEL SULLIVAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN624 NAVY nominations (3) beginning JAMES P. MCDONNELL, and ending JOSEPH E. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN625 NAVY nomination of Donna M. Chuba, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN626 NAVY nomination of Anton B. Allen, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN627 NAVY nominations (5) beginning ADAM M. CLAMPITT, and ending GUSTAVO PEREZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN628 NAVY nominations (3) beginning CHRISTOPHER P. COOK, and ending MATTHEW E. HOBBS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN629 NAVY nominations (2) beginning DEMETRIO A. CAMUA, III, and ending ARTHUR C. FONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN630 NAVY nomination of Loren C. Hoelscher, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN631 NAVY nominations (3) beginning MATTHEW T. CHATIGNY, and ending KEVIN C. LIEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN632 NAVY nominations (3) beginning JOSHUA C. GETTLE, and ending GERARDO TORRES, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN633 NAVY nominations (8) beginning JOHN J. BRIDGES, and ending MARK H. OVERSTREET, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN634 NAVY nomination of Ryan H. Metzler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 4, 2023.

PN663 NAVY nominations (20) beginning DENNIS L. AVERY, and ending BRIAN D. WUESTEWALD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN664 NAVY nominations (10) beginning KHRISTIANNOE C. CAINDOY, and ending DIMITRY P. VINCENT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN665 NAVY nominations (3) beginning MATTHEW D. GLEASON, and ending EMILY Y. ROYSE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN666 NAVY nomination of Jacob S. Tharp, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 15, 2023.

PN710 NAVY nominations (30) beginning CHRISTOPHER BARNES, and ending CHADWICK Y. YASUDA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN711 NAVY nominations (65) beginning KENRIC T. ABAN, and ending JEFFREY C. WORTHLEY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN712 NAVY nominations (20) beginning MICHAEL R. ANDERSEN, and ending CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN713 NAVY nominations (11) beginning DOMINIC J. ANTENUCCI, and ending CHRISTOPHER C. SWAIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN714 NAVY nominations (550) beginning WILLIAM H. ABBITT, and ending THOMAS W. ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN715 NAVY nominations (38) beginning JOSHUA M. ANDERSON, and ending ALEXANDER G. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN716 NAVY nominations (25) beginning DAVID L. AGUILAR, and ending DANIEL J. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN717 NAVY nominations (8) beginning SEAN A. BROPHY, and ending JESUS A. URANGA, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN718 NAVY nominations (16) beginning FRANCIS G. COYLE, and ending DANIEL A. TANTILLO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN719 NAVY nominations (14) beginning REBECCA L. ANDERSON, and ending JOHN L. VINCENT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN720 NAVY nominations (23) beginning NICK AVILA, and ending MICHAEL P. WOLCHKO, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN721 NAVY nominations (11) beginning MICHAEL K. BEALL, and ending ALANNA B. YOUNGBLOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN722 NAVY nominations (2) beginning FORREST N. BUSH and ending NATHAN J. RICHARDSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN723 NAVY nominations (48) beginning SCOTT B. AARON, and ending CLINTON M. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN724 NAVY nominations (32) JESSICA L. ALEXANDER, and ending CRYSTAL R. WARRENE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN725 NAVY nominations (46) beginning SUZANNE T. ALFORD, and ending ERIC R. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN726 NAVY nominations (14) beginning NICHOLAS D. CHIUDIONI, and ending JULIAN G. WILSON, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN727 NAVY nominations (16) beginning MARVIN E. BARTHOLOMEW, and ending KIRTLEY N. YEISER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN728 NAVY nominations (13) beginning QUENTIN ALBEA, and ending EDWARD E. WEEKLEY, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN729 NAVY nominations (15) beginning PAUL M. ALLEN, and ending THOMAS H. WILLIAMS, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN730 NAVY nominations (9) beginning SCOTT P. ADER, and ending PHILIP R. SAULNIER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN731 NAVY nomination of Erika M. Meszaros, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN732 NAVY nominations (36) beginning MARY R. ANKER, and ending BRANDON K. WOLF, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN733 NAVY nominations (12) beginning DAVID W. ALEXANDER, and ending JOHN C. VANDYKE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN734 NAVY nominations (11) beginning CHRISTOPHER S. CASNE, and ending JUSTIN D. SPINKS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN735 NAVY nominations (28) beginning KEVIN L. BORKERT, and ending BLAKE A. WHITTLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN755 NAVY nominations (11) beginning THEODORE G. CAVOORES, JR., and ending CHRISTY L. ROUSSEAU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN756 NAVY nominations (7) beginning ANDREW E. CARMICHAEL, and ending DAVID N. STOCK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN757 NAVY nominations (7) beginning KRISTEN M. BETAK, and ending SUZANNE J. WOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN758 NAVY no which nominations (4) beginning SARAH E. DAVIS, and ending JEFFREY J. ROCKWOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN759 NAVY nominations (28) beginning BRYAN T. ALVAREZ, and ending JENNIFER J. VOGT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN760 NAVY nominations (8) beginning RODNEY M. BONNER, and ending CHARLES C. THOMPSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN761 NAVY nomination of Julie K. Moss, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN762 NAVY nominations (5) beginning LUIS E. ALDERMAN, II, and ending MELINDA S.L. ZALMA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN763 NAVY nominations (6) beginning TIMOTHY W. GLEASON, and ending CORY A. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

IN THE SPACE FORCE

PN764 SPACE FORCE nomination of Robin J. Glebes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN765 SPACE FORCE nominations (3) beginning LISA T. GREEN, and ending KEITH D. VAN DYCK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN766 SPACE FORCE nominations (36) beginning PHOENIX L. HAUSER, and ending DUSTIN L. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

EATS ACT OF 2023

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the recent Supreme Court ruling in favor of the California law that is called Proposition 12, affecting the pork industry, has sent shock waves through the entire agricultural industry. Particularly hard-hit by the news is my State of Iowa, which is No. 1 in pork and No. 1 in eggs; and another proposition California law affects the selling of eggs in California.

California is 15 percent of the national market for pork, so you can see what California is doing can have a big impact on the pork industry in the other 49 States.

If California can regulate pork producers out of business through costly and unrealistic regulation, which food will be next? What segment of agriculture will be negatively affected next?

Consumers should be waking up to the reality of activist policies coming from folks on the left who want to put the kibosh on animal agriculture.

California's law is based on arbitrary and prescriptive standards that lack any scientific, technical, or agricultural basis. It also jeopardizes sow safety. And for you city slickers, "sow" is the word we use for mother pigs.

The cost to implement Proposition 12 has been measured to be approximately \$3,500 per sow—a cost that farmers would need to pass on to the consumer.

This additional cost will threaten the independent pork producers in rural

Iowa and run them out of business due to burdensome regulations.

I am not only speaking for Iowa pork producers, even though we are No. 1 in pork production. This is affecting pork producers in the other 49 States. The result of this law will be significant on Iowa's independent pork producers.

We all know people will continue to eat pork chops, ham, and bacon, but this will only lead to further consolidation so that you will only have three or four companies controlling the entire supply of pork for our country.

The future of the independent pork production is at stake, and I do not want to sit idly by as pork producers across Iowa go out of business. So this Monday, our national holiday, when the Senate wasn't in session, I met with 40 pork producers in Palo Alto county. Hearing from Iowans firsthand on this issue was especially impactful.

Iowa producers who have raised hogs for more than 50 years told me that they have never been so worried. How will rural agriculture fight against the special interests and big money of the coasts is a question I was asked. How can farmers afford to remain compliant with nonsense policies written by someone who has never been on a hog farm?

There has to be a legislative solution to what California is negatively doing to pork producers in the other 49 States, so Senator MARSHALL, Senator ERNST, and I have been working on a solution. The EATS Act—E-A-T-S, that is an acronym for a piece of legislation preventing States from impeding ag trade from other States within the United States, under the constitutional power of Congress, to regulate interstate foreign commerce. Our legislation is an example of Congress regulating interstate commerce.

In the court's majority decision, it was a five-to-four decision—an odd combination of liberals and conservatives on the Supreme Court saying that California did the right thing and an odd combination of liberals and conservatives who said that California didn't have the power to do what they did under our Constitution. But in this majority opinion, Justice Neil Gorsuch wrote that Congress has the power to regulate commerce but has yet to enact legislation to displace Proposition 12.

I read Justice Gorsuch saying to the Congress of the United States—the courts are kind of saying to themselves something like this: Why should we say that California has acted unconstitutionally when Congress has the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce and they have not done it?

So this is the reason for this bill. This bill would put an end to California's war on breakfast and override the coastal State's overreach into the heartland's breadbasket.

The Supreme Court asked Congress to act, so that is what Senators MARSHALL, ERNST, and I—and many other Senators have now joined us in this effort. We are responding to the Supreme Court's decision.

Feeding your family is not a partisan issue and neither is protecting our food supply chain. Food security, after all, is national security.

I am engaging in discussions with as many as my colleagues as I can on this very issue. I hope this will soon be a bipartisan bill.

It is common sense to protect affordable, quality food for America's families and support the 2 percent of the country that we call family farmers who feed the other 98 percent of the people in this State; and not only produce for the other 98 percent but about a third of our agriculture production is exported. Remember, bacon doesn't grow in grocery stores.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of the EATS Act.

STUDENT DEBT

I have one more statement in regard to education that I would like to give.

Mr. President, every person taking out a loan knows it must be repaid. Still, we have seen lots of talk about canceling student debt after the debt has been assumed. But that doesn't help students who are not in college yet but going to enter college. It is closing the barn door after the horse has been stolen.

To lower the cost of college, we need to let students be able to compare the true costs between schools. They can't do that now because, right now, schools that are upfront about their costs, meaning they give the students an exact figure on what they are going to have to pay to get a college degree, these very schools are at a disadvantage to their competition that doesn't play by honest rules and honest policies about what it actually costs to go to a particular school.

So I am going to go into some detail about what is wrong with the present environment, and I am going to start with the Government Accountability Office taking a look at the financial aid letters that should show students how much they will pay. Unfortunately, according to the GAO, not a single college followed all 10 best practices that have been suggested by that Agency, the Government Accountability Office.

Now, here are some examples:

A third of the colleges confused loans and grants—how misleading. You think you are getting a grant, and you find out later it is a loan. And 91 percent of the colleges understate their true costs.

So it is quite obvious the free market doesn't work if students only find out how much they owe after they have already selected the college that they will attend.

That is why my bill that I entitled Understanding the True Cost of College Act creates a standard, easy-to-read fi-

nancial aid letter. Under my bill, students could take this letter that they get from the various colleges that they have been accepted to and see, side by side, what each school offers them. They can compare, in other words, apples with apples, not apples with oranges, as is the very case today.

Another thing that doesn't make any sense: Do you know that the current practice effectively encourages students to go into debt more than what it actually costs to get a college degree? The paperwork offering student loans tends to default to the maximum eligible loan amount, whether that maximum is needed or not, to get a college degree. So then, under this practice, students have to go out of their way to borrow less money than what is offered. But guess what. Most students actually do borrow the maximum.

So, you see, we have a Federal policy that encourages students to take out more debt than they need to get their degree, and we shouldn't have the Federal Government encourage indebtedness that is not needed. The Federal Government, in other words, should help students borrow only what they need.

So I have a bill that goes by the title of Know Before You Owe Act. This act would show students their estimated monthly loan payments after graduating. They would see it compared to the average salary for graduates of their particular college major. It would also require students to type in the amount that they want to borrow, instead of clicking a box that ends up with them taking the maximum that is allowed.

Each of these proposals puts students, then, in the driver's seat, where the student should be.

Choosing a college happens to be one of the largest purchases many Americans ever make. It should be a good investment for a bright future, not a one-way ticket to excessive debt. Students should have all the information they need when they are making that decision of what college or university to attend.

All the ideas I mentioned here are bipartisan, and I have been advocating some of these issues for years. It is not a Republican or Democrat idea to give students the information they need to make the right decision for which school to attend. That is why I was glad to see each of these two ideas that I am talking about now included in legislation called the Lowering Education Costs and Debt Act.

My colleagues in the Senate are right to focus on the start of the process, when students choose a college and take out a loan. Dealing with debt only after it is taken out does not lower the cost of a college education. Right now, a student can't pick a college on price even if they wanted to.

I hope this is the start of a discussion to help students limit their borrowing on the front end and, ultimately, to put pressure on institutions to bring down the cost of college.

Whereas President Biden's proposal to wipe out student debt would give colleges a license to pump up tuition costs, these proposals would pump the brakes on soaring tuition costs by empowering students to make smart decisions on the front end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

ABORTION

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have a question for this body. It is not a legislative question. It starts first with just a question. It is a question for us to be able to think about, and it is a question, quite frankly, that is essential that we think about but that we don't think about very often because it is introspective, because it is personal, because it connects both science and faith and culture and background. But it is essential to who we are as people, human beings, and it is this simple question: When does life begin?

I don't say it flippantly. It is a real question. It is a question that we have had as a nation now the entire time we have been a nation, and it has been decided by different States and by different people from the very beginning of our Nation.

When does life begin? For some people, they would say life begins at birth, when I can see that child, when they are screaming and crying and just born, red-faced.

Some people would say it is actually 10 minutes before that birth; that it is not at birth; that it is just a little bit before.

There are some people who would back it up, and they would say: No, you are really a child when you are alive and you are viable—that is somewhere around 21 weeks' gestation now—that when you are viable, that is when you are really alive.

Some people would back it up even more to say: Not at 21 weeks; maybe at 15 weeks because science would say at about 15 weeks that child in the womb has a nervous system that is developed and they can feel pain.

Some would say: No, I would back it up more than that. I would actually take it to 6 weeks because, at 6 weeks, it is the early stages of a beating heart, and we would say, when that heart beat is actually happening, that is when that child is alive.

And others would back it up even further and would say: When that child has unique DNA that is different DNA than the mom or the dad—in fact, in that mom's body, every single cell in her body has the same DNA marker except for those cells. For those cells in the woman's body, that DNA is different. They are the only cells that are different, and, as they multiply and divide, that DNA signature grows, but it stays right there with that child.

It is a real question.

Fifty-one years ago, our country had different opinions. Different States had different ideas about when life began.

And each State voted, and each State had a debate in their State about when life began. That was what we were like from the very beginning of the country up to 51 years ago.

And then, in 1973, the *Roe v. Wade* decision happened in the Supreme Court, and, at that time, nine Justices said: Nope, individual States and people aren't going to decide this; the nine of us are going to decide this.

And for almost 50 years, the law of the land was that those Justices all made one determination for everybody—until 52 weeks ago, when that same Supreme Court, nine Justices again, said: No, this should be back in the hands of the people, where it has always been, because Justices shouldn't decide this issue. This is a decision we the people should make.

Justice Alito wrote the opinion in that decision, and he said this:

Roe was egregiously wrong from the start. He said:

And far from bringing about a national settlement of the abortion issue, *Roe* and *Casey* have enflamed debate and deepened division. It is time to heed the Constitution and return the issue of abortion to the people's elected representatives.

The permissibility of abortion, and the limitations upon it, are to be resolved like most important questions in our democracy: by citizens trying to persuade one another and then voting.

It is back to the people. So that is where we are.

Now, 1 year after the *Dobbs* decision came out, on the June 24 of last year, it is still back to the same conversation. We still haven't agreed as a nation when life begins. Maybe, we never will. But as a nation, now, that conversation is happening all over the country. Individuals are having the dialogue: When does life begin?

In the past year, there is really no way to know how many children are alive today that would not have been alive prior to the *Dobbs* decision. About half the States in America have already passed some sort of law to limit the number of abortions in their State, while about half of the rest of the country has either left abortion policies in place in their State or even expanded them.

Some of our States have no abortion at all in their States, and in some States, literally, you can have abortion all the way up until the second before delivery—late-term, literally the second before delivery—and choose to have an elective abortion. That is a pretty wide spread in our country. It is a pretty wide set of opinions.

And while we don't know how many children are alive today, we can be certain that there are tens of thousands of children alive right now who would not have been alive a year ago, prior to the *Dobbs* decision. That is tens of thousands of children who are alive that, in the next few months, will be giggling and laughing. Next year, they will be running around singing silly songs. Two years after that, they will be in

kindergarten learning their colors. They will be alive today because of that *Dobbs* decision. And while I understand some people are disappointed that those kids are alive, I am not, and I am convinced our communities and our schools and our workplaces in the future will be glad they are there.

In the past year, while a lot of people have been celebrating the value of every single one of those children who have been born, there are some who have not been.

In fact, in my frustration, this Biden administration has been obsessed with increasing the number of abortions in America, not decreasing them.

Today, there have been numerous unanimous consent requests from the floor of this Senate asking to be able to take out all of the laws across the entire country and to be able to move it back to there is abortion on demand at any stage. They all lost on the floor today, but there is a push on the floor of this Senate today to be able to expand abortion on demand all the way up until moments before birth.

This administration has taken even more aggressive actions than the Senate took today. This administration has shifted a policy longstanding on mail order abortions—do-it-yourself abortions at home, to be able to take a two-drug cocktail to be able to have an abortion at home—where they have stripped out the rules that you have to see a doctor to get this prescription, remembering that this prescription actually takes the life of a child and causes excessive bleeding. You don't have to see a doctor anymore. They have now shifted that to say you have to see a medical professional of any type.

You also don't have to have any screening for ectopic pregnancies. If you take this two-drug cocktail—and the only way you can really determine that is a medical examination—then it could actually kill the woman while it takes the life of that child as well.

If you have the wrong blood type—and the only way to really determine that is to go see a medical professional, although the Biden administration is now saying you no longer have to see them—but if you take this particular two-drug cocktail and have the wrong blood type, it will actually make you infertile for the rest of your life as well as take the life of your child. So if you want to have a baby later, you can't.

The only way you would know one way or the other on that is actually having a medical screening and test, but the Biden administration is so obsessed with increasing the number of abortions in America, they have now said: Don't worry about going to the doctor. Don't worry about if you have an ectopic pregnancy or the wrong blood type.

In fact, they have taken even an extra step and have said to emergency rooms: If someone shows up in an emergency room who has taken this two-drug cocktail and is excessively

bleeding, you do not have to report it to the FDA unless she dies.

Every other condition—excessive bleeding, on the edge of life, emergency room trips—don't report those. Those don't get reported anymore at all. Literally, they are saying we don't need the information about other side effects—only death—for this particular drug. That is an enormous shift. That is an administration that is obsessed with saying: We need more abortions in America, and if things go bad with this two-drug cocktail, don't tell us.

I mentioned before that there is a very, very old Federal law that still stands in Federal law that says you can't mail anything that is going to cause an abortion. It is against Federal law to put something in the mail and mail it to someone that causes an abortion. The Biden administration literally has put out a public opinion from their Office of Legal Counsel saying that law really doesn't apply anymore; it is old. It is trying to say: Well, it means something different than what it actually says. I would encourage anyone to actually read that statute and to come to any other conclusion other than what it says.

The Biden administration has made it very clear under the Department of Justice that, we know this is against Federal law to be able to mail abortion materials, but we are not going to prosecute this. Literally, it is against the law, but we don't care—so much so that even if a woman ends up in the hospital, in the emergency room and checked in, don't even tell us unless she dies.

Last summer, there were several of my colleagues who brought a bill to this floor to give a \$100,000 fine to any pro-life pregnancy center that didn't perform abortions. Now, just let that soak in for a minute. Now, it didn't pass, but this body was debating and trying to shut down the advice of people who are in pro-life centers who say: I believe in the value of every child.

These pro-life centers, if you have never been to one, they are almost always completely run by volunteers. They provide ultrasounds to individuals who are trying to figure out "Am I really pregnant?" They provide free pregnancy tests to be able to help people as they are thinking through it. And, yes, they talk about that they believe in the value in life. But they also provide formula for babies, clothes for babies, diapers for babies. They provide parental advice and counsel for new parents who are terrified, and they say: Hey, we are going to walk with you. If you are considering having an abortion because you are afraid you will be alone and no one will be with you, we will be with you.

Last summer, a bill came to this floor to try to do a \$100,000 fine to those folks who are trying to give away free formula, free diapers, and free mentoring, to people who would say: If you keep your baby, we will walk with you through these tough times.

This administration, the Biden administration, has shifted our VA hospitals into abortion clinics. It is against Federal law, but they have done it anyway. Literally, there is a Federal law that was put in place 30 years ago about VA hospitals and abortions, and it doesn't allow them. This administration has told the VA hospitals "Ignore that Federal law that was passed 30 years ago because we don't like it; we are not going to enforce it" and is literally taking—because there are not dollars allocated to this—literally taking dollars away from our veterans and their healthcare and moving it to doing abortions in our VA centers instead.

As far as we can tell, there are thousands of abortions that have happened in our VA centers across our country in the last few months, all of them paid for by Federal tax dollars, which is against the law, in a facility that was specifically noted could not perform abortions, which is against the law, using Federal dollars to pay for it.

It should not be a surprise to you that President Biden's budget—every year he has been President, he has asked to take away the Hyde amendment. People may not know what the Hyde amendment is, but the Hyde amendment is what prevents abortion dollars from being used—from Federal tax dollars.

A lot of people across the country, I understand, have completely different opinions about abortion, but almost every person I talked to would say: I have a different opinion about abortion, but I don't think American tax dollars should be used to pay for elective abortions. But every year, President Biden has asked to remove the Hyde amendment so Federal dollars can be used to pay for abortions, elective abortions, across the country.

This administration is so incredibly extreme about increasing the number of abortions in America, it has even extended to our southern border.

The people who are here in this room know that I have come to talk about our southern border multiple times to try to bring solutions. There are solutions that are, quite frankly, non-partisan solutions for how we can solve some of the difficult issues of illegal immigration on our southern border. I am a huge fan of legal immigration, but I think unchecked illegal immigration and chaos on our southern border is a bad idea.

This administration, in the middle of what is going on on our southern border right now, has put out what they call Field Guidance 21 out of Health and Human Services to say that if an unaccompanied minor comes across our southern border who happens to be pregnant, that unaccompanied minor is to be relocated to a State that allows abortion. The guidance gives information about how to even transport individuals who are pregnant who cross our border to abortion clinics, and it gives special guidance for those who are in

their last weeks of pregnancy on how to be able to take care of those moms as you transport them to get an abortion—late-term abortions. That is in the HHS guidance that is happening right now on our southern border.

This administration created a website to promote abortions with official Federal dollars that is connected to the White House website. In fact, this administration literally put it as a front-page piece on the White House website: Here is how to be able to get an abortion in America. They have given a \$1.5 million grant to create a national abortion hotline so that anyone who wants an abortion, it would be easier to be able to get it. They have created a reproductive rights task force to try to evaluate all States and be able to get information out on how to be able to increase abortions.

When the COVID money was done, now a year and a half ago—the previous bipartisan bills on COVID all had a restriction on any of that money being used for abortions until the last partisan bill was actually put out, and that specifically allows for abortion with COVID relief dollars.

The Department of Justice did not engage when pro-life centers were being attacked. They have engaged to be able to go after people who oppose abortion. In the past couple of years, there have been 329 attacks on Catholic churches and 87 attacks on pro-life centers, just since the Dobbs leak came out prior to the actual release in June, but there have been no prosecutions to go after those folks. Apparently, if you attack a Catholic church or a pro-life center, the Department of Justice is not interested.

There are also conscience protections. Again, not all Americans agree on the issue of abortion. Many doctors and nurses go into medical practice because they have a passion about life. We have conscience protections in Federal law right now that if you tell your employer in a hospital that you have a conscience issue on performing an abortion and they compel you to do that, the Federal Government is charged to be able to step in and make that employer protect your conscience rights.

That has happened in the past under past administrations, but under this administration, literally when this administration came in, there was a nurse who had been compelled to perform an abortion against her conscience at the University of Vermont Medical Center. She had told her employer in advance that she did not want to participate in abortions, that she believed in the value of every child.

She came in one day to work. She was called into a surgery area, and the physician looked her in the face and said: Don't hate me for this.

She said: What?

Then she turned and realized that she had been called in and was being compelled—or she would lose her job—to perform an abortion and to be a part of that abortion procedure.

Typically, under previous administrations, that person would have been protected. This HHS dropped the case. Literally, it was midway through. The Department of Justice is no longer prosecuting. They are saying that is not relevant; literally saying: If you have a conscience issue as a nurse or a doctor performing an abortion, too bad. Change your occupation. We are not going to protect you.

Oh, and did I mention that if you are in the U.S. military now, under the new Biden policy, and you went to your commanding officer and said "Hey, my grandmother passed away. I would like to get 5 days off to go travel, to go to my grandmother's funeral," you would be told no. But if you go to your commanding officer and say "I would like to be gone 5 days to get an abortion," not only would your commanding officer, under the Biden administration, be instructed "Yes, you can have 5 days' paid leave off," but they would also say to you "How far are you going to travel? We are going to pay for your travel to reimburse you while you are gone."

So if you need to go to your aunt's funeral, you don't get days off because that is too distant of a relative, but if you need to get an abortion, not only will this administration give you 5 days off to go get it, they will literally pay for your travel there and back to be able to go do it, not to mention the change in the Mexico City policy. Now we are paying for abortions overseas currently with Federal dollars.

HHS launched a new web page that actually gave out what they call creative ways for health clinics to advise teenagers on sex, birth control, pregnancy testing, and abortion. HHS, in fact, has proposed a new rule that they are in the process of finalizing which redefines "reproductive healthcare" to include abortion. It prohibits entities from cooperating with law enforcement or a court order if an investigation is related to an abortion. It redefines the word "person" to "a human being that is born alive."

HHS has also changed the billing requirements for the ACA—the Affordable Care Act—and has blatantly ignored the law on how abortion funding is done, in direct opposition to when this body debated that publicly.

If I can just mention one other thing, my State, like every other State, gets grants for what they call title X grants. These are Federal grants for cancer screenings for women, for contraceptives, for those that are in poverty. That is normal. We have that all over the country for every State. It is a typical grant that comes out to be able to have women in poverty get cancer screenings and get access to contraceptives.

My State was just informed that the Biden administration is cutting off our title X funds and will not send Federal dollars to Oklahoma for cancer screenings for women or contraceptives for women in poverty to my State. Do you want to know why?

The reason that the Biden administration cut off my State is because my State would not include an abortion hotline in all of our medical information going out to the citizens of my State. That is right. If my State would not promote ways to get abortion to women in my State, then the women of my State can't get access to cancer screenings or contraceptives for low-income women.

Literally, what they are saying is: You either promote abortion in your State, or women in your State can't get access to screenings. That is this administration's extreme policy on abortion.

Listen, I understand we have differences of opinion. I happen to believe every child is valuable. This administration believes some children are disposable and some children are valuable. I just don't find any child disposable in my world. I think they are all valuable. I think they are all important. I think we look in the eyes of those tens of thousands of children that have been born in the past year post Roe, and we look them in the face and we say, I am glad you are here. What are you going to be? What are you going to invent? What are you going to do? What is life going to be like for you?

And like millions of other Americans, they will have a chance to live out life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, because we are right there looking in their eyes. Let's have this conversation. Let's keep this dialogue going.

We are a nation that should talk about hard things in respectful ways. But let's talk about it, because there is lots of families in the days ahead that are counting on us living out our values and respectfully having dialogue where we disagree, because I think kids are worth it. So let's have that dialogue. One year after the Dobbs decision, we are not resolved, but at least we are talking about it again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

LONELINESS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am on the floor tonight to talk about a topic that rarely, if ever, gets discussed on the Senate floor. I am here to talk about loneliness.

Every single one of us, over the course of our life, has felt lonely, maybe really intensely lonely. I certainly have. It is an awful feeling, right? It creates this pit in your stomach. It creates a consuming melancholy for many. Sometimes intense loneliness can make you physically ill. Often, it makes you really agitated and angry, right? Why is this happening to me?

Now, there are, frankly, a lot of reasons to believe that less Americans today should feel lonely than ever before. More of us live in densely populated parts of the country than ever before. Technology now allows us to con-

nect to friends and family and communities that share interests more easily than ever before at the press of a button.

But evidence from psychology and sociology tells us that the opposite is true. In recent decades, we have seen rising levels of both aloneness, which is defined as having fewer social contacts, and high levels of loneliness, which is defined as feelings of isolation.

We live closer to each other than ever before. We have technologies that allow us to connect to people with more ease than ever before, but people are feeling lonelier. As we look out at a country that seems to be kind of coming apart a little bit at the seams—I mean, people are getting shot at just for ringing the wrong doorbell or pulling into the wrong driveway. Hundreds are dying every day from taking a drug that is designed to deaden their emotions. Thousands of people engaged in violent rebellion right here in the Nation's Capital.

We need to be engaged in this search for the reasons why people are feeling more pessimistic, more frustrated, and angrier than ever before. And so about 8 or 9 months ago, I started talking about what I believed to be one of the most important political issues of our time: loneliness.

Millions of Americans are feeling this way. People report feeling more intense loneliness than ever before in our lifetime. And it is irresponsible for policymakers to just keep ignoring it.

Now, there are a lot of explanations for how we got here, but a few stand out as particularly important for my colleagues to consider.

So it is true that technology does allow us to stay connected to family and friends and find new communities, but on the whole, technology has left many Americans, especially young people, feeling more alone than ever before.

During the height of COVID-19, we learned the hard way that digital communication cannot replace the value of in-person experience. For example, studies show that face-to-face interactions create faster connections to humans and build stronger, more enduring relationships than anything that you can create online.

Of course, staying in touch electronically is better than losing touch altogether, but when Facebook likes and Instagram comments replace in-person experiences, it actually can drive up feelings of loneliness.

Staring at your screen for 6 hours a day, no matter how many people you are looking at, it can be a very lonely experience.

And it doesn't stop there, because there are millions of users with developing minds—children—who spend hours staring at their screens, scrolling through an endless stream of pictures and videos that have been carefully curated to create an illusion of perfection, leaving young people feeling inadequate or wanting.

Constant comparison breeds—in young people especially but in all of us—and can result in more anxiety than fulfillment. Kids are feeling really lousy today, and it is not just because they are spending tons of time on their screens instead of engaging in real in-person experiences. It is also because the content that they are watching is dangerous and corrosive and making them feel more alone in the world because of those feelings of envy.

Now, the second really important factor contributing to this epidemic of loneliness in America is the erosion of local communities. Now, connection sometimes happens randomly; but, mostly, it is facilitated through local institutions: churches, sports teams, civic clubs, labor unions, business organizations. We derive personal meaning as well from those institutions, from the communities that we create or join. We get connection, but we also get meaning.

Those institutions help us construct an identity, a sense of purpose. It connects us to something bigger than ourselves. But in 2023, you would be hard-pressed to find a community with the kind of thriving local institutions of decades ago.

Globalization has erased thousands of healthy, unique downtowns, where people often met each other at local businesses. And that outsourcing of commerce online has also diminished local cultures that facilitate connection, identity, and meaning. Growing up, my identity was really strongly connected to the town that I lived in, and there was no shortage of ways that I could easily connect with the people I lived with.

Back then, we had thriving local newspapers where I could learn really easily about the people in my town, which made it easier to create that connection.

Those local newspapers are drying up by the day. We all get our news from national sources. It was my local grocer who used to slip me a free slice of American cheese when I would visit on the weekend with my grandparents that made me feel like I belonged to a community, that I wasn't alone. But now the local grocer is gone, driven out of business by superstores or food-delivery drivers.

But even if you still had these local institutions to be a part of, who has time any longer? A few decades ago, one job could easily provide a family with a comfortable middle-class life. Today, adults are forced to maintain two or three jobs to match that same income, or work 50 or 60 or 70 hours a week. There is no time any longer for millions of Americans to go to church, to be part of a civic club, or just hang out with your friends or your neighbors or your family.

And so what are you seeing? Participation in youth sports is plummeting. That is in part because overextended parents are just too busy these days to shuttle their kids to games or practices, or they just can't afford the fees

or equipment costs. Yes, kids are more interested in online gaming and their screens, but it is also stressed-out parents who just don't have time to participate in all those extracurricular activities with their kids but also don't have time to join the kind of institutions that used to give them value back when 40 hours a week was enough.

And so here is maybe the most important question: Why should we care? What are the public policy implications of loneliness? Well, first, there are health consequences to loneliness. American suicide rates are rising at an alarming rate, most significantly amongst two key populations: teenagers and rural men, who are both disproportionately affected by the changing landscape of American culture and economics.

Researchers at NYU found a direct correlation between teenage girls' use of Instagram and the corresponding spike in teenage girls' self-harm rates; and teenage rates of sadness are higher than ever.

For rural white men—one of my favorites—Nobel prize-winning economist Angus Deaton, he argues that as the white male dominated “blue-collar aristocracy” of 50 to 100 years ago has vanished, with the loss of social and economic status that went with it, those men are struggling. And this feeling of isolation, specifically amongst that population, is rising to epidemic levels as well, with a record number of white men who are struggling in this new world, committing acts of self-harm.

Surgeon General Vivek Murthy does a great job of connecting the dots between widespread loneliness and individual health. It is not just suicide. Last month, he released a detailed advisory with shocking statistics: Social isolation is associated with a 29-percent increase in the risk of heart disease and a 32-percent increase in the risk of stroke. Chronic loneliness can increase the risk of developing dementia in older people by 50 percent. Do we think it is a coincidence that life expectancy rates in this country are falling at the same time that loneliness is spiking?

The second reason that we should care about this epidemic as policymakers is because this growing isolation of Americans is helping to fuel a growing culture of resentment and anger.

I mentioned that young woman who was shot because she pulled up to the wrong driveway; but we see this edginess all over in our culture today. People are strung out. Violence is more common as a means to settle disputes, and fringe groups and conspiracy theories are more popular than ever.

I think loneliness is a big part of the reason why all this is happening. I mentioned that loneliness is often accompanied by a sense of anger. Why do I feel like this? Who is to blame? This anger, coupled with this diminishing availability of positive identities like

family, place, or institution, makes negative identities built on hatred and distrust all the more attractive.

And so the newly isolated, the lonely, become targets for demagogues who offer up scapegoats to blame for the decay of these traditional sources of meaning and identity.

In 2017, America was shocked when a huge White Supremacists rally in Charlottesville drew thousands, but this shouldn't have been a surprise. Loneliness drives people to dark, dangerous places. And those young White men carrying tiki torches are only the tip of a giant iceberg of isolated, angry Americans whose search for meaning might lead them to a seething anti-Semitic or racist mob.

Now, the picture I am painting—I get it—is pretty grim, but I am here to tell you, there are reasons to hope. One of the reasons why I really believe Congress can get something done attacking isolation and loneliness and building more social connections is because there is a growing consensus across the aisle about this set of problems that we are dealing with and the solutions, which this problem set may be a little less political than other problems we face in this body.

I think Congress is coming to acknowledge that the consequences of rapidly advancing technology are not value-neutral. We have seen how social media has deepened polarization and addicted a generation of kids to their screens, and in the past few months, we have been involved in a new conversation about generative AI and machine learning and how it has the potential to displace millions of jobs and a whole bunch of basic human functions.

Most Republicans and Democrats agree that we made a big mistake by sitting on the sidelines during the early days of the internet and the development most recently of social media.

The good news is that Republicans and Democrats are working together on this problem. There are a few good pieces of legislation that could start to hold social media companies accountable who are driving kids into lives of increasing loneliness and isolation.

Senators COTTON, SCHATZ, BRITT, and I have proposed a bill to set a minimum age of 13 to use social media, to require parental consent. It also prohibits social media companies from using these highly personalized algorithms to drive dangerous, isolationist-inducing content to kids.

On the issue of AI, Senator SCHUMER has convened a bipartisan group that is beginning its work as well, and I am glad to be a part of it.

A second starting point that I really think really think has bipartisan potential would be to advance policies specifically aimed at restoring the health of our local communities and local institutions.

In Western Connecticut, in my old congressional district, we have got the “Brass City,” the “Silver City,” the

“Hardware City,” the “Hat City.” For a long time in this country, identity, meaning, and connection were created because we really were proud of the things we made, of the jobs that existed. But the theory of economic neoliberalism sent most of those jobs overseas and assumed that better jobs would replace them. That is not what happened.

So I really believe that industrial policy is part of the solution to decreasing isolation and loneliness. Why? Because so many people get meaning and identity from the things that we make and used to make, from jobs that have meaning and good wages and benefits and pensions attached to them. That is why the CHIPS and Science Act paved the way for a new industrial policy to get the Republicans and Democrats to come together and work on creating more meaning in work which I think leads to isolation and loneliness.

But, as I said before, that only works if a full-time job provides a living wage and you have enough time in the evenings and on the weekends to be able to engage with your friends and your family and your community.

So I am also hopeful that we can make progress across the aisle driving up the minimum wage and incentivizing jobs to pay real living wages.

This week, a conservative group called American Compass released a report that was underlaid by a really scathing critique of modern capitalism. The conference was attended by a bunch of our Republican colleagues here. The report called for policymakers to remake capitalism so that our economic system works to build strong families, healthy individuals, and connected communities instead of just viewing families and individuals as mere pawns of the global market, the grease that makes the wheels of profit move. This is a really interesting development. Serious people on the right are starting to rethink the nature of capitalism to make sure that our economy works for families and individuals to make us more connected and less lonely. So there is real possibility that both parties, the right and the left, can come together to address this crisis of American isolation.

America's epidemic of loneliness is far from terminal. Our retreat into ourselves is a product of economic, cultural, and political choices we have made, but it is not too late to chart a new path. I get it. This is a Congress that has a hard time solving much more straightforward problems, so tackling a metaphysical crisis like loneliness might feel like a Herculean task. So, right now, I would argue that we just need a starting point, an organizing point for some of these discussions.

So I am working on legislation that would just start by establishing a national strategy, a national conversation around loneliness and how to promote connectedness. Every Agency

should have a role to play in this crisis. So I would argue that we just need to start with a dedicated office to coordinate a governmentwide strategy to tackle loneliness and strengthen communities.

I also think we should have guidelines and best practices for public entities to engage in trying to connect people. We have guidelines for nutrition and physical activity and sleep. We should have these guidelines for social connection.

Finally, we can't really address this crisis adequately if we don't understand it. So my legislation would also include some small amounts of funding to support research on the social and health impacts of widespread loneliness.

I look forward to talking to my colleagues about this legislation. It doesn't solve the problem, but I think it is time that we start organizing our work and our thoughts around what is, in many ways, a foundational problem, which explains a lot of the things that people are feeling that drives political instability, bad health outcomes, and just general unhappiness in this country.

Loneliness is one of the few issues that defies traditional political boundaries, cuts across almost every demographic, from teenage girls living in cities, to White men living out in rural areas, blue States to red States, unaffordable cities to left-behind manufacturing towns.

There is a ton of room for us to come together to combat this growing epidemic of loneliness, and I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle are eager to be part of this solution.

I yield the floor.

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

DIGITAL PLATFORMS

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I am sorry I didn't have the chance to say thank you to our colleague from Connecticut for his speech tonight about loneliness in the United States. I was grateful that he gave it and grateful that he is in the Senate and grateful to know that another parent of young kids has the perspective that he has shared tonight because I think it is so important. And strangely enough, I am here to talk about something similar tonight.

First, Madam President, I will put it away because it is not supposed to be on the floor, but I wanted to come here tonight to talk a little bit about this smartphone and the world of social media, the world of machine learning algorithms and generative AI that has now been put at our fingertips.

The rise of smartphones and social media is one of the most rapid, profound, and, I would argue, poorly understood transformations in American life in our entire history.

If you had asked me when I was the age of the pages who are here, when I was growing up, and you had said to me: Someday, Michael, there is going

to be a device—well, here is the device—there is going to be a device that looks like this; it doesn't even have a wire next to it, that would have been astonishing in and of itself. How can an electronic device not have a wire? But it does not have a wire. Not only does it not have a wire, but you can FaceTime anybody on Earth the way Captain Kirk and Mr. Spock FaceTimed each other.

The Presiding Officer knows what I am talking about. These folks may not know who Captain Kirk was or who Mr. Spock was. But the idea that you could reach somebody and communicate with them on video, on a telephone, or a device that had no wires, that alone would have been shocking.

If you had said: Well, let me tell you something else about that device, I would say: OK. What else can you tell me about that device?

And you said: Well, you can buy any book that has ever been written by humans, basically, on that device. And if you want it, you can make a choice. You can have it digitally, and it will just download immediately on your device, or you can order it, and it can be at your house by tonight, if you would rather have a print version of the book rather than getting it digitally. And I will tell you something else, Michael, it will translate any language that you care to hear.

I was, today, with the CEO of Google who was in my office talking about how one of their projects now is to help recover and sustain lost languages or languages we are in danger of losing in this country and around the world, which I think is a worthy project. We definitely, in my State, are at risk of losing Native American languages that really are at risk.

But in any case, if you said to me: You can translate any language or you can translate yourself into any language, and somebody would ask: What do you think that device is worth? In 1983 or 1987, when I was graduating from high school or college, I think I probably would have said that is probably—I can't imagine what it is worth—millions of dollars. Millions of dollars. To have every book that has ever been published that is in every library in the world? Millions of dollars, to be able to translate every language that you can translate? Millions of dollars.

And if you told me that it actually only cost a few hundred dollars, which it does, and that everybody on planet Earth would have one, which is almost in many ways the case, I would have asked what you were smoking. But it is true. It is true. And that is the world we have inhabited for almost 20 years. It is not new: the digital age, the information age, the age of ubiquitous smartphones, social media, and a handful of digital platforms that control them.

And for all of the extraordinary convenience and extraordinary productivity and entertainment that these

technologies have allowed, as a country, we still haven't come to grips with the profound cost to our economy, to our society, and to our democracy, and that is before we even consider AI.

This is what everybody around here is talking about, what some would call the most consequential technology for humanity since the invention of fire. But unlike fire, this technology can improve itself, and it has the potential to move faster and transform more than any innovation in our history, for better or for worse.

Even in its early days, generative AI has already demonstrated the power to write the code to animate and even compose in ways that would have been absolutely unimaginable 20 years ago or 10 years ago, to say nothing of when we were in school.

It is easy to forget how different the world was just 20 years ago. Twenty years ago, General Motors topped the Fortune 500 list. Apple was 285, and Amazon didn't even make the cut. Twitter was still an idea somewhere in the recesses of Jack Dorsey's head. Mark Zuckerberg was barely old enough to vote, even though he likely already acquired the undeveloped view of the First Amendment that he seems to hold to this day. No one on this planet had ever heard of Gmail or TikTok or ChatGPT. That was only 20 years ago, but it might as well have been 200 years ago.

Today, Americans spend over 2 hours a day on social media, more time socializing online than in person. The average TikTok user in our country spends 90 minutes a day on the app—more than 3 weeks a year.

Facebook now hosts 2.7 billion friends—a half a billion more souls than Christianity.

Twitter has fewer followers, but they include every single politician—probably almost every single person in this Chamber—every journalist, every TV producer in America, withering our political debate to 280-character effervescent posts.

In just two decades, a few companies—less than a handful, really—have transformed much of humanity's daily life: how we amuse ourselves, how we discover, how we learn, how we shop, how we connect with friends and family and elected representatives, how we pay attention, how we glimpse our shared reality. This transformation is a staggering testament to American innovation.

And we can all think of a dozen ways that platforms have improved our lives. I, for one, have been entirely relieved of the stress of sitting in rush-hour traffic, wondering if there is a better route. I am now confident that Waze is guiding me like my own personal North Star, and that has made an enormous difference to my sense of well-being.

But this dramatic shift from our analog to our digital human existence has never been guided and has never been informed by the public interest. It has

always been dictated by the unforgiving requirements of a few gigantic American corporations and their commercial self-interests. And what are those interests? To make us better informed citizens? To make us more productive employees? To make us happier people? Of course not. It is to turn a profit and protect their profits through their own economic dominance, and they have succeeded beyond their wildest dreams.

This is the market capitalization of some of the largest industries in America. You can see at the top here that this is Apple and Microsoft and Alphabet and Amazon and Meta combined. They are at \$9 trillion in market cap. To get to \$9 trillion, you basically have to add up our entire banking sector, our entire oil and gas sector, and our entire pharmaceutical sector just to give you a sense of the size of the market cap of these companies alone and the reason they have become so dominant.

Through it all, unlike almost any small business in Boulder, CO, or in any town in New Hampshire, these digital platforms have remained almost entirely unregulated—moving fast and breaking things, as they have famously said, and forcing the rest of us to sweep up the wreckage.

There is another way these companies are different from the brick-and-mortar companies in Boulder, CO, or in New Hampshire. Digital platforms aren't burdened by the fixed costs of an analog world. Beyond the blinking lights of their energy-intensive server farms, their businesses are on the cloud, a place where no one works and that requires little physical investment. They have no need to use their profits to invest in America by building the kind of infrastructure these other industries do or had.

Unlike their industrial forbearers, today's platforms have devised a new digital barrier to entry to protect their profits. It is different from the way it was in the past. They have figured out how to protect their profits and economic dominance, and we know that digital barrier as the network effect.

The network effect means that platforms become exponentially more valuable as more people join and spend more of their waking moments there—more valuable to users because their friends and families are on it; more valuable to the platforms themselves, which Hoover up our identities for their profits and train their machine-learning algorithms; more valuable for advertisers, who pay the platforms for our identities to barrage us with ads; and so valuable—so valuable—to the markets, where the top tech companies now equal, roughly, a quarter of the entire S&P 500.

In the name of building this barrier to entry—this network effect—they have stolen our identities and our privacy, and they have addicted us to their platforms. The platforms' imperative to grow big and stay big poses a

very basic question: How do you get people on your platform, and how do you keep them there?

For platforms like Apple and Amazon, it is to sell products that people want, to offer subscriptions, and, if they are lucky, to enmesh them in your closed ecosystems. For social media platforms with free services, like Meta and Twitter and TikTok, the answer is more sinister, I am afraid—to harvest as much data on your users as you can, to feed that data to your algorithms to serve up whatever content it takes to keep people hooked so you can keep selling ads.

That is the core business model. That is the model that has led to these market caps. Although this particular business model has bestowed enormous value on a few companies, it has imposed profound costs on everybody else, even in places we don't necessarily expect it.

A senior law enforcement official just told me, within the last couple of weeks, that social media is the "last mile of every fentanyl and meth transaction in America." The Presiding Officer knows that in being from New Hampshire. It took my staff 20 seconds to find illegal drugs for sale on Instagram.

I would ask the pages, please, to avert your eyes here. The image on the left appears to be pills of MDMA. The image on the right shows you how to contact the dealer through Whatsapp and pay him through another app called Wickr. Below that are all of the places you can purchase this stuff, including in Denver, CO, where we are having a terrible, terrible problem with fentanyl and with methamphetamines.

Even though the vast majority of Americans never interact with content like this, we all pay a price. Millions of Americans have surrendered to private companies an endless feed of data on their lives, all for the convenience of being served up self-gratifying political content on YouTube, less traffic, or better movie recommendations. Most Americans have made that trade without ever really knowing it.

The young people who are here today don't know a world where that trade was something that wasn't automatically made. Any suggestion that we have made that trade fairly, I think, is ludicrous. It mocks any sense of consent. These are contracts of adhesion, really. As a society, we have never asked how much of our identity or our privacy we are willing to trade for convenience and entertainment. We have never had a negotiation with Mark Zuckerberg about that. Until today, these questions have been resolved entirely to the benefit of the platforms' bottom lines.

I suppose it would be one thing if the only consequences of the digital platforms' use of our data were to sell better advertising—although even that would be a fairly pathetic concession, I think, of our own economic interests and of the precious value of our data

and our privacy and our identities. But, as every parent knows and as every kid suspects, better advertising is not the only consequence of this model.

Over the years, digital platforms have imported features from gaming and from gambling—from brightly covered displays to flashing notifications, to likes—and they unleash secret algorithms to reverse-engineer our most basic human tendencies, which are to seek out tribe approval, conformity, and to create an almost irresistible feed of content.

Americans now spend a third of their waking hours on their phones, which we check an average of 344 times a day. In speaking as a parent who has raised three daughters in this era, we certainly have not agreed to run a science experiment on our children with machine-learning algorithms and generative AI chatbots that the companies themselves barely understand at all.

While we are still coming to understand the specific role social media plays in the epidemic of teen mental health, the early evidence gives us plenty of reason to worry. Here is what we do know:

In 2006, Facebook became available to the general public. The following year, Apple released the iPhone. By 2012, just 5 years later, half of Americans had a smartphone. Today, everyone has one. Everybody has got one, I think, except for CHUCK SCHUMER, the majority leader, who is still using a flip phone.

A similar story unfolded with teens and with social media. By 2012, about half of teens used social media. Today, 95 percent of teens use it. When my parents excoriated me—and they did, just like your parents excoriated you for being glued to the television in the 1970s—the average American teen watched TV for 4 hours a day. Today, teens are on their screens for twice as long. Half are online almost constantly, they say. More than one in five 10th grade girls spend 7 or more hours a day on social media. That is 35 hours a week. In France, that is a full-time job.

As our children retreat into the digital world of someone else's making, they pay for it. They are paying for it with less sleep and exercise and time with their friends, as my colleague from Connecticut was talking about. All of this has contributed to an epidemic of teen anxiety, to depression, and to loneliness, especially among teenage girls.

Today, girls who use social media heavily are two to three times as likely to say they are depressed, compared to those who use it less often or not at all. And since the introduction of smartphones and social media, we have seen a dramatic and unprecedented rise in serious depression among Americans under 25.

To be fair, I am not saying social media is the only cause of this. But as the father of three daughters who have

grown up in its shadow, I know it has played a role.

Kids are in despair in our country. Today, almost half of teens believe they can't do anything right. Almost half of teens say: I don't enjoy life, and my life is not useful.

All of these numbers began to rise around the time that smartphones and social media began to pervade the country and hook a generation to their screens.

Over this same period, we have tragically seen the suicides of young people increase 60 percent compared to 2007.

I see this crisis of teen mental health everywhere I go in Colorado—everywhere I go in Colorado. Parents tell me about how social media has undermined their children's sense of well-being and especially—especially—a girl's body image and sense of self.

A teenager recently told me that the "electronic bullying follows me home."

"There is no escape," she said, "at any hour, on any day."

And I felt the panic. I felt the panic of a parent who can't fix it and make it better. It felt like there was nothing that I could do. It was beyond my control to make it better.

It has become common now, at the end of my townhalls, for parents to come up to me. They are usually not people—or they are often not people—who have come to the townhall to listen to the townhall; they are people who might be working the slide projector or who might have set the chairs out for people to sit in. They come to me after the talk is over, the conversation is over, and they will say something like: My daughter is 5 feet 10 inches, she is 105 pounds, and her confidence is in tatters because of the way she has interacted with social media and the way it has shredded her body image.

All of my young staff and my two eldest daughters universally say how lucky they are to have avoided middle school in the age of social media or to have gone to middle school before there was social media. Their younger siblings aren't so lucky, and they know that about their younger siblings.

Maybe the most poignant expression of this concern were the moms whom I met in the Mississippi Delta, in my wife's hometown of Marianna, AR, which is the county seat of Lee County, AR. One after the other of these moms told me that their kids in this rural, poor county in America just don't read because no book can compete with their phone—even as the Silicon Valley executives who designed these phones send their kids to social media detox camps every single summer. That is not something that is available to these parents in Marianna. These parents work two or three jobs. They can't afford childcare. And they have to compete for their child's attention against algorithmic poison. They have never stood a chance, and neither have their kids. Now these parents also have to compete with generative AI,

virtual reality, and the power they bestow to fully immerse yourself in the digital world.

My constituents in Colorado are most worried about what digital platforms have done to their kids and their families. I will tell you, I don't have a bunch of data tonight about the causal link between social media and the phones and the mental health epidemic that is going on in America, especially among American youth, but there is no doubt that we are having that epidemic. There is no doubt that it correlates to the advent of the phone and social media. There is no doubt it has been compounded by COVID and the effects of that.

This has been a hard time to be a young person in our country, to be a high school student, to be a college student, to have your life interrupted by a once-in-a-generation, once-in-100-years pandemic on top of everything else. I just think about all the kids like my daughter Anne, who spent so much of that time in her room at home on that phone.

When I was superintendent of the Denver public schools 15 years ago, we were working, focused so much on student achievement. It is amazing the way things have changed. When I was asked about this—about education in America—long after I had been superintendent but before COVID happened, I had an easy answer back then. My answer was mental health. Mental health. Mental health. And that was pre-COVID. There isn't anybody in America who thinks things have gotten better since then.

This is a tough time to be a kid in our country. It is a tough time to be a kid because of this dynamic. It is a tough time to be a kid because we haven't, as the Senator from New Hampshire has told us here over and over again, figured out how to stop this epidemic of fentanyl in this country, so that we are living in a time now, unlike when I was superintendent, where kids have to lobby their school nurses to be able to put antidotes in the nurse's office so their friends don't die because they took one pill that was labeled a prescription drug, and that pill killed them or almost killed them. We didn't do that—worry about that when I was superintendent 15 years ago.

This is off-topic tonight, but add on to that the fact that in America—this is the only country in the world where the leading cause of death for kids is guns, and two-thirds of that is people killing people, other people, assaults or suicides. Only 5 percent are accidents.

This is a tough time to be a kid in America.

I would argue that a lot of what we are dealing with here is manmade, human-made. It is not just a natural occurrence out there, somehow, in the world. We have to come to grips with it. We have to understand it.

Among other things, we need these companies, like other companies in the past, to share their data so that inde-

pendent researchers can help us make the assessments we need to make in order to make the judgments we need to make to provide oversight—kind of like the tobacco companies finally had to cough up the data way back when.

As I say, my constituents are most worried about this, these issues, about their kids and about their families, but they also worry a lot about the effect on our democracy, and they have a lot of reason to be concerned about that too.

When I first joined the Senate, it was around the time of the so-called Twitter revolutions in Egypt and Libya and Tunisia that we then heralded as the Arab Spring. At the time, people in Washington and around the world hailed social media as a powerful tool for democracy. It didn't take long, though, for tyrants to turn those tools against democracy. The dictators who once feared social media soon harnessed it for their purposes—to track opponents, to dox critics, and to flood the zone with propaganda.

Vladimir Putin understood this better than most. He saw the vast and unregulated power of social media over our democracy, and he wielded social media as a digital Trojan horse to inflame our divisions and undermine trust in our democracy. The damage inflicts us to this day.

Ahead of the 2016 elections, Putin flooded our social media with disinformation. According to the Mueller report, the Russians "conducted social media operations . . . with the goal of sowing discord in the U.S. political system." We know that, of course, now.

They sought to fracture our country along every conceivable line—race, religion, class, sexuality, politics—playing both sides. They didn't care. Half this stuff is pro-immigrant, for example; half is anti-immigrant. Half of it is pro-Muslim; half is anti-Muslim. What they wanted was to divide this country, to divide this democracy.

By the way, it took us more than a year to figure out this was Russian propaganda and not just our own political discourse, which says a lot about our own political discourse, where we might want to reflect on that.

The Russians played both sides over 10 million tweets and nearly 4,000 fake accounts. Imagine what Putin would have done with generative AI or could do with generative AI and the power to create fake images and videos that most of us would fail to distinguish from reality.

Back in 2016, as I said, we let it all happen because we couldn't tell the difference between this discourse and our discourse.

I published a book during my not-very-well-noticed campaign for President about this because I kept running into people—I can remember I ran into a senior at a nursing home in New Hampshire who was repeating stuff that I knew was Russian propaganda.

He was saying: What are you going to do about it?

I am not saying that you couldn't find something on the internet that is true. Obviously, there is a lot there. But he was repeating Russian propaganda, and he didn't have any idea.

When I joined the Senate Intelligence Committee after that, I began to realize that this problem extended far beyond our borders and that it was serious. That is why 3 years ago I wrote to Mark Zuckerberg, warning him—warning him—that Facebook had become authoritarians' "platform of choice" to suppress their opposition around the world.

The consequences have been horrific. In Myanmar, the United Nations named Facebook "a significant factor" in stoking communal violence against the Rohingya after it repeatedly ignored calls to remove hate speech and hire more staff who actually knew the country.

Around the world, we have seen fake stories on these platforms spark violence—in India, in Sri Lanka, in Kenya, and on January 6, 2021, here in the United States of America.

In the weeks before January 6, President Trump—our first President who ran his campaign and administration through Twitter—incited a mob to invade this Capitol. I remember sitting in a windowless room with the Presiding Officer in the Capitol on the 6th. We watched CNN as our fellow citizens invaded the U.S. Capitol with their racist banners and with their anti-Semitic t-shirts to "save" an election, they said, that had not been stolen.

In these moments, we cannot bury our heads in our digital feeds. All of us are called upon to defend this democracy and to burnish our example at home. We can help—the people in this body can help by reining in the vast power of digital platforms and reasserting the interests of the American people and our public interest.

The Americans who came before us would never have known about algorithms. They wouldn't have known about network effects. But they would recognize the challenge that we face, and their example should guide our way.

The Founders themselves designed one of the most elegant forms of checks and balances to guard against tyranny.

After Upton Sinclair exposed ghastly conditions in meatpacking facilities, in 1906, Teddy Roosevelt joined Congress to create the Food and Drug Administration. As broadcasting became more central to American life, in 1934, FDR and Congress created the Federal Communications Commission. After the 2009 financial crisis, President Obama and Congress established the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. In each case, Congress knew it lacked expertise to oversee complex new sectors of the economy, so it created independent bodies to empower—to empower—the American people.

Today, we have no dedicated entity to protect the public interest, and we

have been powerless as a result. That is why last year, I introduced a bill to create a Federal Digital Platform Commission. I reintroduced it earlier this month with our colleague Senator WELCH from Vermont.

We have essentially proposed an FCC for digital platforms—it is not really more complicated than that—an independent body with five Senate-confirmed Commissioners empowered to protect consumers, to protect competition, and to defend the public and the public's interest. The Commission would hold hearings, conduct research, pursue investigations, establish commonsense rules for the sector, and enforce violations with tough penalties. Most important, the Agency would finally put the American people in a negotiation with digital platforms that have amassed vast power beyond our imagination and over the American people's lives and the lives of our children.

Previous Congresses knew they would never have the expertise to approve or disapprove new drugs, for example.

We didn't have a debate on this floor about that because we knew that expertise would better lie with the FDA. We don't write the safety guidelines for airlines on this floor either. We have a commission that will do that.

Why would we expect Congress to be able to regulate technologies that are moving at quantum speed like AI? It is not possible.

And perhaps this is why Sam Altman, the creator of ChatGPT, testified that we urgently need a new regulator—assuming that he wasn't a deep fake.

Some may say: We don't need a new government Agency. We already have the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice.

These Agencies are staffed by hard-working public servants, but they don't have the expertise or the tools or the time to regulate this brandnew sector. And that was before generative AI.

And I want to say, on that note, I am very grateful to CHUCK SCHUMER, the majority leader, for his remarks earlier today. I completely agree that we need to chart a responsible course between promoting innovation in AI and ensuring the safety of our children and our democracy.

And while I think a dedicated, expert Agency is the best solution, and I believe others will come to that judgment as well, I welcome the debate that we are going to have on this. And I am the first to admit that I don't have a monopoly on wisdom on anything but certainly on this.

But whatever we do, we cannot accept another 20 years of digital platforms transforming American life with no accountability to the American people. We are still coming to terms with the harm from 20 years of unregulated social media. And we haven't come to grips with that. Every parent knows that. I shudder to imagine what our country will look like if we allow the

same story to work its way out with AI.

That particular technology may be new, but we face a familiar American juncture. We have been here before. In the late 19th century, when Gilded Age robber barons abused their dominance of the coal, steel, and railroad industries to stifle competition, to exploit workers and undermine democracy, government stepped in to assert the public interest.

And, looking back, it is hard to imagine American life without the victories of that era—from basic antitrust laws and consumer protections to the direct election of Senators and the income tax. And I think, looking forward, we have similar questions to answer.

What will our response be to the digital robber barons of our era that addict our children, that corrode our democracy and plunder our privacy, our identity, and our attention? Will we allow them to continue transforming American life according to their self-interest, or will we step up to safeguard the interests, civil liberties, and the freedoms of the American people?

You know, especially for young people that are listening to this who might say: There is nothing you can do; the cat is out of the bag; you can't hold back the ocean—my answer to that is not very helpful because it is to recall something that young people here won't remember, but it is in my mind when I am talking to families and to young people in my State and I am listening to them talk about the mental health impacts of what they are facing.

It reminds me of when the Cuyahoga River caught on fire in Cleveland. And that moment, for those of us who were around then, was so extraordinary because that unbelievable image of a river in America burning, catching on fire, flames shooting into the sky, that is what finally forced us to come to grips with the pollution that we were allowing to flow freely into our watersheds and into our communities. The same thing with our air. And we finally did something about it, and the country is better as a result.

This is another case, by the way, just like those environmental regulations, where I think it is critically important for the United States, with our set of values and our commitments to democracy, to help set the international standards here and to not take standards from authoritarian regimes like China, for example.

And that is a big risk if we don't act here. But I think we will, and I think we can. And I think that is going to not only give the American people a chance to negotiate with these companies but give America the chance to lead on questions that are fundamentally important for humanity.

None of this is going to be easy. It never is. But when the stakes are nothing less than the health of our children and the health of our democracy, we have no choice but to try. And we

should try. I think we have a unique responsibility to lead here, not just for the reasons that I just said but also because, after all, it was American companies that blazed the trail into the digital age and invited all of humanity to follow. And we now live in the world that they created, for better and for worse, with its wonders and with its conveniences but also with its risks and dangers and difficult questions.

The same platforms that amplify a protester's cry for freedom in Iran also equip tyrants around the world to suppress democratic movements. The same technologies that liberated anyone to say anything also unleashed a perpetual cacophony, leaving all of us screaming louder to be heard. The dazzling features that brought the world online have also trapped us there, more connected but more alone, more aware but less informed—enthralled to our screens, growing more anxious, more angry and addicted by the day.

Overcoming all of this will not be easy, but we can't simply hide under our covers or scroll through TikTok and hope these problems are going to solve themselves. That is our job. The health and future of our children lie in the decisions that we make or the decisions that we fail to make.

Our objective, my objective to being here tonight, is not to hold the world back. In Colorado, we have always welcomed innovation, but we also understand that not all change is progress and that it is our job to harness these changes toward a better world.

We are the first generations to steer our democracy in the digital age, and it is an open question whether democracy can survive in the world that digital platforms have created. I may be wrong, but the evidence so far does not fill me with confidence. It fills me with urgency—urgency to reassert the public interest; to reclaim our public square and exercise in self-government; to level the playing field for America's

teens, for our parents, for teachers and small businesses who, for 20 years, have battled alone against some of the most powerful companies in human history.

This is a fight worth having. This is a fight worth winning. And if we succeed, we may help save democracy not just in this country but around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

BUDGET ENFORCEMENT LEVELS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023, P.L. 118-5, which Congress passed earlier this month, resolved a manufactured default crisis and avoided an economic catastrophe. In addition, the bipartisan bill provided a congressional budget for 2024.

Specifically, the legislation instructs the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget to file enforceable budgetary levels in the Senate consistent with current law. Today, I submit the required filing.

Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 requires the chairman to file a spending allocation for the Committee on Appropriations for 2024; spending allocations for other committees for 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033; an aggregate spending level for 2024; aggregate revenue levels

for 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033; and aggregate levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for 2024, 2024 through 2028, and 2024 through 2033. Section 121 also requires the chairman to include a list of accounts eligible for advance appropriations.

The amounts included in this filing are consistent with the Congressional Budget Office's May 2023 baseline, adjusted for the passage of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023, including the discretionary spending limits established by that act. Because the legislation does not include budget enforcement for fiscal year 2023, it will not be possible to submit reports required by section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act until fiscal year 2024.

In addition, section 121 allows the deficit-neutral reserve fund in section 3003 of S. Con. Res. 14—117th Congress—to be updated by 2 fiscal years. Pursuant to that authority, that reserve fund shall be considered updated and available for use for legislation which does not increase the deficit for the time period of fiscal year 2024 to fiscal year 2033.

For purposes of enforcing the Senate's pay-as-you-go rule, which is found in section 4106 of the fiscal year 2018 congressional budget resolution, I am resetting the Senate's scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.

Section 111 of the act requires my counterpart, the chairman of the House Committee on the Budget, to file similar enforceable budgetary levels in the House of Representatives consistent with the discretionary limits in the act. That filing will help both Houses uphold the bipartisan agreement.

I ask unanimous consent that the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

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

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO SENATE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 and Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)
(\$ in billions)

	Budget Authority	Outlays
Appropriations:		
Revised Security Category/Defense	886.349	N/A
Revised Nonsecurity Category/Nondefense	703.651	N/A
General Purpose Discretionary	N/A	1,813.382
Memo:		
On-budget	1,583.271	1,806.643
Off-budget	6.729	6.739
Mandatory	1,473.002	1,452.200

N/A = not applicable. Budgetary changes related to program integrity initiatives and other adjustments pursuant to section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, as amended by the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023, will be held in reserve until consideration of legislation providing such funding. "Revised security category" means discretionary appropriations in budget function 050, while "revised nonsecurity category" means discretionary appropriations other than in budget function 050.

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO SENATE COMMITTEE OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS

(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 and Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)
(\$ in billions)

	2024	2024–2028	2024–2033
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry:			
Budget Authority	190.758	1,002.518	2,088.798
Outlays	191.517	972.954	1,974.649
Armed Services:			
Budget Authority	277.969	1,193.836	2,117.074
Outlays	272.144	1,192.368	2,114.710
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:			
Budget Authority	34.273	161.597	333.779
Outlays	7.051	–12.803	–70.708
Commerce, Science, and Transportation:			
Budget Authority	24.239	107.446	196.019

ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO SENATE COMMITTEE OTHER THAN APPROPRIATIONS—Continued
(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 and Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)
(\$ in billions)

	2024	2024–2028	2024–2033
Outlays	20.356	101.673	185.182
Energy and Natural Resources:			
Budget Authority	8.811	39.714	77.966
Outlays	12.920	68.359	113.543
Environment and Public Works:			
Budget Authority	63.847	325.494	654.349
Outlays	12.649	60.869	87.739
Finance:			
Budget Authority	3,449.522	19,587.982	46,205.916
Outlays	3,458.376	19,589.956	46,199.103
Foreign Relations:			
Budget Authority	43.978	220.169	440.898
Outlays	39.915	215.035	435.773
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:			
Budget Authority	59.175	254.652	504.747
Outlays	85.410	295.186	521.242
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:			
Budget Authority	178.828	941.599	1,986.949
Outlays	182.794	937.140	1,965.386
Indian Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0.456	2.329	4.303
Outlays	1.445	4.304	6.252
Judiciary:			
Budget Authority	20.322	102.547	212.588
Outlays	24.903	109.571	217.340
Rules and Administration:			
Budget Authority	0.045	0.225	0.460
Outlays	0.024	0.124	0.275
Intelligence:			
Budget Authority	0.514	2.570	4.112
Outlays	0.514	2.570	4.112
Veterans' Affairs:			
Budget Authority	210.295	1,243.056	2,961.841
Outlays	197.725	1,246.361	2,963.470
Small Business:			
Budget Authority	0.000	0.000	0.000
Outlays	0.120	0.130	0.130
Unassigned to Committee:			
Budget Authority	– 1,267.733	– 6,910.352	– 15,632.915
Outlays	– 1,257.765	– 6,854.818	– 15,493.532

Memorandum: Includes entitlements funded in annual appropriations acts. Budgetary effects of the Fiscal Responsibility Act are assigned to the Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions Committee, which has jurisdiction over the majority of the rescissions included in that law.

BUDGET AGGREGATES				
(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 and Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)				
(\$ in billions)				
	2024	2024–2028	2024–2033	
Spending:				
Budget Authority	4,878.570	N/A	N/A	
Outlays	5,056.741	N/A	N/A	
Revenue	3,651.838	20,174.716	45,331.678	
Social Security:				
Outlays	1,322.667	7,504.648	17,473.681	
Revenue	1,195.545	6,540.268	14,442.782	

N/A = not applicable. Figures represent current law, including CBO's May 2023 baseline and the enactment of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE SENATE				
(\$ in billions)				
				Balances
Fiscal Year 2023				0
Fiscal Year 2024				0
Fiscal Years 2024–2028				0
Fiscal Years 2024–2033				0

ACCOUNTS IDENTIFIED FOR ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS	
(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023)	
Financial Services and General Government:	
Payment to the Postal Service Fund	
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education:	
Employment and Training Administration	
Education for the Disadvantaged	
School Improvement Programs	
Career, Technical, and Adult Education	
Special Education	
Transportation, Housing, and Urban Development:	
Tenant-based Rental Assistance	
Project-based Rental Assistance	

CELEBRATING THE RENOVATION OF THE PLATTE COUNTY COURTHOUSE

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I rise today in recognition of the distinct history of Wyoming's Platte County Courthouse. The courthouse reopens this summer following its first signifi-

cant renovation in over a century. For 105 years, the residents of Platte County have recognized the courthouse as an important landmark and testament to the county's history. Located in the county seat of Wheatland, WY, the roots of this historic courthouse are tied to the wild frontier.

After the county's incorporation in 1911, the Platte County Board of Commissioners agreed to lease office space in the Stock Growers Bank for \$55 per month. Five years later, the commission recognized the need for a permanent structure to house both the court and jail. Eager to start, commissioners issued \$50,000 in county bonds to finance construction, subject to voter approval. Residents were passionate about the campaign for a new courthouse and jail. There were well-reasoned arguments on both sides. On November 7, 1916, the will of the people won: Platte County would build a new courthouse and jail.

Construction progressed quickly. Commissioners contracted with architectural firm Baerreson Brothers, based in Denver and Cheyenne, for initial design plans. By April 6, 1917, the county approved Archie Allison's bid for general construction. State Grand Master of the Masonic Lodge, Herbert King of Laramie, dedicated the building's cornerstone on June 20, 1917. In January 1918, the county completed work on the courthouse and jail. The total cost, including furnishings, was \$85,000. Since then, generations of dedicated civil servants have preserved and enhanced the building. The National Park Service recognized the rich historical value of the courthouse on October 15, 2008, when the building was

listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

Today, the courthouse acts as an archive for the history of Platte County. It provides a sense of community for its citizens and is an important gathering place for public activities. Remarkably, in its 105-year history, the Platte County Courthouse has undergone only small renovations to adapt to changing technology and workplace standards. That changed in 2018, when voters authorized the county to collect \$4.7 million in Specific Purpose Excise Tax—more commonly known as a sixth-penny sales tax. This, plus other reserve funds and grants, allowed the county to complete \$6.5 million in extensive renovations. For the past 18 months, county officials have been temporarily displaced while the building underwent massive changes. In addition to a brandnew HVAC and electric system, the renovation includes added insulation, new plumbing, and a new elevator. The county implemented all of these designs with an intent to increase efficiency and accessibility.

On July 1, 2023, residents of Platte County will gather to celebrate this impressive achievement. Officials will host a county-wide celebration. They plan to commemorate the history of the county and the generosity and commitment of its citizens.

Platte County is led by these dedicated individuals:

Steve Shockley, Commissioner
Kayla Mantle, Commissioner
Ian Jolovich, Commissioner
Malcolm Ervin, Clerk
Kristi Rietz, Treasurer
David Russell, Sheriff
Doug Weaver, Attorney

Phil Martin, Coroner
 Danette Eppel, Assessor
 Hal Hutchinson, Engineer
 Terry Stevenson, Emergency Management
 Jim DeWitt, Maintenance Supervisor
 Doug Dumont, Planning Director
 Penny Simonton, Public Health
 Beal Angle, Road and Bridge
 Mona McAuley, Clerk of the Court
 Honorable Edward Buchanan, 8th Judicial District Court Judge
 Honorable F. Scott Peasley, 8th Judicial District Court Judge
 Honorable Nathaniel Hibben, 8th Judicial Circuit Court Judge
 Honorable Clark Allan, 8th Judicial Circuit Court Judge
 Magistrate Scott Cole, 8th Judicial District

It is an honor to rise in recognition of this significant milestone for Platte County. Bobbi joins me in extending our congratulations to the citizens of Platte County on the lasting legacy of their newly renovated courthouse.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROCHELLE P. WALENSKY, M.D., M.P.H.

Mr. WARNOCK. Madam President, today I have the honor and privilege to recognize Dr. Rochelle Walensky for her unwavering dedication, service, and contributions to public health.

Before her time at the CDC, Dr. Walensky's groundbreaking work in understanding the transmission, prevention, and treatment of HIV/AIDS was paramount in addressing disparities in access to care, vaccine efficacy, and distribution among underserved communities while addressing gaps in knowledge, earning her widespread recognition and acclaim.

With a drive toward making a difference, Dr. Walensky began her tenure as Director of the CDC in 2021, in the midst of the unprecedented global COVID-19 pandemic. Despite this challenge, Dr. Walensky boldly stepped into the role, bringing her years of experience and perspective to the Georgia-based Agency. As evidenced by the CORE Health Equity Science and Intervention Strategy, which she unveiled within months of starting, and declaration that racism is a serious public health crisis, Dr. Walensky's passion for health equity has ensured that equity is baked into the CDC's mission.

Dr. Walensky's pursuit of truth and dedication to the well-being of others has left an indelible mark on the field of public health. Her leadership during the most challenging public health crisis of this generation saved lives. She has displayed true servant leadership by prioritizing science, empathy, and public welfare during heightened times of distrust and misinformation.

As we reflect on Dr. Walensky's remarkable achievements before she begins the next chapter in her career, I am proud to honor her as a pioneer for health equity. Her commitment to public health and pursuit of the idea that we all have inherent value, combined with her tireless efforts to protect and improve the lives of all individuals, will forever inspire future generations

of healthcare professionals. Thank you, Dr. Walensky, for your great service to the American people.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF BLANCHARD SPRINGS CAVERNS

• Mr. BOOZMAN. Madam President, I rise today to recognize Blanchard Springs Caverns on its 50th anniversary. Blanchard Springs Caverns—BSC—opened to the public in 1973 after decades of underground exploration and development to share this natural wonder with the community and the entire world.

Blanchard Springs Caverns is the second-largest commercial cave in the country and is often described as one of the most beautiful. This is, in part, thanks to U.S. Forest Service—USFS—employees, community advocates, and outdoor enthusiasts who ensure they are maintained in their natural state—helping Arkansas live up to its own proud title as a home of spectacular outdoor elements and resources.

Although the first documented visit to the cave system was in 1934 by Civilian Conservation Corps planner Willard Hadley, its name is derived from the nearby spring that formed it and had been used by John H. Blanchard, a Civil War veteran who called the area home, to power a gristmill.

The Dripline Trail Tour was the first to launch for recreational use, and as time went on, two other tours, the Discovery Trail and the Wild Cave, opened as well. BSC is referred to as a “living” or “active” cave, as it is constantly changing. The caverns include an underground river, delicate “soda straw” formations, stalactites, stalagmites, columns, and huge areas of flowstone. Along with the unique formations, it is also home to a number of species of cave animals. The USFS has demonstrated its commitment to ensuring preservation and conservation of the habitats including the Ozark blind salamander native to BSC. In addition to what is happening underground, there is also the amazing landscape of the Ozark National Forest. As people from all across the globe are attracted to the area for its splendor, they are driving the local economy. This popular destination helps support area businesses, spurring critical development and commerce.

I am pleased to recognize all those helping to maintain Blanchard Springs Caverns over the last five decades. This natural wonder is accessible and engaging because of their dedication to preserving it for all Arkansans and visitors to enjoy. •

REMEMBERING JOE A. GARCIA

• Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, across more than five decades in public service, Governor Joe A. Garcia of Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo was a leader

among leaders, for his community and all of Indian Country. He was also a dear friend and close mentor. In so many ways, New Mexico will not be the same without him.

Governor Garcia was a three-time Governor of Ohkay Owingeh Pueblo, where he oversaw the Self Governance Initiative, under which the Pueblo now runs all of its Bureau of Indian Affairs programs. He was serving as the Pueblo's Head Councilman at the time of his death.

Governor Garcia served for two terms as the president of the National Congress of American Indians, the oldest and largest American Indian and Alaska Native organization serving sovereign Tribal Nations. He also served as the vice president of the Board of Trustees of the Santa Fe Indian School and as the chairman of the All Indian Pueblo Council—now named the All Pueblo Council of Governors—which represents 20 Pueblos located in New Mexico and Texas.

In addition, Governor Garcia was a member of the Tribal Leaders Task Force, where he served as cochair for 3 years for the Federal Communications Commission. He was also a cochair of the Tribal Technical Advisory Committee for the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration—SAMHSA—and cochair of the Tribal Transportation Self Governance Program Negotiated Rulemaking Team.

As a young man, Governor Garcia served in the U.S. Air Force. After his military service, he earned a bachelor of science in electrical engineering from the University of New Mexico. Governor Garcia worked on the technical staff at Los Alamos National Laboratory for 25 years, working on electronics design and development for data acquisition systems. He also taught courses in computers, electronics, lasers, and math at the Northern New Mexico College from 1979 to 1983.

Governor Garcia fought to advance the mission of Tribal sovereignty over education through his leadership at the Santa Fe Indian School—SFIS. The SFIS became the first former Federal Indian boarding school where a Tribal organization—the All Indian Pueblo Council—contracted for the education of their children.

Since the signing of the Santa Fe Indian School Act in 2000, the Pueblo Governors have held the school's land in trust and established an educational program based on the right and responsibility to educate New Mexico Indian children in a way that supports their cultural and traditional belief system. Governor Garcia championed both increased funding and support for SFIS and the establishment of Tribally controlled educational systems across Indian Country.

On a personal note, I was fortunate to be among the many who learned from Governor Garcia—his wise counsel and advice and the example he set

for all of us to follow. I will never forget sitting down with him years ago when he first encouraged me to run for the U.S. Senate to represent our great State. My thoughts are with his wife, Oneva, his daughters Melissa and MorningStar, his six grandchildren, two great-grandchildren, and all those in Ohkay Owingeh, New Mexico, and Indian Country who knew and loved him.

The legacy that Governor Garcia built over decades of steadfast advocacy for Tribal sovereignty, educational sovereignty, and the cultural preservation of Pueblo communities will be felt for generations to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KURT NEWMAN, M.D.

● Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I rise today to honor the career of Kurt Newman, M.D., president and chief executive officer of Children's National Hospital on the occasion of his retirement. For nearly four decades, Dr. Kurt Newman has made outstanding contributions to pediatric healthcare for children and families in Maryland, the greater DC metropolitan region, nationally, and internationally.

Dr. Newman joined Children's National Hospital as a surgical fellow in 1984 and became surgeon-in-chief and senior vice president for Joseph E. Robert, Jr. Center for Surgical Care in 2003. Inspired by the bold vision of making surgery for children minimally invasive and pain-free, Dr. Newman was instrumental in developing the vision for the Sheikh Zayed Institute for Pediatric Surgical Innovation at Children's National where he served as founding vice president in 2009.

In 2011, Dr. Newman became president and chief executive officer of Children's National Hospital, a 323-bed pediatric acute care hospital. Under his exemplary leadership, Children's National has risen in the ranks of U.S. News & World Report to be consistently ranked among the very best children's hospitals in the Nation. Under Dr. Newman's leadership, Children's National led the critical COVID-19 response by opening one of the Nation's first drive-thru and walk-up COVID testing center for children, offering a critical resource for children in the region and beyond.

Through a culture of patient-centered care, Dr. Newman has championed innovation in research, operations, and clinical care. He has strengthened and diversified the economy of the region by growing pediatric medical research at Children's National and the high-wage jobs that support that field by turning Children's National into one of the top-funded pediatric institutions in terms of National Institutes of Health funding. Additionally, Dr. Newman has worked tirelessly to draw more funding and attention to the youth mental health crisis through robust advocacy efforts.

As the majority of Children's National Hospital's patient population

hails from Maryland, Dr. Newman has continuously expanded care into our State, including the opening of Children's National Prince George's County on July 23, 2020. This facility, among more than 20 care locations throughout the State, makes it easier for Maryland patients and families to receive high-quality care. I want to personally thank Dr. Newman for keeping members of Congress, especially those of us in the Washington, DC, metropolitan area, informed about critical healthcare needs in our region and throughout the country.

Children's National and its many supporters will celebrate Dr. Newman on his retirement on June 30, 2023, and Children's National will continue to build upon his legacy to provide high-quality pediatric healthcare across the Washington, DC, metropolitan region.

As a nationally recognized leader in pediatric health, I commend Dr. Kurt Newman for his exemplary leadership and dedication to Children's National over nearly four decades. I congratulate him and wish him a well-earned, enjoyable, and fulfilling retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO LEAH BRENGLE

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Leah Brengle, an intern in my Rapid City, SD, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Leah is a graduate of Sturgis Brown High School in Sturgis, SD. Currently, she is attending South Dakota State University in Brookings, SD, where she is pursuing a degree in criminology. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

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

TRIBUTE TO NOAH GREBLE

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Noah Greble, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Noah is a graduate of O'Gorman High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending Augustana University in Sioux Falls, SD, where he is pursuing degrees in government and marketing. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Noah for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KEELY LARSON

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Keely Larson, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of

the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Keely is a graduate of Harrisburg High School in Harrisburg, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of Arizona in Tucson, AZ, where she is pursuing a degree in philosophy, politics, economics, and law. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

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

TRIBUTE TO TAYLOR NEELY

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Taylor Neely, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Taylor is a graduate of O'Gorman High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of Nebraska-Lincoln in Lincoln, NE, where she is pursuing a degree in nutrition, exercise, and health sciences. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

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

TRIBUTE TO NATALIA STYS

● Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Natalia Stys, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Natalia is a graduate of Creighton University in Omaha, NE, having earned a degree in psychology. Currently, she is pursuing a law degree at the University of South Dakota Knudson School of Law in Vermillion, SD. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:52 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 bill, without amendment:

S. 30. An act to authorize major medical facility projects for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2023, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1606. An act to amend the Small Business Act to codify the Boots to Business Program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3672. An act to designate the clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Indian River, Michigan, as the "Pfc. Justin T. Paton Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic".

The message further announced that pursuant to section 20 U.S.C. 2103(b), and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following individual to the Board of Trustees of the American Folklife Center in the Library of Congress on the part of the House of Representatives for a term of 6 years: Mrs. Heather Obernolte of Big Bear Lake, California.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276d and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group: Mr. Huizenga of Michigan, Chair, Mr. Bergman of Michigan, Mr. Stauber of Minnesota, Mr. Tenney of New York, Mr. Finstad of Minnesota, and Mr. Langworthy of New York.

The message further announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group: Mr. McCaul of Texas, Chair, Mr. Valadao of California, Mr. Gimenez of Florida, Mr. Ciscomani of Arizona, and Ms. De La Cruz of Texas.

The message also announced that pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276l, and the order of the House of January 9, 2023, the Speaker appoints the following Members on the part of the House of Representatives to the British-American Interparliamentary Group: Mr. Latta of Ohio, Chair, Mr. Aderholt of Alabama, Mr. Cole of Oklahoma, Mr. Meuser of Pennsylvania, Mr. Smucker of Pennsylvania, Mrs. Kim of California, and Mr. Kean of New Jersey.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 7:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 30. An act to authorize major medical facility projects for the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2023, 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. 1606. An act to amend the Small Business Act to codify the Boots to Business Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

H.R. 3672. An act to designate the clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Indian River, Michigan, as the "Pfc. Justin T. Paton Department of Veterans Affairs Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 277. An act to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

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-1538. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-1539. A communication from the Security Officer II of the Office of Senate Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report regarding fiscal year 2022 Annual Nuclear Weapons Stockpile Assessments (OSS-2023-0589); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1540. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1541. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1542. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-1543. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a legislative proposal to establish the Secretary of Energy's authority to set increased pay pursuant to the Department's EJ pay plan authority and to update related obsolete text; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-1544. A communication from the Branch Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Guidance Relating to the Employee Plans Compliance Resolution System" (Notice 2023-43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2023; to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Leonard F. Anderson IV, to be Lieutenant General.

*Marine Corps nomination of Gen. Eric M. Smith, to be General.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. Kaine, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 5. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of sex, gender identity, and sexual orientation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2062. A bill to prohibit United States contributions to international organizations that advocate for sexual activity by persons who are younger than the domestically prescribed minimum age of consent; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 2063. A bill to authorize the payment of a travel or transportation allowance for a member of the uniformed services to travel to obtain professional development training only if such training relates to the military occupational specialty of the member and not to the sex, sexual orientation, race, or religion of the member; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 2064. A bill to ensure that Foreign Service officers are evaluated and given opportunities for advancement based on their conformance to merit system principles, to require the review of Performance Improvement Plans during tenure and promotion appraisals of Foreign Service officers, and to eliminate the requirement for the inclusion of a public member on selection boards; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. 2065. A bill to authorize a study on educator workforce data to advance teaching and learning and a program to support increasing access to well-prepared and diverse

educators; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 2066. A bill to amend the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 to authorize rewards under the Department of State's rewards program relating to information regarding individuals or entities engaged in activities in contravention of United States or United Nations sanctions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2067. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to non-profit organizations to assist such organizations in carrying out programs to provide service dogs to eligible veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 2068. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to allow for the registration of venture exchanges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and Mr. CRAMER):

S. 2069. A bill to require the review by the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States of greenfield investments by the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 2070. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from replacing physician anesthesiologists with certified registered nurse anesthetists under the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 2071. A bill to amend section 11101 of title 49, United States Code, to ensure that rail carriers provide transportation or service in a manner that fulfills the shipper's reasonable service requirements; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. 2072. A bill to establish a pilot program to provide mental health check-ups for students at schools operated by the Department of Defense Education Activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. LANFORD):

S. 2073. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require agencies to include a list of outdated or duplicative reporting requirements in annual budget justifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2074. A bill to maintain the free flow of information to the public by establishing appropriate limits on the federally compelled disclosure of information obtained as part of engaging in journalism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FETTERMAN:

S. 2075. A bill to amend the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act to modify the Safe Streets and Roads for All program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 2076. A bill to adjust the definition of service in the uniformed services with re-

spect to readmission requirements for servicemembers under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2077. A bill to amend the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to ensure that producers who rely on acequia systems have access to drought protections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

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

S. 2078. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to take actions necessary to ensure that certain individuals may update the burn pit registry with the cause of death of a registered individual, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 2079. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require the label of a drug intended for human use to identify each ingredient in such drug that is, or is derived directly or indirectly from, a major food allergen or a gluten-containing grain, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 2080. A bill to reauthorize and improve the pilot program to support State medical stockpiles, to ensure that State, local, Tribal, and territorial public health departments or officials are consulted by the Public Health Emergency Medical Countermeasures Enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 2081. A bill to amend section 485 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require venue-specific heat illness emergency action plans for any institution of higher education that is a member of an athletic association or athletic conference, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEE, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. WELCH, Mr. RICKETTS, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2082. A bill to make technical corrections relating to the Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 2083. A bill to direct the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment to submit to Congress a report on incinerators and waste-to-energy waste disposal alternatives to burn pits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

S. 2084. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to establish an outreach program to inform members of the Armed Forces assigned to work near burn pits of the risks of toxic exposure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2085. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multi-cancer early detection screening tests; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2086. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to establish the Sea Turtle Rescue Assistance Grant Program; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 2087. A bill to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. THUNE):

S. 2088. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to complete all actions necessary for certain land to be held in restricted fee status by the Oglala Sioux Tribe and Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mrs. BRITT):

S. 2089. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to prohibit the Administrator of General Services from constructing or acquiring public buildings or entering into leases based on the legality or availability of abortion, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 2090. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to prevent the elimination of the sale of motor vehicles with internal combustion engines; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2091. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to increase penalties for individuals who illegally reenter the United States after being removed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. LANFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. BUDD):

S. 2092. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a child tax credit for pregnant moms with respect to their unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2093. A bill to establish a program at BARDA for developing medical countermeasures for viral threats with pandemic potential; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 2094. A bill to reauthorize the Interagency Committee on Women's Business Enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2095. A bill to authorize the Federal Communications Commission to enforce its own forfeiture penalties with respect to violations of restrictions on the use of telephone equipment; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 2096. A bill to enhance the eligibility of India for Foreign Military Sales and exports

under the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 2097. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to improve a program that provides livestock disaster assistance, and for other programs; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 2098. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a military training program with the Government of Mexico in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2099. A bill to establish an Office of Community Financial Institutions within the Small Business Administration that will strengthen the ability of Community Financial Institutions to support the development of small business concerns in underserved communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2100. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to modify fees and funding for certain small business refinancing loans and loans to qualified State or local development companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. LEE, and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 2101. A bill to provide for an earlier effective date for the requirement of Senate confirmation of the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2102. A bill to provide for drought preparedness and improved water supply reliability; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KAINE:

S.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution redesignating the Robert E. Lee Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery as the "Arlington House National Historic Site"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 259. A resolution recognizing the importance of United States-India relations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COONS):

S. Res. 260. A resolution recognizing Tunisia's leadership in the Arab Spring and expressing support for upholding its democratic principles and norms; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. Res. 261. A resolution commending and congratulating the Vegas Golden Knights on winning the 2023 Stanley Cup Final; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. Res. 262. A resolution authorizing the printing of a collection of the rules of the

committees of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. Res. 263. A resolution commemorating June 19, 2023, as "Juneteenth National Independence Day" in recognition of June 19, 1865, the date on which news of the end of slavery reached the slaves in the Southwestern States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CASIDY):

S. Res. 264. A resolution designating June 2023 as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month" and June 27, 2023, as "National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to extend the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 134

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

S. 140

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 140, a bill to combat organized crime involving the illegal acquisition of retail goods for the purpose of selling those illegally obtained goods through physical and online retail marketplaces.

S. 412

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 412, a bill to provide that it is unlawful to knowingly distribute private intimate visual depictions with reckless disregard for the individual's lack of consent to the distribution, and for other purposes.

S. 414

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Washington

(Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 414, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve and to expand eligibility for dependency and indemnity compensation paid to certain survivors of certain veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 626

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 626, a bill to recommend that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation test the effect of a dementia care management model, and for other purposes.

S. 672

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 672, a bill to enable the payment of certain officers and employees of the United States whose employment is authorized pursuant to a grant of deferred action, deferred enforced departure, or temporary protected status.

S. 806

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 806, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish a grant program to assist with the purchase, installation, and maintenance of point-of-entry and point-of-use drinking water quality improvement products, and for other purposes.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 838

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 838, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to mental health services under the Medicare program.

S. 985

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

S. 1036

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1036, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to streamline nutrition access for older adults and adults with disabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1091

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 1091, a bill to provide for automatic renewal protections, and for other purposes.

S. 1189

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1189, a bill to establish a pilot grant program to improve recycling accessibility, and for other purposes.

S. 1201

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1201, a bill to reform the labor laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1266

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1266, a bill to amend titles 10 and 38, United States Code, to improve benefits and services for surviving spouses, and for other purposes.

S. 1271

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1271, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to trafficking of illicit fentanyl and its precursors by transnational criminal organizations, including cartels, and for other purposes.

S. 1318

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1318, a bill to provide enhanced protections for election workers.

S. 1349

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1349, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 1387

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1387, a bill to reauthorize the Project Safe Neighborhoods Grant Program Authorization Act of 2018, and for other purposes.

S. 1424

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1424, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to improve health care coverage under vision and dental plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1457

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Nebraska

(Mr. RICKETTS), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1457, a bill to authorize negotiation and conclusion and to provide for congressional consideration of a tax agreement between the American Institute in Taiwan (AIT) and the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office (TECRO).

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1457, *supra*.

S. 1465

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1465, a bill to establish the Baltic Security Initiative for the purpose of strengthening the defensive capabilities of the Baltic countries, and for other purposes.

S. 1529

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1529, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide for greater protection of roosters, and for other purposes.

S. 1573

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1573, a bill to reauthorize the Prematurity Research Expansion and Education for Mothers who deliver Infants Early Act.

S. 1595

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1595, a bill to prohibit taxpayer-funded gender transition procedures, and for other purposes.

S. 1743

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1743, a bill to amend the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act of 1978 to modify the forest inventory and analysis program.

S. 1829

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1829, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons engaged in the import of petroleum from the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 1837

At the request of Mr. FETTERMAN, the names of the Senator from Maryland

(Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1837, a bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to include spotted lanternfly control research and development as a high-priority research and extension initiative, and for other purposes.

S. 1839

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1839, a bill to improve Federal population surveys by requiring the collection of voluntary, self-disclosed information on sexual orientation, gender identity, and variations in sex characteristics in certain surveys, and for other purposes.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1856, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to improve the administration of antidumping and countervailing duty laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1885

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1885, a bill to eliminate employment-based visa caps on abused, abandoned, and neglected children eligible for humanitarian status, and for other purposes.

S. 1905

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1905, a bill to expand the categories of forfeited property available to remediate harms to Ukraine from Russian aggression, and for other purposes.

S. 1916

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1916, a bill to establish in the Department of State the Office to Monitor and Combat Islamophobia, and for other purposes.

S. 1933

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) were added as cosponsors of S. 1933, a bill to enhance flight options for consumers flying to and from Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport.

S. 1963

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1963, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to ensure College for All.

S. 1985

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator

from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1985, a bill to prohibit the flying, draping, or other display of any flag other than the flag of the United States at public buildings, and for other purposes.

S. 1999

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1999, a bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

S. 2019

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2019, a bill to prevent States and local jurisdictions from interfering with the production and distribution of agricultural products in interstate commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 2025

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2025, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to prohibit the provision of any foreign assistance for state sponsors of terrorism.

S. 2029

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2029, a bill to appropriate amounts to carry out the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act.

S. 2053

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2053, a bill to protect freedom of travel and reproductive rights.

S.J. RES. 25

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

S.J. RES. 31

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 31, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Federal 'Good Neighbor Plan' for the 2015 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards".

S. RES. 20

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 20, a resolution condemning the coup that took place on February 1, 2021, in Burma and the Burmese military's detention of civilian leaders, calling for an immediate and unconditional release of all those detained, promoting accountability and justice for those killed by the Burmese military, and calling for those elected to serve in parliament to resume their duties without impediment, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 75

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 75, a resolution reaffirming the state of Arunachal Pradesh as Indian territory and condemning the People's Republic of China's provocations in South Asia.

S. RES. 106

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 106, a resolution condemning Beijing's destruction of Hong Kong's democracy and rule of law.

S. RES. 258

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 258, a resolution reaffirming the importance of the United States promoting the safety, health, and well-being of refugees and displaced persons in the United States and around the world.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA:

S. 2072. A bill to establish a pilot program to provide mental health checkups for students at schools operated by the Department of Defense Education Activity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise to introduce the Supporting Mental Health for Military Children Act. This legislation would establish a routine mental-health and well-being checkup pilot program in Department of Defense Education Activity, DODEA, Schools.

In response to the growing youth mental health crisis in America, this bill would establish a biannual mental health screening program to ensure students have the resources they need to support their mental health, combat the stigmatization of seeking help, and promote healthy lifestyles.

Our Nation's young people are facing an unprecedented mental health crisis. An estimated 49.5 percent of American adolescents have had a mental health disorder at some point in their lives, with 50 percent of all lifetime mental illnesses beginning by age 14; 75 per-

cent by age 24. This state of affairs was only worsened by the pandemic.

While these numbers are already staggering, military children are at even greater risk of mental/behavioral health problems than the general population given their unique vulnerability to adverse childhood experiences. As such, early screening and treatment are essential to decreasing the risk of suicide and improving management of/recovery from mental health conditions amongst this vulnerable segment of youth.

The evidence is clear: Ubiquitous mental health screening and education protocols, offered by 55 percent of U.S. public schools in 2019 to 2022, are well-tested, relatively low-resource, and high-impact ways to swiftly diagnose and treat mental health conditions amongst youth.

I would like to thank Congressman MOULTON for his leadership and efforts on the House side. I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact the Supporting Mental Health for Military Children Act as quickly as possible.

By Mr. KAINE:

S.J. Res. 35. A joint resolution redesignating the Robert E. Lee Memorial in Arlington National Cemetery as the "Arlington House National Historic Site"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, today, I am introducing legislation to remove "Robert E. Lee Memorial" from the official name of Arlington House.

This legislation is partially inspired by requests from descendants of General Robert E. Lee and people who were enslaved at Arlington House. This is an effort to promote a society that is more just and equitable for all, regardless of race, by moving on from a public symbol that honors a figure that fought to protect slavery.

Arlington House is the first name of the historic mansion, which sits on Federal land within Arlington National Cemetery. The property is administered by the National Park Service and overlooks the Potomac River and the Nation's Capital. The house was built by Martha Custis Washington's grandson, George Washington Parke Custis, as the Nation's first memorial to George Washington. Later, his daughter married Robert E. Lee and the couple lived in the home until the Civil War, when Federal forces occupied the house and surrounding property. During that period, the site was chosen to serve as a national military cemetery in part to prevent Lee from returning.

Only in the 20th century, in 1955 and again in 1972, did Congress add the commemorative text honoring Robert E. Lee to the site's formal name in Federal statute. This was part of a retrograde effort across the former Confederacy to bestow public recognition on prominent Confederate figures as heroes while minimizing or whitewashing their roles in taking up arms

against the United States to preserve slavery. As Senator from the State that has among the most difficult histories when it comes to slavery, civil rights, and Confederate monuments, I believe these symbolic proposals matter, that the Federal Government should reserve honorifics for individuals whose lives advanced American values and ideals, not detracted from them.

Today, the National Park Service is dedicated to telling the story of those who were enslaved at the Arlington House. I am hopeful that this name change will help to do just a little bit more to encapsulate the full history of the site, which included the presence of many families and generations throughout history, such as the Syphax, Burke, Parks, and Gray families.

I am pleased that companion legislation is also being introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by my colleague, Representative DON BEYER, who has led this effort for years.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 259—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF UNITED STATES-INDIA RELATIONS

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 259

Whereas the Republic of India achieved its independence on August 15, 1947, and is celebrating 75 years of its independence;

Whereas the United States-India Comprehensive Global Strategic Partnership is critical for regional and global prosperity;

Whereas, according to United Nations population estimates, India will become the most populous country in the world in 2023, with an estimated population of more than 1,425,000,000 people;

Whereas strong people-to-people and educational exchanges between the United States and the Republic of India cement our nations' ties and serve as the foundation for deeper cooperation;

Whereas students from the Republic of India comprise nearly 20 percent of all international students studying in the United States, that this community is expected to soon become the largest foreign student community in the United States, and in 2022, the United States Mission in India issued more than 82,000 Indian student visas, a record-breaking amount;

Whereas, according to International Monetary Fund data, India is the fifth largest economy in the world;

Whereas the furthering of trade and investment between the United States and the Republic of India, two of the world's largest economies, is in the interest of both countries as well as the broader global economy;

Whereas the United States became India's largest trading partner in 2022, with bilateral goods and services trade almost doubling since 2014, and exceeding \$191,000,000,000 in 2022;

Whereas the Republic of India hosted the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework for Pros-

perity (IPEF) negotiating round in February 2023;

Whereas the United States designated India as a Major Defense Partner in 2016, and a strong United States-India defense partnership is critical for United States and Indian interests in the Indo-Pacific region;

Whereas military-to-military ties between our two countries have deepened, with both countries undertaking bilateral and multilateral military exercises across air, land, and maritime domains, and are taking steps to strengthen defense industrial base collaboration;

Whereas the Republic of India's G20 presidency reflects its economic rise and demonstrates its commitment to furthering multilateral coordination and progress in the areas of inclusive growth, environmental protection, technology and knowledge-sharing, women-led development, and more;

Whereas the United States and India have coordinated closely in numerous multilateral forums such as the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue ("the Quad"), the I2U2 Group, and the G20, to address issues ranging from energy and food security to space, infrastructure, health, and critical and emerging technologies;

Whereas the United States and India have been partners in advancing global health security, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, during which India assisted other countries, including in the developing world through the deployment of vaccines and medicines;

Whereas there are significant opportunities to work together to develop emerging technologies through private sector and academic and research partnerships to achieve shared energy goals;

Whereas the United States and India announced the Initiative on Critical and Emerging Technology (iCET) in May 2022, as a significant line of partnership to expand defense industrial and technological cooperation, including in areas such as artificial intelligence, quantum and high-performance computing, space, next generation telecommunications, and semiconductor supply chains; and

Whereas the diverse Indian American community, which numbers over 4,000,000 individuals, is critical to the strong people-to-people ties between India and the United States and has made critical contributions to the culture and economy of the United States, and forms one of the strongest bonds linking our two countries together: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the strong and long-standing partnership between the Governments of the United States and the Republic of India, rooted in people to people ties, strategic interests, including upholding peace, security, and prosperity in the Indo-Pacific region;

(2) encourages the United States and India to continue and expand cooperation for a free, open, and resilient Indo-Pacific, including through the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue;

(3) welcomes the Republic of India's participation in economic initiatives, including through bilateral and multilateral forums, its participation in the Quad, and other venues of cooperation;

(4) supports the United States and the Republic of India identifying further opportunities to deepen engagement and further defense, commercial, and investment ties;

(5) affirms the importance of technology cooperation between the United States and India, including through the Initiative on Critical and Emerging Technology;

(6) recognizes the importance of expanding people-to-people programs between the

United States and India, particularly between educational institutions;

(7) appreciates the contributions of Americans of Indian origin, and desires closer relations between the people of the United States and the people of India; and

(8) views the bilateral relationship as holding the potential to bring significant benefit to the citizens of both nations, and to make considerable contributions to addressing the global challenges of the 21st century.

SENATE RESOLUTION 260—RECOGNIZING TUNISIA'S LEADERSHIP IN THE ARAB SPRING AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR UPHOLDING ITS DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES AND NORMS

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. COONS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 260

Whereas Tunisia gained its independence from France on March 20, 1956, with Habib Bourguiba serving as Prime Minister, before becoming Tunisia's first President in 1957;

Whereas President Bourguiba led Tunisia through independence and the ensuing 30 years, a period that included vast social reforms and restrictions on civil society and democratic participation;

Whereas, in 1987, Prime Minister Zine El Abidine Ben Ali deposed President Bourguiba and named himself President of Tunisia, citing Bourguiba's incompetence and failing health to justify his undemocratic actions;

Whereas President Ben Ali was subsequently elected in 1989 and 1994 without genuine opposition, and was re-elected in 1999, 2004, and 2009 by implausibly high vote margins in election processes that were widely deemed as neither free nor fair;

Whereas President Ben Ali's rule was marred by gross human rights violations and a lack of democratic freedoms;

Whereas, the 2003 Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, released by the Department of State on February 25, 2004, stated, referring to Tunisia—

(1) "Elections are regularly characterized by notable irregularities, including voter intimidation, and there is no secret ballot.";

(2) "Security forces physically abused, intimidated, and harassed citizens who voiced public criticism of the Government.";

(3) "The Government continued to impose significant restrictions on freedom of speech and the press."; and

(4) "The Government remained intolerant of public criticism and used physical abuse, criminal investigations, the court system, arbitrary arrests, residential restrictions, and travel controls (including denial of passports) to discourage criticism by human rights and opposition activists.";

Whereas, on December 17, 2010, 26-year-old fruit and vegetable street vendor Mohamed Bouazizi lit himself on fire in desperate protest in Sidi Bouzid, Tunisia, an act that was largely seen as the beginning of the Arab Spring movement that spread throughout the region;

Whereas ensuing popular protests in Tunisia in response to corruption, repression, and economic failure—

(1) forced the resignation of President Ben Ali from the office of president;

(2) ended his 23-year rule; and

(3) further inspired similar pent up democratic demands throughout the Arab world;

Whereas Tunisia emerged from the Arab Spring as one of the most hopeful and promising reformed democracies in the region, including with an interim government and a

Constituent Assembly responsible for drafting a new constitution and fostering political compromise for a future democratic government;

Whereas, in February 2011, Senator John McCain urged United States support for Tunisia's democratic transition, noting "The revolution in Tunisia has been very successful and it has become a model for the region.";

Whereas, in March 2011, United Nations Secretary General Ban Ki-moon pledged full support for Tunisia's transition to democracy, hailing the country's revolution as the spark that lit "the profound and dramatic changes" sweeping the Arab world;

Whereas, on January 26, 2014, the Constituent Assembly of Tunisia adopted a new constitution demonstrating consensus for building a democracy founded on freedom and equality;

Whereas the new constitution of Tunisia includes Articles that—

- (1) give equal rights to men and women;
- (2) protection freedoms of assembly, peaceful demonstration, expression, and publication; and
- (3) outline an electoral system and representation for the Tunisian people with checks and balances;

Whereas, in November 2014, Tunisia held its first genuinely free and fair presidential election since its independence in 1956, with 27 candidates freely competing for the office of president;

Whereas longtime politician Beji Caïd Essebsi won the election in a runoff with 55 percent of the vote, becoming Tunisia's first legitimately elected president since independence;

Whereas President Essebsi faced many difficult challenges, including economic turmoil, terrorist attacks, and public expectations for change;

Whereas public disillusionment with the country's political elites increased amid continued corruption and devastating acts of terrorism that severely hurt the tourism industry and larger economy;

Whereas political outsider and constitutional law professor Kais Saïed won the presidential election held on October 13, 2019, and was sworn into office 10 days later in a peaceful transfer of power;

Whereas, by 2021, protests in response to worsening economic conditions, further exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, occurred across cities in Tunisia, to which the police responded violently;

Whereas, in July 2021, President Saïed capitalized on unrest to unilaterally seize power by—

- (1) dismissing Prime Minister Hichem Mechichi;
- (2) suspending Parliament for 30 days; and
- (3) assuming full executive authority without first consulting the government;

Whereas in late 2021, President Saïed indefinitely suspended Parliament and transferred all legislative powers to himself;

Whereas, in early 2022, President Saïed continued to undermine Tunisia's democratic institutions, including by taking control of the Independent High Authority for Elections and dissolving the High Judicial Council;

Whereas, in July 2022, President Saïed unilaterally put to a referendum a new draft constitution, which—

- (1) consolidated power to the presidency;
- (2) limited parliamentary authority; and
- (3) diminished judicial independence;

Whereas the new draft constitution was approved despite remarkably low voter turnout and heavy domestic and international criticism surrounding the lack of genuine debate throughout the drafting process;

Whereas, between 2021 to 2023, Tunisia experienced—

(1) a dramatic drop in voter participation and public confidence in the political process; and

(2) an escalation in politically motivated arrests of political opponents, judges, lawyers, journalists, and business leaders; and

Whereas President Saïed's actions have dramatically undermined and threatened Tunisia's nascent democratic institutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes Tunisia as the symbolic birthplace of the historic Arab Spring movement and the country's notable democratic reforms that emerged during the Arab Spring period;

(2) commends the Tunisian people for their courage and democratic achievements made in the immediate years following the Arab Spring;

(3) expresses deep concern for more recent reversals of such democratic gains, including—

- (A) the erosion of judicial independence;
- (B) political repression and arrests; and
- (C) the undemocratic consolidation of power;

(4) urges the Government of Tunisia—

- (A) to release all political prisoners; and
- (B) to respect the rights of the people to free exercise of peaceful assembly, expression, and the press; and

(5) calls on the Government of Tunisia to support a transparent and open 2024 presidential election process.

SENATE RESOLUTION 261—COM-MENDING AND CONGRATU-LATING THE VEGAS GOLDEN KNIGHTS ON WINNING THE 2023 STANLEY CUP FINAL

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself and Ms. ROSEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 261

Whereas, on June 13, 2023, the Vegas Golden Knights won the 2023 National Hockey League (referred to in this preamble as the "NHL") Stanley Cup Final;

Whereas the 2023 Stanley Cup Final is the first Stanley Cup Final won by the Vegas Golden Knights in the 6 years in which the franchise has competed in the NHL;

Whereas, on their way to winning the 2023 Stanley Cup Final, the Vegas Golden Knights defeated—

- (1) the Winnipeg Jets in the first round of the playoffs;
- (2) the Edmonton Oilers in the second round of the playoffs;
- (3) the Dallas Stars in the Western Conference Finals to win the Clarence S. Campbell Bowl; and
- (4) the Florida Panthers in the Stanley Cup Final;

Whereas, during the 2022-2023 NHL Season, the Vegas Golden Knights—

(1) won a franchise record 51 games during the regular season and set a new team record with 111 points scored to clinch their third Pacific Division Championship; and

(2) had Head Coach Bruce Cassidy and 2 All-Stars, Logan Thompson and Chandler Stephenson, represent the franchise at the 2023 NHL All-Star Game in Sunrise, Florida;

Whereas, during the 2023 Stanley Cup Playoffs—

(1) Adin Hill of the Vegas Golden Knights set a NHL Playoff record by achieving 11 wins in a single postseason after making his debut in the second round; and

(2) Jonathan Marchessault of the Vegas Golden Knights won the 2023 Conn Smythe Trophy, which is awarded to the most valuable player in the Stanley Cup Playoffs;

Whereas the entire Vegas Golden Knights roster contributed to the 2023 Stanley Cup victory: Mark Stone, Alex Pietrangolo, Reilly Smith, Adin Hill, Michael Amadio, Ivan Barbashev, Teddy Blueger, William Carrier, Paul Cotter, Jack Eichel, Brett Howden, William Karlsson, Phil Kessel, Keegan Kolesar, Jonathan Marchessault, Nicolas Roy, Chandler Stephenson, Nicolas Hague, Ben Hutton, Alec Martinez, Brayden McNabb, Brayden Pachal, Shea Theodore, Zach Whitecloud, Laurent Brossoit, Jire Patera, Jonathan Quick, and Logan Thompson;

Whereas behind the Vegas Golden Knights roster is a team of coaches and support staff committed to enriching the Las Vegas community on and off the ice;

Whereas the Vegas Golden Knights deserve special recognition for their continued work to provide hope and unity to a grieving Las Vegas community since their inaugural season in 2017-2018, following the Route 91 tragedy that occurred on October 1, 2017; and

Whereas the Vegas Golden Knights represent their loyal fans, the Las Vegas community, and the entire State of Nevada with a commitment to excellence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the Vegas Golden Knights and its loyal fan base for becoming the 2023 National Hockey League Stanley Cup champions; and

(2) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to members of the Vegas Golden Knights' ownership, management, and coaching staff, namely—

(A) the Chairman, Chief Executive Officer, and Governor of the Vegas Golden Knights, Bill Foley;

(B) General Manager Kelly McCrimmon; and

(C) Head Coach Bruce Cassidy.

SENATE RESOLUTION 262—AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF A COLLECTION OF THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mrs. FISCHER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 262

Resolved, That a collection of the rules of the committees of the Senate, together with related materials, be printed as a Senate document, and that there be printed 250 additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Rules and Administration.

SENATE RESOLUTION 263—COM-MEMORATING JUNE 19, 2023, AS "JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY" IN RECOGNITION OF JUNE 19, 1865, THE DATE ON WHICH NEWS OF THE END OF SLAVERY REACHED THE SLAVES IN THE SOUTHWESTERN STATES

Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. KAINE, Mr.

CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. SMITH, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. WELCH, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. COONS, and Mr. HOEVEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 263

Whereas news of the end of slavery did not reach the frontier areas of the United States, in particular the State of Texas and the other Southwestern States, until months after the conclusion of the Civil War, more than 2½ years after President Abraham Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863;

Whereas, on June 19, 1865, Union soldiers, led by Major General Gordon Granger, arrived in Galveston, Texas, with news that the Civil War had ended and the enslaved were free;

Whereas African Americans who had been slaves in the Southwest celebrated June 19, commonly known as “Juneteenth National Independence Day”, as inspiration and encouragement for future generations;

Whereas African Americans from the Southwest have continued the tradition of observing Juneteenth National Independence Day for more than 150 years;

Whereas Juneteenth National Independence Day began as a holiday in the State of Texas and is now a Federal holiday and celebrated by Americans from many walks of life as a special day of observance in recognition of the emancipation of all slaves in the United States;

Whereas Juneteenth National Independence Day celebrations have been held to honor African-American freedom while encouraging self-development and respect for all cultures;

Whereas the faith and strength of character demonstrated by former slaves and the descendants of former slaves remain an example for all people of the United States, regardless of background, religion, or race;

Whereas slavery was not officially abolished until the ratification of the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States in December 1865; and

Whereas, over the course of its history, the United States has grown into a symbol of democracy and freedom around the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates June 19, 2023, as “Juneteenth National Independence Day”;

(2) recognizes the historical significance of Juneteenth National Independence Day to the United States;

(3) supports the continued nationwide celebration of Juneteenth National Independence Day to provide an opportunity for the people of the United States to learn more about the past and to better understand the experiences that have shaped the United States; and

(4) recognizes that the observance of the end of slavery is part of the history and heritage of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 264—DESIGNATING JUNE 2023 AS “NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS MONTH” AND JUNE 27, 2023, AS “NATIONAL POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS AWARENESS DAY”

Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. KAINE, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 264

Whereas the brave men and women of the Armed Forces, who proudly serve the United States—

(1) risk their lives to protect the freedom, health, and welfare of the people of the United States; and

(2) deserve the investment of every possible resource to ensure their lasting physical, mental, and emotional well-being;

Whereas, since the events of September 11, 2001, nearly 2,800,000 members of the Armed Forces have deployed overseas and served in places such as Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the current generation of men and women in the Armed Forces has sustained a high rate of operational deployments, with many members of the Armed Forces serving overseas multiple times, placing those members at high risk of enduring traumatic combat stress;

Whereas, when left untreated, exposure to traumatic combat stress can lead to severe and chronic post-traumatic stress responses, which are commonly referred to as post-traumatic stress disorder or post-traumatic stress injury;

Whereas many men and women of the Armed Forces and veterans who served before September 11, 2001, live with mental health needs from post-traumatic stress and remain at risk for responses to that stress;

Whereas many post-traumatic stress responses remain unreported, undiagnosed, and untreated due to a lack of awareness about post-traumatic stress and the persistent stigma associated with mental health conditions;

Whereas post-traumatic stress significantly increases the risk of post-traumatic stress responses, including anxiety, depression, homelessness, substance abuse, and suicide, especially if left untreated;

Whereas the Secretary of Veterans Affairs reports that—

(1) approximately 20 percent of veterans who served in Operation Iraqi Freedom or Operation Enduring Freedom have post-traumatic stress in a given year;

(2) approximately 12 percent of veterans who served in the Persian Gulf War have post-traumatic stress in a given year; and

(3) approximately 30 percent of veterans who served in the Vietnam era have had post-traumatic stress in their lifetimes;

Whereas public perceptions of post-traumatic stress as a mental health disorder create unique challenges for veterans seeking employment;

Whereas the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, veterans service organizations, and the private and public medical community have made significant advances in the identification, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of post-traumatic stress and the symptoms of post-traumatic stress, but many challenges remain;

Whereas increased understanding of post-traumatic stress can help eliminate stigma

attached to the mental health issues of post-traumatic stress;

Whereas additional efforts are needed to find further ways to eliminate the stigma associated with post-traumatic stress, including—

(1) an examination of how post-traumatic stress is discussed in the United States; and

(2) a recognition that post-traumatic stress is a common injury that is treatable;

Whereas timely and appropriate treatment of post-traumatic stress responses can diminish complications and avert suicides;

Whereas post-traumatic stress—

(1) can result from any number of stressors other than combat, including rape, sexual assault, battery, torture, confinement, child abuse, car accidents, train wrecks, plane crashes, bombings, natural disasters, or global pandemics; and

(2) affects approximately 8,000,000 adults in the United States annually;

Whereas traumatic events such as the COVID-19 pandemic could—

(1) increase the number of individuals impacted by post-traumatic stress; or

(2) exacerbate the responses of post-traumatic stress;

Whereas the diagnosis of post-traumatic stress disorder was first defined by the American Psychiatric Association in 1980 to commonly and more accurately understand and treat survivors of physical and psychological trauma, including veterans who had endured severe traumatic combat stress;

Whereas the word “disorder” can perpetuate the stigma associated with combat stress, so the more general term “post-traumatic stress” is often preferred; and

Whereas the designation of a National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month and a National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day raises public awareness about issues relating to post-traumatic stress, reduces the stigma associated with post-traumatic stress, and helps ensure that individuals suffering from the invisible wounds of war receive proper treatment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates—

(A) June 2023 as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Month”; and

(B) June 27, 2023, as “National Post-Traumatic Stress Awareness Day”;

(2) supports the efforts of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Secretary of Defense, and the entire medical community to educate members of the Armed Forces, veterans, the families of members of the Armed Forces and veterans, and the public about the causes, symptoms, and treatment of post-traumatic stress;

(3) supports efforts by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of Defense to foster—

(A) cultural change around the issue of post-traumatic stress; and

(B) understanding that personal interactions can save lives and advance treatment;

(4) welcomes the efforts of local Vet Centers (as defined in section 1712A(h) of title 38, United States Code) to provide assistance to veterans who are suffering from the effects of post-traumatic stress;

(5) encourages the leadership of the Armed Forces to support appropriate treatment of men and women of the Armed Forces who suffer from post-traumatic stress;

(6) recognizes the impact of post-traumatic stress on the spouses and families of members of the Armed Forces and veterans; and

(7) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit a copy of this resolution to—

(A) the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and

(B) the Secretary of Defense.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I have 16 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 in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 2:30 p.m.

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 Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 9:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 10 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 9 a.m.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 11 a.m.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in open session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 11:15 a.m.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

The Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 10 a.m.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 21, 2023, at 9:30 a.m.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following set of resolutions: S. Res. 261, S. Res. 262, S. Res. 263, and S. Res. 264.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to; the preambles, where applicable, be agreed to; and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions (S. Res. 261, S. Res. 263, and S. Res. 264) were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to. (The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The resolution (S. Res. 262) was agreed to.

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

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF ESCORT COMMITTEE

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Presi-

dent of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Excellency Narendra Modi, Prime Minister of the Republic of India, into the House Chamber for the joint meeting at 4 p.m. on Thursday, June 22, 2023.

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

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 277

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The clerk will read the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 277) to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that major rules of the executive branch shall have no force or effect unless a joint resolution of approval is enacted into law.

Mr. BENNET. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 22, 2023

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 22; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that following the conclusion of morning business, notwithstanding rule XXII, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 100, H.J. Res. 44, and that at 11:45 a.m., the joint resolution be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on passage; further, that following disposition of the joint resolution, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of treaty document 112-8, postcloture, and that at 1:45 p.m., amendment No. 136 be withdrawn, and all time be considered expired.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

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

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:57 p.m., adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JEFFREY PRESCOTT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS AGENCY FOR FOOD AND AGRICULTURE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

CHARLOTTE A. BURROWS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2028. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. JAMES F. PORTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. BETH A. SALISBURY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

ANDREW R. UPDIKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 7064:

To be major

VEGAS V. COLEMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

ERICA L. KANE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS CHAPLAINS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be lieutenant colonel

JOSHUA T. ADE
KEITH L. ADERHOLD
LYDE C. ANDREWS
STEPHAN H. BUCHANAN
JAMES D. DICE
JONATHAN R. FISHER
CHARLES G. GILBERTSON
JONATHAN L. GINDER
CHAN Y. HAM
JOSEPH E. HAMILTON
JASON E. HESSELING
CURTIS E. HULSHIZER
WALLACE A. JACKSON IV
BENJAMIN H. JUNG
BRADLEY D. KATTELMANN
SCOTT G. KENNIS
HERBERT A. LEMKE
SEAN A. LEVINE
KENNETH R. MAY
BRIAN M. MINIETTA
DAVID T. MORRISON
WILLIE J. NEWTON
SAMUEL RICO
ISMAEL O. SERRANO
CHARLES E. SHIELDS, JR.
JOHN F. SMITH
MARK A. SMITH
MICHAEL N. SMITH
DARREN D. TURNER
JARED L. VINEYARD
EVERETT E. ZACHARY

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 716:

To be major

WILLIAM M. SCHWERTZER

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO BE A CONSULAR OFFICER AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

GEORGE A. AYACHE, OF TEXAS
SCOTT A. BENNETT, OF MISSOURI
SYEDA S. BORCHMEYER, OF NEW YORK
THOMAS S. CLEVER, OF TEXAS
ERIN M. COLE, OF IOWA
JA'NEL M. EDENS, OF VIRGINIA
DUREA R. ELMAKI, OF VIRGINIA
SCOT B. GONZALES, OF VIRGINIA
CLINTON L. HARPER, OF VIRGINIA
MATTHEW J. HOKNER, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN P. KIM, OF TEXAS
KERRY F. LEPAIN, OF ALASKA
ANNETTE K. LIPP, OF IDAHO

CARA L. LOFARO, OF MARYLAND
DEBRA K. MARTIN, OF WEST VIRGINIA
JOHN P. MCCADAMS, OF TENNESSEE
JOHN C. MUELLER, OF FLORIDA
SICHAO NI, OF FLORIDA
SARAH E. NICKEL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
LAWRENCE T. OUTLAW, OF LOUISIANA
DAVID A. PASQUINI, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER D. PRIDDY, OF VIRGINIA
AISHA N. SALEM-HOWEY, OF FLORIDA
ROBERT E. SCULLY III, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS A. STRAUSS, OF MISSOURI
HALEY M. SUND, OF CALIFORNIA
DONALD E. TOWNSEND, JR., OF FLORIDA
JUSTIN D. TAPP, OF TENNESSEE
NATHAN C. TRAURIG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MATTHEW T. WESTERBERG, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

SANTIAGO DAVILA, OF CALIFORNIA
FREDERICK HELFRICH, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MELISSA HILL, OF CALIFORNIA
SETH OPPENHEIM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IRWIN ROBERTS, OF NORTH CAROLINA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

ALULA ABERA, OF NEVADA
STEPHANIE L. ALTMAN, OF MARYLAND
ANN BACON, OF OHIO
MUSTANSIR BARMA, OF NEBRASKA
JENNIFER BERGESON-LOCKWOOD, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHAD BERKOWITZ, OF NEW YORK
AMANDA BOACHE, OF MARYLAND
DANIELLE BROOKS, OF TEXAS
JOLISA BROOKS, OF MICHIGAN
JEANNE CHOQUEHUANCA, OF TEXAS
LEA CLAYE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MARYLIN COICOU, OF HAWAII
SARAH COOPER, OF CALIFORNIA
NATHAN CUTLER, OF TEXAS
JACQUELINE SCHUMACHER CUTTEN, OF WASHINGTON
LORI DU TEUILLE, OF CALIFORNIA
DENNIS E. FOSTER, OF TEXAS
BRIAN FRIEDMAN, OF ALASKA
PETER GAUTHIER, OF TEXAS
MARK GRAY, OF WASHINGTON
BERNAN HAGOS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
FRANCIS A. HALL, OF TEXAS
FAYE E. HASELKORN, OF CALIFORNIA
KEISHA HERBERT, OF OHIO
DAVID HOWLETT, OF NEVADA
FARIDA IBRAHIM, OF FLORIDA
HENOCK KEWENDEBELAY, OF COLORADO
PETER KHAEMBA, OF FLORIDA
JOYCE KIM, OF CALIFORNIA
JULIE M. LAMADRID, OF NEW MEXICO
BENJAMIN LAWRENCE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
BRIAN LECUYER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANGELIQUE MAHAL, OF NEW YORK
KAREEM MANSOUR, OF FLORIDA
DAVID MARTZ, OF FLORIDA
MARIELA MEDINA CASTELLANOS, OF CALIFORNIA
TIMOTHY MELVIN, OF FLORIDA
ALINA MENICUCCI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
BRYAN MOODY, OF NEVADA
BRIAN MURPHY, OF FLORIDA
CEARA O'CARROLL, OF WISCONSIN
CORY O'HARA, OF WYOMING
JAZMIA ALLEN OHANYERE, OF CALIFORNIA
KRINA PATEL, OF VIRGINIA
MERON PAULOS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ANDREA PAVLICK, OF PENNSYLVANIA
NATHAN PIPER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DAVID RAWSON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
VANN ROLFSON, OF MARYLAND
KRISTOPHER ROWELL, OF MISSOURI
STEVEN RYNECKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KEVIN SAMPSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
AARON SCHUBERT, OF ALASKA
BRYCE S. SMEDLEY, OF OHIO
NOAH SPRAFKIN, OF NEVADA
SARA SULIMAN, OF FLORIDA
ANDREA SURDU, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHAEL O. TAURAS, OF CALIFORNIA
SUMMER TUCKER, OF MICHIGAN
KION TURNER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
STEPHANIE M. ULLRICH, OF WASHINGTON
PATRICIA A. VIALA, OF VIRGINIA
MEGHAN E. WATERS, OF COLORADO
HOWARD M. WESTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
VANESSA WILKS, OF FLORIDA

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, EFFECTIVE JANUARY 25, 2022:

DALE TASHARSKI, OF VIRGINIA

THE JUDICIARY

NATASHA C. MERLE, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW K. BERKEY AND ENDING WITH BRANDON WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 17, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JACQUELYN P. SMITH, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID B. BARKER AND ENDING WITH JOCELYN M. WHALEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF DANIEL J. WITTMER, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MARINA F. PEREZ, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEPHEN DAVID ALBERT AND ENDING WITH JAMIE TAYLOR ZIMMERMANN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT D. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH NICOLAS H. ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER K. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH RAYMOND P. ZHANG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICHOLAS F. ALIOTTA AND ENDING WITH JASON J. ZUMMO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW D. AHN AND ENDING WITH OYUNCHIMEG YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARAH E. ABEL AND ENDING WITH MICHELLE E. WYCHE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. ALFARO AND ENDING WITH SARA M. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF CANDICE L. PIPES, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL A. GROWDEN AND ENDING WITH HSIENLIANG R. TSENG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF CRAIG A. AMBROSE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF BIBEK JOSHI, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ADRIAN K. WILLIFORD, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL D. COLE AND ENDING WITH EDWARD F. LEONARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KYLE D. AEMISEGGER AND ENDING WITH D017212, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 27, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALLEEN R. CABANADALOGAN AND ENDING WITH JOHN F. UNDERWOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MARCH 27, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HARRY T. AUBIN AND ENDING WITH D016621, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 17, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA A. AKERS AND ENDING WITH SHENICE L. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 17, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALEXANDRA M. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH D016620, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 17, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREA C. BADER AND ENDING WITH PETER S. YOON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 17, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HEATHER R. ALSUMPOTON AND ENDING WITH JUDIZA L. ZELAYA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMIE D. BELL AND ENDING WITH JUSTIN ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 21, 2023:

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RACHEL A. ACCIACCA AND ENDING WITH LAURA E. RIDDLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMILIA M. ADAMSHENDERSON AND ENDING WITH JOHN E. WILSON, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH COREBRIANS A. ABRAHAM AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER R. WILSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AARON CROMBIE AND ENDING WITH LARRY A. WYATT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHARLES E. BANE AND ENDING WITH THOMAS R. TUCKER III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATION OF THOMAS A. SUMMERS, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NICHOLAS J. NORTON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ARTREES R. ADAMS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF WARREN N. WASHINGTON, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JACOB W. CAVENDER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JUSTIN M. FOWLER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JASON P. PANCOE, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN F. IVERSON, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MARK G. KAPPELMANN, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF LEAH H. GEORGIEVA, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF NICHOLAS R. YETMAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KEVIN L. MONTGOMERY, JR., TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID J. BEDDELS AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL D. ZULTAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MOLLY E. KEITH AND ENDING WITH DALLAS D. MCMULLEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STEVEN D. BRYANT AND ENDING WITH D011389, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JOSEPH A. ST PIERRE II, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JEFFREY A. BANKS AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL J. WEINSTEIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ISAAC A. GUTIERREZ, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF RICK J. MATA, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF D016094, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF DUSTIN B. KOSAR, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF STEVEN E. ANDERSON, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRYCE D. ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW A. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EDWARD A. CARLTON AND ENDING WITH GENEVIEVE G. UBINA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREA H. CAMERON AND ENDING WITH WARREN W. TOMLINSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MYLENE R. ARVIZO AND ENDING WITH ASHLEY S. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARAH E. ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH JOHN A. WALSH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CURTIS BROWN AND ENDING WITH GARY M. SHELLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK K. CORBLISS AND ENDING WITH ANTOINE D. THORNTON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HANNAH L. BEALON AND ENDING WITH STANLEY C. WARE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-

PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CAMERON M. BALMA AND ENDING WITH MELINDA K. SCHRYVER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALAN M. BRECHBILL AND ENDING WITH DAVID J. TEBBE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROSS M. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH ROGER D. HORNE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH HOMER F. HENSY AND ENDING WITH GREGORY F. NOTARO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TOMMIE G. CRAWFORD AND ENDING WITH SHANNON P. THOMPSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN E. FAGE AND ENDING WITH REBECCA L. REBARICH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GAVIN H. CLOUGH AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW G. ZUBLIC, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER J. LANDRY AND ENDING WITH JONATHAN A. SAVAGE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRADLEY H. ABRAMOWITZ AND ENDING WITH CHELSEY L. ZWICKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 25, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC J. ADLER AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW A. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LUCAS R. ARGOBRIGHT AND ENDING WITH SARAH E. TURSE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF PATRICK C. LAZZARETTI, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT A. PAYNTER, JR. AND ENDING WITH TODD C. WINN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH STANLEY J. BENES IV AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL SULLIVAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JAMES P. MCDONNELL AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH E. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DONNA M. CHUBA, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ANTON B. ALLEN, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADAM M. CLAMPITT AND ENDING WITH GUSTAVO PEREZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER P. COOK AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW E. HOBBS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DEMETRIO A. CAMUA III AND ENDING WITH ARTHUR C. FONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF LOREN C. HOELSCHER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW T. CHATIGNY AND ENDING WITH KEVIN C. LIEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA C. GETTLE AND ENDING WITH GERARDO TORRES, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN J. BRIDGES AND ENDING WITH MARK H. OVERSTREET, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 4, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RYAN H. METZLER, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DENNIS L. AVERY AND ENDING WITH BRIAN D. WUESTEWALD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KRISTIANNOE C. CAINDOY AND ENDING WITH DIMITRY P. VINCENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW D. GLEASON AND ENDING WITH EMILY Y. ROYSE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 15, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JACOB S. THARP, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER E. BARNES AND ENDING WITH CHADWICK Y. YASUDA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KENRIC T. ABAN AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY C. WORTHLEY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL R. ANDERSEN AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DOMINIC J. ANTENUCCI AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER C. SWAIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM H. ABBITT AND ENDING WITH THOMAS W. ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOSHUA M. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH ALEXANDER G. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID L. AGUILAR AND ENDING WITH DANIEL J. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SEAN A. BROPHY AND ENDING WITH JESUS A. URANGA, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANCIS G. COYLE AND ENDING WITH DANIEL A. TANTILLO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH REBECCA L. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH JOHN L. VINCENT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICK AVILA AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL P. WOLCHKO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL K. BEALL AND ENDING WITH ALANNA B. YOUNGBLOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FORREST N. BUSH AND ENDING WITH NATHAN J. RICHARDSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT B. AARON AND ENDING WITH CLINTON M. WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JESSICA L. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH CRYSTAL R. WARRENE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SUZANNE T. ALFORD AND ENDING WITH ERIC R. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICHOLAS D. CHIUDIONI AND ENDING WITH JULIAN G. WILSON III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARVIN E. BARTHOLOMEW AND ENDING WITH KIRTLEY N. YEISER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH QUENTIN ALBEA AND ENDING WITH EDWARD E. WEEKLEY, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PAUL M. ALLEN AND ENDING WITH THOMAS H. WILLIAMS, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT P. ADER AND ENDING WITH PHILIP R. SAULNIER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF ERIKA M. MESZAROS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARY R. ANKER AND ENDING WITH BRANDON K. WOLF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID W. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH JOHN C. VANDYKE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHRISTOPHER S. CASNE AND ENDING WITH JUSTIN D. SPINKS, WHICH

NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KEVIN L. BORKERT AND ENDING WITH BLAKE A. WHITTLE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 30, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THEODORE G. CAVOORES, JR. AND ENDING WITH CHRISTY L. ROUSSEAU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREW E. CARMICHAEL AND ENDING WITH DAVID N. STOCK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KIRSTEN M. BETAK AND ENDING WITH SUZANNE J. WOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-

PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SARAH E. DAVIS AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY J. ROCKWOOD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRYAN T. ALVAREZ AND ENDING WITH JENNIFER J. VOGT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RODNEY M. BONNER AND ENDING WITH CHARLES C. THOMPSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JULIE K. MOSS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LUIS E. ALDERMAN II AND ENDING WITH MELINDA S. L. ZALMA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND AP-

PEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TIMOTHY W. GLEASON AND ENDING WITH CORY A. WOODS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

IN THE SPACE FORCE

SPACE FORCE NOMINATION OF ROBIN J. GLEBES, TO BE MAJOR.

SPACE FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LISA T. GREEN AND ENDING WITH KEITH D. VAN DYCK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.

SPACE FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH PHOENIX L. HAUSER AND ENDING WITH DUSTIN L. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 6, 2023.