

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 685.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Anne Rachel Traum, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 685, Anne Rachel Traum, of Nevada, to be United States District Judge for the District of Nevada.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Gary C. Peters, Edward J. Markey, Ben Ray Lujan, Martin Heinrich, Tammy Baldwin, Jacky Rosen, Jeff Merkley, Raphael G. Warnock, Michael F. Bennet, Tammy Duckworth, Angus S. King, Jr., Alex Padilla, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Patrick J. Leahy.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 662.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Andrew M. Luger, of Minnesota, to be United States Attorney for the District of Minnesota for the term of four years.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 662, Andrew M. Luger, of Minnesota, to be United States Attorney for the District of Minnesota for the term of four years.

Charles E. Schumer, Gary C. Peters, Edward J. Markey, Ben Ray Lujan, Martin Heinrich, Tammy Baldwin, Jacky Rosen, Jeff Merkley, Raphael G. Warnock, Mazie Hirono, Michael F. Bennet, Tammy Duckworth, Angus S. King, Jr., Alex Padilla, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Margaret Wood Hassan, Patrick J. Leahy.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 677.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I finally ask consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, March 14, be waived.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Montana.

TRIBUTE TO JANE LEE HAMMAN

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, today I have the distinct honor of recognizing Jane Lee Hamman of Jefferson County as Montanan of the Month,

for her patriotism, her dedication to serving her community, our great State, and our great Nation.

Jane's selfless contributions began at a young age when she started volunteering for Meals on Wheels with her parents. Jane also joined her parents in supporting Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and the civil rights movement as well, believing in equal opportunity and advancement for all people based on their character, not the color of their skin. In fact, her life mantra is "Living to advance freedom, knowledge, and justice for all." I think I can speak for all who know her when I say that she truly embraces these ideals.

Jane's love for her country is on full display in the monthly column she writes for the Boulder Monitor newspaper. The goal of Jane's column is to preserve liberty, to educate readers about America's vision of the Declaration of Independence, and to celebrate our Constitution.

She also shares her values of patriotism and volunteerism with others while serving as the lay leader of the Clancy United Methodist Church and as the Oro Fino Chapter Registrar of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

Additionally, Jane has been appointed by Gov. Greg Gianforte to the Montana State Board of Education and is the chair for the North Jefferson County Public Library District Board of Trustees.

I have no doubt that her love for the great State of Montana and the United States of America influences every person she meets.

It is truly my honor to recognize Jane for her commitment to serving her community, her State, and her country while spreading Montana's values of service and patriotism.

Jane, keep up the great work.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WHITEHOUSE). The Senator from Louisiana.

ENERGY

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I have had many experiences presiding when you have gotten up to speak about energy and climate. So now the roles are reversed, and I will take a perspective somewhat similar to yours in the past but perhaps a little bit broader.

We are in a point in time where it is clear that there is a nexus between energy, climate, economic security for a family and for a nation, and national security. And if we ignore any one, if we overemphasize one and forget the rest, then we lose all four.

I will just share the example we have right now. The administration has clearly prioritized climate in such a way that they have attempted to decrease the amount of fossil fuel being produced in the United States of America and limit the exports of that fuel. Because of that singular emphasis, we are now at a point where we have endangered the economy of many—not "we" but circumstances around the

world have endangered the economies of the European countries dependent upon Russian oil. It has endangered the pocketbook of the families that cannot afford \$4- to \$6-a-gallon gasoline, depending upon where you live. And the climate globally is worse.

Because there are inadequate amounts of liquefied natural gas going to Europe, they are going to burn tremendous amounts of coal, and that coal, of course, will have a greenhouse gas profile that is far greater than that of natural gas.

So the question is, How do we achieve all of our goals: the climate, the national security, the pocketbook issues for families and for our nation, as well as our energy security? So that is what I wish to speak about today.

Now, of course, we know there is a tension here, and the tension here is between this kind of almost battle we have been having in our country: How do we develop America's resources, but how do we do it while at the same time lowering carbon intensity?

If one party is in charge of the regulatory state, then they will attempt to use regulatory power to choke off the amount of carbon coming from America's resources. I am speaking of fossil fuel resources at this point. But, as I mentioned, it seems that with this backdrop of a need globally to be free of Russian energy, we need to have a different approach—acknowledging totally those who are concerned about carbon intensity; acknowledging totally the Europeans who are now so vulnerable to Russian energy shortages; acknowledging totally the family at home with the 10-year-old pickup truck who can't afford to fill it up to get to work.

Mr. President, let's set the stage. Europe depends on Russia for 40 percent of its natural gas supplies. Some countries in Europe depend upon Russia for 90 percent of their natural gas supplies. In 2013, the EU imported 135 billion cubic meters of Russian natural gas and in 2019, 166 billion cubic meters. One reason we need to export liquefied natural gas is to decrease that reliance upon Russian natural gas.

By the way, one of the reasons that the EU is using more natural gas is that the carbon footprint of natural gas is so much less than that of coal. So using gas was a way to achieve that which the United States has achieved—an ability to decrease your carbon emissions by changing from coal to natural gas.

Our goal here is to help the Europeans continue not just that transition away from coal to lower their carbon intensity but also to help them decrease, lower their dependence upon Russia as regards overall their use of natural gas.

There is a way to get at this within the next 10 months—to lower global greenhouse gas emissions, to help the Europeans be freer from Russian gas—in a way which actually does not involve increased production here in the

United States. When I speak of our goals here, it isn't just to pump more out of the United States; it is to solve a global problem.

An Italian energy executive with whom I spoke mentioned how in North Africa, they are using natural gas. They ship a certain amount of it to Italy, and then it goes to the rest of the continent. But the tanks coming from North Africa are about 50 percent full, and there is a liquefied natural gas terminal in Egypt which is way below capacity. Why? Because the population growth in North Africa has been so great and the number of people getting electricity has increased so dramatically that the natural gas they used to ship to Europe is now being used domestically.

But the powerplants they are using to burn the natural gas are antiquated. They don't burn efficiently. The emission profile of these natural gas powerplants is much greater than that which is state of the art. So this gentleman in Italy had a great idea. He said: Why don't we build out in the near term a \$10 billion investment of solar panels in North Africa?

It would seem like there is no better place in the world to do solar panels than the Sahara Desert. So if you did solar panels in Africa and you are exchanging the electrons from the solar panels for the electrons being burned in antiquated natural gas facilities, that gas would then be freed up to be shipped to Africa. It doesn't increase—in fact, it decreases the net amount of natural gas being built, but it does it in a way that it delivers the gas where it is going to be burned in a more environmentally friendly way. But it has economic development, and it has the substitution of solar for gas in North Africa. This is a win and a win and a win.

What is the U.S. role here? Well, the U.S. role can take our DFC, which is our financing corporation for overseas development, and I am told that if we just put up 5 percent of the amount, that sends a message to other investors that this has the support of the U.S. Government and that they can step in here and make an investment too.

Solar panels of that magnitude is a big project. On the other hand, it is something which can be done in the near term. In that near term, we are able to increase the supply of natural gas to Europe, while decreasing global greenhouse gas emissions. That is something we can do now.

It does raise the question—someone said: Building that many solar panels, surely there would be some issues. It is my impression, at least, that there is far more open ground in the desert than there is in the cities but also that the regulatory burden in order to deploy solar panels is a lot less in Africa, which kind of takes me to my next issue.

We have the ability to increase our export of liquefied natural gas, to increase the deployment of renewables

here in the United States, to mine the uranium that would replace the Russian uranium we get for nuclear but also replace the Russian uranium the Europeans use. We have the ability to do that, but we are just locked up with regulations. I am not saying do away with the regulations; I am saying do something different in terms of how we regulate.

We actually have a model for this. We saw at the beginning of the COVID pandemic that we had multiple Federal Agencies responsible for approving a new vaccine. They would kind of get to each other's issue and request when they got to each other's issue and request. So it could take 2½ years to have a new vaccine approved by regulation in order to even begin testing, much less to show that it worked and to begin to deploy.

The previous administration, working with the different Agencies—I visualize it as bringing everybody in a room, and if somebody had a question, they would turn this question over to somebody else, and they had to sit there at that table until they resolved it, and then they gave it back, not “Hey, listen, send it over here, and we will have it back to you in 4 weeks.” No. “Send it over here, and we will have it back to you in 3 days.” They compressed the time so that a vaccine, which, optimistically, we were hoping would be ready in 3 years, ended up being ready in less than 1. There is always a concern that if you compress that timeframe, you have to sacrifice safety, but there is no evidence that occurred with the coronavirus vaccine.

In the same way, if we have multiple Agencies right now that are in charge of permitting some aspect of energy—whether it is renewable, whether it is mining, whether it is export—there can be an Operation Warp Speed for how they work together to bring our energy resources to bear and helping the Europeans become free of Russian energy.

It is not just lowering the price at the pump for us, because you can argue that is going to be very difficult to do in the near term. What it can be, though, is to keep the Europeans from going into a recession or a depression next winter because the demand for fuel is so great and they are unable to meet it. And if they don't have some substitute for Russian energy and if the Russians decide to cut them off, they end up freezing, going energy poor, or having their industries crater because of a lack of energy.

One more time, this is a nexus. We can do this in a way that is environmentally friendly, producing the energy and exporting it in such a way that lowers global greenhouse gas emissions, because what is driving us right now is the economy of countries and the economy of families.

If European families are energy poor, they will lose their political will to stand up to the Russians, and we will lose our ally. We have to support not just our families but theirs so that

they can get through this economically; so that, one, they can more afford life; but, secondly, so that we can maintain political will as we stand up against the Russians.

There are other aspects of this, as well. For those interested in battery technology, most of the critical minerals are coming from Russian or Chinese sources. If we are concerned about climate and we are concerned about the ability to be critical mineral independent in case of geopolitical tension, this is the exact same issue that we have been speaking about.

How do we proceed? One, we just have to recognize that we are at a time of extreme geopolitical tension where decisions we make in this country have ramifications worldwide. The Europeans are looking to us to help them with their energy crisis, and if we fail to help the Europeans with their energy crisis, the Europeans will pay as much as 6,000 euros more a year per family for their energy, and they will probably go into a deep recession.

On the other hand, if we are able to solve this for the Europeans, we will also solve it for our families, the ones who are paying \$4 to \$6 for a gallon of gasoline.

We know what we are speaking about. Just to show that this can be done, as the United States has substituted natural gas for coal, we have lowered our domestic emissions by 14 percent at a time when global emissions have risen 4 percent. In that time, since 2005, where we lowered our emissions by 14 percent, our economy is larger. We have millions more people and we are domestically producing much more oil and gas, and there has been a subsequent return of energy-related industry to the United States.

So despite an industrial profile and a mining profile and a population profile that would suggest that there would be greater emissions, we actually have 14 percent less than 2005. We did it by acknowledging that domestic production of energy was going to help with our economy, help with the economy of families, but also help our domestic security, and would also help climate and the carbon intensity of our society.

We have done this for our country. Now the question is, Can we do it for the world? I would argue that if we choose not to, the Russians will win. There is no way that Europe or Europeans are going to accept energy poverty with a crater economy due to the lack of affordable energy.

On the other hand, if we are able to make this commitment doing things such as financing for solar panels in North Africa, an Operation Warp Speed for energy to bring our energy resources to bear, the continued substitution of lower carbon intensity energy sources for that which currently is higher carbon intensity, then, we can accomplish worldwide that which we have accomplished here in the United States, which is to lower greenhouse gas emissions while making a more

prosperous society and increasing domestic and international security.

This is not theoretical. I have spoken with someone who could have an offshore LNG export facility completed in 12 months, if he had his permits from the Federal Government. I spoke to someone involved with drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf and learned that their company could be sending oil to the refineries in Louisiana within 12 months if they could get their permits done expeditiously. And I can give list after list of renewable, of fossil, and otherwise.

It is now the time for the United States to take leadership. If we don't, our families will continue to suffer at the pump, Europeans will enter a recession, and, most unfortunately, the cause of freedom worldwide will be harmed by Russia's continued economic hegemony over the rest of the world because of their energy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 3 minutes.

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

NOMINATION OF SHALANDA D. YOUNG

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise in support of Shalanda Young's nomination to be the Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Ms. Young has served with distinction as OMB's Acting Director for the past year, leading the administration's efforts to execute the American Rescue Plan, the bipartisan infrastructure bill, and numerous Federal cybersecurity priorities.

Over the past year, she has been a true partner to Congress, working closely with Members on both sides of the aisle to find bipartisan paths forward.

In addition to her proven leadership at OMB this past year, Ms. Young brings nearly two decades of public service experience to her role, including as a senior staff Member on the House Appropriations Committee where she led challenging bipartisan negotiations around the debt limit, government funding, and budget reform.

OMB will continue to be central to the administration's efforts to tackle the Nation's ongoing challenges, and Ms. Young will be instrumental in leading that work.

I have every confidence in Ms. Young's ability to continue to rise to the challenges facing OMB, both now and in the future.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the confirmation of Shalanda Young as director of the Office of Management and Budget.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 726, Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget.

Charles E. Schumer, Alex Padilla, Christopher Murphy, Edward J. Markey, Gary C. Peters, Brian Schatz, Jack Reed, Tammy Duckworth, John W. Hickenlooper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tim Kaine, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Margaret Wood Hassan, Patrick J. Leahy, Debbie Stabenow.

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 Shalanda D. Young, of Louisiana, to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 79 Ex.]

YEAS—53

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blunt	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Hoeven	Sanders
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shelby
Cardin	Kelly	Sinema
Carper	King	Smith
Casey	Leahy	Stabenow
Cassidy	Lujan	Sullivan
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cramer	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warnock
Gillibrand	Murkowski	Warren
Graham	Murphy	Whitehouse
Grassley	Murray	Wyden
Hassan	Padilla	

NAYS—31

Barrasso	Cornyn	Ernst
Blackburn	Cotton	Fischer
Boozman	Crapo	Hawley
Braun	Cruz	Inhofe
Capito	Daines	Johnson