

The legislation that we passed earlier this week with overwhelming bipartisan support will help ensure that the Postal Service can continue its vital mission, and I am looking forward to seeing President Biden sign it into law.

I am proud of our bipartisan efforts to protect this vital public service, and I would like to take just a few moments to thank the many people who made this possible.

First, I want to recognize my Senate colleague on this effort, Senator ROB PORTMAN, who is the ranking member of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

I am also grateful to Chairwoman MALONEY and Ranking Member COMER on the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, who worked with me hand in hand, as well as with Senator PORTMAN, to write and to build key support for this legislation.

Senator CARPER, who is a former chairman of Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs and a stalwart advocate for the Postal Service, was an absolutely indispensable resource, a critical voice, and we worked together to advance this bill.

I would also like to recognize each of our Senate cosponsors: Senators TILLIS, SINEMA, and BURR, Chairman WYDEN of the Senate Finance Committee, Senators COLLINS, HASSAN, DAINES, ROSEN, CAPITO, PADILLA, SULLIVAN, MANCHIN, HAWLEY, SCHATZ, BLUNT, ROUNDS, SMITH, CRAMER, REED, MURKOWSKI, Chairman SANDERS of the Budget Committee, and Senators HOEVEN, TESTER, MORAN, and KAINE.

Key stakeholders like the Postal Service, our postal employee unions, Postmaster General Louis DeJoy, and the countless members of the public who spoke out about what timely service meant to them also played an essential role in providing technical assistance and building support in passing this legislation.

But none of these vital reforms to protect this longstanding public service would have been possible without the dedicated and tireless work of congressional staff.

First, I would like to recognize my staff on the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, who worked tirelessly to ensure this bill received bipartisan and bicameral support, as well as stakeholder support.

Thank you to Annika Christensen, Lena Chang, and Victoria Pleasant for your determined efforts to craft and build support for this consensus reform.

I would also like to thank Senator PORTMAN's staff, Pam Theissen, Andy Dockham, Amanda Neely, and Renee Sheehy, who all played an important role in crafting and passing these reforms.

On the House Committee on Oversight and Reform, Mark Stephenson and Ethan Van Ness on Chairwoman MALONEY's staff, as well as Christian Hoehner, Jake Greenberg, Daniel Ashworth, and Bill Womack on Rank-

ing Member COMER's staff, provided valuable counsel and expertise on the legislation.

Senate Finance Committee Chairman WYDEN's staff, Eva Dugoff and Sam Conchuratt, and Ranking Member CRAPO's staff, Erin Dempsey, offered vital assistance to ensure the Medicare integration proposal worked effectively.

House Ways and Means Committee staff Kathryn Olson, T.J. Sutcliffe, and Elisa Walker all provided critical technical assistance.

Leader SCHUMER's staff provided vital expertise and guidance throughout the entire process and especially over the past few weeks as we prepared to pass this bill on the floor.

Finally, Jackie Maffucci from Senator CARPER's office and Erin Bursch and Erin Schulte from Senator SINEMA's office spent countless hours helping to craft and secure robust support for the bill.

These folks, along with countless others, ensured that the Postal Service would be able to keep delivering for the American people.

In recent years, it has been a rare occasion when the Senate comes together to pass this kind of bipartisan, consensus legislation with such overwhelming support to address a very, very real problem. I am grateful to every person who played a role in raising awareness—working on this legislation—and getting it passed by both the House and the Senate.

Once signed into law, this groundbreaking, bipartisan bill will help ensure that the Postal Service can continue its nearly 250-year tradition of providing delivery to every American.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from Texas.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, government funding, as we all know, is set to expire tomorrow night at midnight, and the Senate has the responsibility not just to keep the lights on but also to make critical investments in our country.

I could only wish that we had come to this point through a more rational and more deliberative sort of way; but, unfortunately, this seems to be more the norm than the exception where four people get into a room and they write a piece of legislation, then they bring it to the floor, and your only option is to vote yes or no on it. We don't have a practice of making sure that on each one of these bills, people get to actually offer amendments and shape that legislation. I guess that is a quaint and old-fashioned notion, but that is how I thought the legislative process was supposed to work. Maybe that is a topic for another day, but it is unfortunate that this is where we are.

Last night at 10 o'clock, the House voted on an almost 3,000-page bill, and

then we are expected to vote on it the next day or the next 2 days. This is not a way to run a railroad.

We all know that democracy is under attack in the world, and that means we need to do everything we can to provide for our defense and to support our friends and allies around the world.

We know that there has been a tug-of-war between our Democratic colleagues and this side of the aisle when it comes to prioritizing national security spending, and that actually is one reason why we find ourselves here at this late date, voting on this multi-thousand-page bill, because our colleagues on the other side of the aisle wanted to prioritize domestic spending, not national security spending.

Thank goodness that has been now negotiated where there is virtual parity. Thanks to the leadership of Ranking Member SHELBY and our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee, the bipartisan bill includes \$42 billion more in defense spending. I can't think of any time in our recent history where we need those additional resources more for our security and the security of our friends and allies.

This \$42 billion increase in defense spending will provide our military commanders with what they need to respond to the threats that we are facing today and to prepare for those threats we see on the horizon.

It is ironic I find myself speaking to the Senator from Maine, whom I serve with on the Intelligence Committee, because he knows a lot of this subject matter as well—certainly well, maybe better than I do. But we all know that Russia's unprovoked attack on Ukraine was what we thought was a relic of the past.

My dad was a B-17 pilot in the Army Air Corps in World War II. He was shot down on his 26th bombing mission over Nazi Germany and captured as a prisoner of war, where he served for the last 4 months of that war. We thought—Europe thought, the world thought—that perhaps we had gotten beyond that sort existential threat to our way of life and that the autocrats of the world—people like Vladimir Putin, President Xi, the Ayatollah in Iran, Kim Jong Un in North Korea—that these individuals would be deterred from provoking a war like Vladimir Putin has provoked in Ukraine.

One thing Winston Churchill liked to say: If there is one thing for sure, it is that humankind is unteachable. We keep making the same mistakes over and over again. We keep thinking, well, we can cash the peace dividend because that is in the past, only to find ourselves, as Secretary Bob Gates said—he said, of all the military conflicts we found ourselves involved in, in the last several generations, we haven't planned for a single one of them. But we had to be ready, and we had to be able to defend our way of life and our values and our allies.

So Russia's unprovoked attack on Ukraine is a reminder of the threats

that remain to our freedom and the freedom of other democracies around the world. So there could not be a more appropriate time to plus-up our national defense spending, while at the same time providing additional resources, humanitarian and otherwise, to our friends in Ukraine who are fighting for their very existence.

We know that Ukraine is not a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, so we have no legal obligation to come to Ukraine's defense, but I do believe we have a moral obligation to provide that assistance, both military and humanitarian.

Russia has waged an unmistakable war on that democracy, violated the sovereignty of the Ukrainian people. It has even targeted civilians and brought immeasurable destruction to Ukraine. The only question is, After Putin has miscalculated the will of the Ukrainian people to defend themselves and the commitment of America and our NATO allies and other freedom-loving countries around the world to support Ukraine—now that they are bogged down, Russia is bogged down in Ukraine, the question is, Well, is Putin going to give up? Is he going to try to come up with a face-saving device, or is he going to double down? I am afraid Putin is going to double down, which means we are going to see more attacks on innocent civilians. We are going to see more Ukrainian cities leveled to the ground, indiscriminate killing of men, women, and children. This is all that Putin knows. The question is, How does this end? That is a chilling question, but the answer is even more chilling.

As I said, I believe we have a moral duty to support Ukraine, and this legislation provides \$13 billion in humanitarian, economic, and military assistance. We need to get this money out the door as soon as possible, while the United States and NATO needs to continue to supply the Javelins and other anti-aircraft, anti-tank weapons to help the Ukrainians defend themselves against this existential threat.

The good news is, this is a bipartisan effort. A lot of things we do around here we divide up along party lines—the shirts and the skins, I like to call them—but the fact is, we all support Ukraine, and we are all looking for ways we can help them during their time of need.

Another thing that this Omnibus appropriations bill does is it reauthorizes the Violence Against Women Act. This critical program has been defunct and moribund since 2019. For some reason, this was not a priority of this Chamber or of this Congress for the last 3 years, but thanks to the leadership of Senators ERNST and MURKOWSKI—Senator FEINSTEIN was an essential part of the negotiations—we were able to reach a bipartisan agreement to strengthen and modernize this law.

I am a proud cosponsor of the legislation, and I thank our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee for

prioritizing its inclusion in this legislation. This funding will make critical investments for our country, including critical investments in our own people.

One of the good things about this Omnibus appropriations bill is it does exclude poison pills that included things like taxpayer funding of abortions. Those are not included in this bill.

While it is far from perfect, there is no question that a bill drafted solely by Republicans would look a little different. But the world does not operate on the basis of ideals. The perfect cannot be the enemy of the good. So despite its flaws, despite the crazy process by which we find ourselves here voting on this \$1.5 trillion appropriations bill, notwithstanding all the reasons I could cite why maybe I should vote against it, I think there is enough good in this bill to support it.

#### NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on another matter, 2 weeks ago, President Biden nominated Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson—and I know I mispronounced her first name; Judge Jackson, let me just call her—to serve as an Associate Justice on the Supreme Court.

During his State of the Union Message, President Biden said that choosing somebody to serve on the Supreme Court is one of the most serious constitutional responsibilities a President of the United States has. Likewise, I believe our responsibilities under the Constitution of evaluating the nominee, going through the advice-and-consent process, is one of the most serious responsibilities we as Senators have, and I don't take that responsibility lightly.

Members of this Chamber are pretty familiar with Judge Jackson's qualifications, as she was confirmed to the DC Circuit Court of Appeals just 9 months ago—sometimes called the second most powerful Federal court in the land, right below the Supreme Court of the United States.

There is no question that Judge Jackson is an incredibly smart person and has all of the sort of pedigree that you would expect: graduated from the best universities, the best law schools, has had a broad range of practice. She received both her undergraduate and law degrees from Harvard. She clerked for a Supreme Court Justice, Justice Breyer. She served on the Federal bench for nearly 9 years.

I could say, as somebody who served on the State court bench for 13 years, I appreciate the President picking somebody who has actually had real-world experience on the trial bench. Too often, I think our Supreme Court nominees are academics and people who have very little real-world experience. But you can't argue that Judge Jackson does not have that kind of real-world experience, serving as a public defender, serving on the trial court,

and serving on the court of appeals for the last 9 months.

We all know that a nomination for the Supreme Court requires a rigorous assessment of far more than just a resume, though. Our Framers set forth the role of the Supreme Court in article III of our Constitution.

Alexander Hamilton noted in Federalist 78 that the judiciary, he said, would have “no influence over either the sword or the purse. . . . [i]t may truly be said to have neither force nor will, but merely judgment.” Now, if I can interpret what Alexander Hamilton was really saying in modern language, it is that judges shouldn't be politicians. They are not policymakers.

That is why we appoint them—they are appointed—for lifetime tenure, to be protected from the pressures of politics or personality, and that is why they have such a critical and important role in our government. But it is not the same role as we serve as elected representatives. We are enmeshed in politics. We are directly responsible to the people—not for the legal correctness of our arguments or our legislation or constitutional interpretation, although I think we do have some responsibility since we take an oath to uphold the Constitution and laws of the United States, but it is different, and I think most people recognize judges are different than politicians. Judges should not be politicians appointed to serve for lifetime tenure and be unaccountable to the public and yet make policy. That is why judges decide individual cases. We don't decide individual cases here; we make policy for broad swathes of the American people. But judges decide cases based on a controversy, a set of facts, and the application of the law to those facts, which is, again, the antithesis of politics. That is what judging is all about.

So the Supreme Court is not just another branch of government that you can go to if you don't get your desired outcome in the political branches. If you don't win the election, if you don't elect your like-minded representative, you are not supposed to just go to the Supreme Court and say: OK, now you give me what I want because I couldn't get it through the political branches.

The Supreme Court is not supposed to be a failsafe to be utilized to deliver results that can't be secured through the legislative process. Our democracy, equal justice under the law—that is what it says right above the door of the Supreme Court of the United States: “Equal Justice Under Law”—can only be accomplished when the same law applies to all of us. Cases are therefore decided based on their unique facts—not on politics, not on personal preferences, not even on strongly held personal beliefs. This is absolutely critical to our system of checks and balances and the health of our democracy.

So I look forward to meeting Judge Jackson in person. I saw her across the hearing room when she was before the Judiciary Committee just about a year