

What I saw, I hope no one will ever see. Mariupol will become part of a list of cities that were completely destroyed by war.

“What I saw, I hope no one will ever see. Mariupol will become part of a list of cities that were completely destroyed by war.” We don’t have to look far for the source of these horrors; they can be attributed to one man, to Vladimir Putin.

To achieve his vision of a Russian Empire, he has laid waste to the country of Ukraine; thousands of lives sacrificed, on both sides, because he wants Ukraine, because he thinks Ukraine should be part of Russia. It doesn’t matter that the people of Ukraine have made it unmistakably clear that they are their own people and a sovereign nation willing to lay down their lives for their freedom. Putin wants Ukraine, and he is apparently willing to destroy Ukraine to get it.

All this evil, all this destruction, so many—so many—human lives wasted all because of one man’s fixation on a Russian Empire. More than 3.3 million refugees have fled Ukraine, including at least 1.5 million children, and around 6.5 million Ukrainians are internally displaced. That amounts to roughly one-quarter of Ukraine’s population forced from their homes. And the numbers continue to grow.

Last week, President Zelenskyy addressed Congress. In powerful words, he outlined a situation in Ukraine and asked for additional help as Ukrainians battle for their country. I am proud that the United States has provided Ukraine with substantial military assistance and has put in place strong sanctions against Russia, including sanctioning the lifeblood of the Russian economy, which is the Russian energy sector.

But, Mr. President, we have to do more. However much current sanctions have hit the Russian economy, Putin is still prosecuting his war of aggression in Ukraine, and so we have to do more. We have to send the message, unequivocally, that Russia will be an outcast from the free world until it withdraws from Ukraine.

There are additional sanctions the United States can put in place, and we need to immediately get to work unleashing American energy production so we can provide energy to our allies in Europe and lessen their dependence on energy from Russia. Every dollar—every dollar—that goes to purchase Russian energy is a dollar that Russia can use to finance its war of aggression.

The United States has correctly banned Russian oil and gas imports; now we need to help our allies in Europe permanently divest themselves of their reliance on Russian energy. Congress needs to act immediately on legislation to suspend Russia’s favorable trading status. Membership at the World Trade Organization should be limited to countries that don’t launch unprovoked wars on their neighbors. We also need to continue our ship-

ments of arms to Ukraine. And the President needs to find a way to further enhance Ukrainian air defenses, whether that involves sending the S-300 air defense systems that President Zelenskyy asked for, or armed drones, or facilitating the transfer of MiG aircraft from NATO countries to the Ukrainian Air Force, or all of the above.

Russia is currently unleashing devastation from the skies of Ukrainian cities, and we need to find a way of helping Ukrainians to reduce or eliminate that threat.

Finally, we need to make sure that while we are sanctioning Russia on the one hand, we are not enriching it on the other with things like an Iran deal that could see Russia benefit to the tune of \$10 billion.

The people of Ukraine are not waiting for anyone to come and save them. They are fighting with everything they have to save their country, but they are asking for our help. They need arms and resources and humanitarian assistance to sustain their fight against Russian forces that are increasingly showing less and less restraint. And they are relying on us—on us—on our shared belief in freedom and self-determination, on our shared commitment to human liberty.

The Ukrainian people know what they want to be and that is a free people in a free country, and they have the will to stay in this fight. They just need our help. Let’s not let them down. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). The clerk will call the roll. The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECESS

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:01 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. Sinema).

#### AMERICA CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR MANUFACTURING, PRE-EMINENCE IN TECHNOLOGY, AND ECONOMIC STRENGTH ACT OF 2022—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

NOMINATIONS OF CRISTINA D. SILVA AND ANNE RACHEL TRAUM

Ms. Cortez Masto. Madam President, this week, the Senate considers two outstanding nominees to the U.S. District Court for the District of Nevada. They have my full support and

the support of Senator Rosen, and I urge the Senate to confirm them.

Nevada’s Federal bench has had vacancies since 2016 and 2018, so the need is urgent. Senator Rosen and I have carefully reviewed the records of the President’s nominees, Judge Cristina Silva and Professor Anne Traum, in cooperation with the bipartisan judicial commissions in our State.

Both of these women have the skill, the dedication, and knowledge of the law to serve Nevadans and the Nation as district court judges. Judge Cristina Silva held leadership positions at the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the District of Nevada, where she became the first woman and Latina to serve as chief of the criminal division and worked on the investigation into the Route 91 Harvest Festival shooting in Las Vegas.

Since 2019, she has been a judge on the Eighth Judicial District Court in Las Vegas. Nevada has benefited immensely from Judge Silva’s public service, and I am confident she will continue that service on the Federal bench.

Professor Anne Traum has served as an attorney for civil courts in the U.S. Attorney’s Office, as an assistant Federal public defender, and as a practitioner who has argued more than 30 cases before the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

She currently teaches at UNLV’s William S. Boyd School of Law, where she directs the law school’s appellate clinic in working on cases before the Ninth Circuit and the Nevada Supreme Court.

Professor Traum’s record, as both a practitioner and as an academic, will make her a strong addition to the U.S. District Court.

These two nominees have received the support of many in Nevada’s legal community, including former Republican Governor Brian Sandoval, a former Federal judge himself. They have demonstrated their commitment to justice, the law, and to their community.

They represent the best of Nevada, and I will vote for them enthusiastically, and I ask and call on my colleagues to do the same.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. Cornyn. Madam President, as anybody who has been watching C-SPAN knows, the confirmation process for Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson is well underway.

Over the last few weeks, members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, on which I am honored to serve, have conducted a meticulous review of Judge Jackson’s record and qualifications.

During this week’s hearing, though, we have an opportunity to dig deeper and to hear directly from the nominee about her ability to serve as a fair and impartial Supreme Court Justice—somebody without an agenda, somebody who doesn’t dabble in politics,

and somebody who doesn't use this position to enact policies that they prefer.

Many of our colleagues are familiar with Judge Jackson's experience because she was recently confirmed to the District of Columbia's Circuit Court just 9 months ago. She received her undergraduate degree and law degree from Harvard, certainly sterling credentials, and she worked for Justice Steve Breyer, who is the judge that she is succeeding on the Court.

She has had varied experience, which I think is to her credit. She has been a public defender. She later served on the U.S. Sentencing Commission. And she has spent the last 9 years as a trial court judge on the Federal bench. Judge Jackson is obviously smart, and she is quite accomplished.

But we know that a lifetime appointment on the Supreme Court requires more than just an impressive resume. Our democracy requires that judges rule based on the law. To use the words that Judge Jackson used this morning in the Judiciary Committee hearing, she said, Judges need to stay in their lane, which I actually appreciate, because under the separation of powers, obviously, a lifetime-tenured Federal judge who does not stand for election should not be making policy. That should be left to those of us in the electoral process to make those decisions, and then, of course, the Courts determine the constitutionality and legality of those policy choices. It is not appropriate for them to impose their own preferences instead.

Unlike previous nominees who had no experience on the bench, we don't have to make assumptions about Judge Jackson's decisions; we have the ability to examine hundreds of prior opinions that she has issued and to ask for clarity from the nominee herself.

In addition to her time on the Federal bench, we have a responsibility to dive into Judge Jackson's record as both a prosecutor and as a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission.

Despite what some of our colleagues have suggested, none of these lines of questioning are out of bounds. It is really amazing to me that even though the President has a constitutional right to nominate whomsoever he chooses, we have a constitutional duty to provide what is called "advice and consent."

And so that means asking tough, but respectful, questions about her record and background. The Senate is not here to rubberstamp the White House's nominee. We have a responsibility to scrutinize her record, understand her thinking, her judicial philosophy, and, ultimately, to determine whether she has the right qualities to serve as a member of the Court.

That is exactly what advice and consent involves, and Judge Jackson's record—including her work at every point of her career—should be examined, and none of it should be out of bounds.

Beyond a thorough review of Judge Jackson's record, we also need to gain a clear picture of how she approaches her job of judging—what some people call judicial philosophy, what I call who decides. There are some questions that are decided by judges that should be decided by judges and not elected Representatives, like Members of Congress.

Conversely, there are some areas, as I suggested, where we should be making the decisions and be held accountable for those decisions, and the judge ought to be making a more narrow and focused review of those decisions for constitutionality and legality.

But that does not give her permission to impose her policy preferences over those of a majority of Congress when a bill is passed and signed into law by the President.

Judge Jackson previously suggested that she didn't really have a judicial philosophy—something I find very difficult to believe.

Today, she did not provide a lot of clarity beyond offering vague statements about the methodology by which she decides cases. I find it very hard to believe a judge with this kind of experience says she doesn't have a judicial philosophy, and I hope we can gain more clarity as the hearings continue. Again, she did talk about staying in her lane, not making political or policy decisions, which is a good start. But there is a lot more we need to hear about and a lot more commitments we need to get from the judge before she is confirmed to the Federal bench.

Judicial philosophy has always been of the central points of inquiry by the Judiciary Committee. And never more so than at this particular moment is it important.

The Framers of the Constitution, we know, had the wisdom to establish one branch that made policy decisions. And that would be the executive branch and the legislative branch—actually two branches of government—and another that would operate free of politics and elections and be given lifetime tenure.

Ultimately, all legitimacy of government comes from consent of the governed and so we don't have a group of nine overlords or wise men and women on the Potomac who are going to tell us how to live our lives. That is a decision that we the people make through our elected Representatives and through our Constitution and other laws.

In Federalist 78, Alexander Hamilton said that the courts would have "no influence on either the sword or the purse." In other words, they wouldn't be responsible for national security or public safety or for spending tax dollars.

And he went on to say, "It may truly be said to have neither force nor will, but merely judgment." That is another way of saying that judges decide cases and controversies. They don't make broad policy pronouncements. That is our job here in Congress for which we

are held accountable every time we stand for election.

We do not need—nor do I want—a judge who will decide at the front end the result they want to reach and then cherry-pick the law and the facts in order to justify that decision. So it is important to understand the process by which Judge Jackson makes her legal decisions, and we got a little bit of a glimpse this morning, but over the next couple of days, we will have further opportunity to ask more questions about that.

One of the things I am concerned about is some of the outside groups that are advocating for Judge Jackson's confirmation. We are seeing activists that demand judges reach a particular result, regardless of the facts, or what the law prescribes.

Some of these outside rabble-rousers believe judges should deliver results that their party can't seem to accomplish through the deliberation, compromise, and rough-and-tumble of the legislative process.

And when the Court does not deliver these results, many of these outside groups will attack the integrity and legitimacy of the Court as an institution.

In recent years, these radical views have made it into the mainstream. In the summer of 2019, five of our Democratic colleagues—including the current chairman of the Judiciary Committee—filed a "Friend of the Court" brief in the U.S. Supreme Court on gun rights. These Senators, in their brief, made a not-so-subtle threat that unless the Court ruled a particular way, the entire institution would be restructured.

Several months later, the leader of the Senate—the majority leader—fired his own warning shot. He actually went to the Supreme Court steps and threatened two sitting Supreme Court Justices by name if they did not rule in a particular fashion.

But the Senate isn't the only place we are seeing these sorts of irresponsible attacks. Liberal dark money groups, like Demand Justice, have paid millions of dollars to promote Court packing and sow public distrust in the legitimacy of the Court.

And even the White House appears to be open to a Supreme Court overhaul. On the campaign trail, for example, President Biden refused to disavow reforming the Supreme Court. His administration even established a commission to study the issue.

The courts were not designed and are not designed to be a roundabout way to deliver certain results or invent new rights out of whole cloth. That is illegitimate, in my view, and I am not the only one who thinks that. That is why it is imperative that we gain a clear understanding of Judge Jackson's approach to judging and what she regards as in her lane and what she understands to be out of her lane in terms of policymaking or political decision making.

We need to know that if confirmed, she will rule without fear or favor; that she will follow the law as written, not as what she wants it to be, but what it actually is; and that she will defend the Supreme Court as an institution, as Justice Breyer has and Justice Ginsburg had when asked about Court packing.

The Senate's duty is to provide advice and consent, and it is absolutely critical to the integrity of the High Court and the health of our democracy. Judges, after all, don't have term limits. They don't serve for 2 years and stand for reelection or 6 years as we do here in the Senate.

They are not accountable in elections. They wield tremendous power as defenders of the Constitution and the last word in resolving contested lawsuits in the courts.

So we have a responsibility to the American people to get this right, to thoroughly evaluate Judge Jackson's qualifications, and do our best to ensure that, if confirmed, she will be an impartial and fair judge, not just for the people who nominated her, not just for the outside groups that are cheering on her confirmation, but for all Americans.

Before Judge Jackson was named to fill this vacancy and before there was even a vacancy to fill, President Biden promised to nominate an African-American woman to fill this bench. While the historic nature of Judge Jackson's nomination has been heavily reported, there has been far less attention paid to the fact that she is not the first African American who was considered for the Supreme Court—African-American woman.

When Justice Sandra Day O'Connor announced her retirement in 2005, one of the top names floated as a potential successor was Judge Janice Rogers Brown.

And, as we now know, Democrats filibustered Judge Brown, and she was ultimately never even given the opportunity to be nominated to serve on the Supreme Court. But that wasn't because of opposition by Republicans; it was because our Democratic colleagues, led by then-Senator Joe Biden, derailed her nomination. Janice Rogers Brown had the opportunity to make history by being the first African-American woman nominated for and confirmed as a member of the Supreme Court, but it is very clear that then-Senator Joe Biden led the effort to derail that nomination and denied her that historic opportunity.

I understand and appreciate the historic nature of Judge Jackson's nomination, but I hope our colleagues and members of the media do not lose sight of the mistreatment of the many nominees and should-have-been nominees who came before Judge Jackson. What the American people have seen over the last 2 days is a far cry from the way we have seen people like Justice Gorsuch or Justice Kavanaugh treated by our friends across the aisle.

Judge Jackson has been treated with courtesy, with civility, dignity, and respect, and I expect that trend to continue through the remainder of this process. As Republicans have said all along, this process will be thorough and exhaustive, but it will be respectful.

We have a busy week ahead of us, and I am eager to learn more about Judge Jackson, her judicial philosophy, and the qualifications she would bring if confirmed to the Supreme Court.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### CORPORATE WELFARE

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, at a time of massive and growing income and wealth inequality, the American people are outraged at the unprecedented level of corporate greed that is taking place all around them.

Today, while the working class of this country is struggling with higher gas prices, higher food prices, and higher housing prices, the billionaire class and large corporations are doing phenomenally well and, in fact, have never ever had it so good.

In the United States today, while the average worker is making \$44 a week less in inflation-accounted-for dollars than he or she made nearly 50 years ago, corporate profits are at an alltime high, and CEOs have seen huge increases in their compensation packages. We have never seen in this country the level of corporate greed that we are seeing right now—unprecedented.

Now, let me just give you a few examples. While the price of gas has soared—it is now \$4.25 a gallon on average—ExxonMobil, Chevron, BP, and Shell made nearly \$30 billion in profit last quarter alone—just last quarter. Meanwhile, Big Oil CEOs are on track to spend \$88 billion this year—not to produce more oil, not to address the crisis of climate, but to buy back their own stock and hand out dividends to enrich their wealthy stockholders.

Here is more corporate greed. In fact, it is never-ending. Amazon raised the price of its Prime membership by 16.8 percent while it increased its profits by 75 percent to a recordbreaking \$35 billion—and, by the way, managed to avoid paying \$5.2 billion in taxes. Meanwhile, the founder of Amazon, Jeff Bezos, became \$81 billion richer during the pandemic and is now worth some \$186 billion. That is his worth.

More corporate greed: The price of beef is up 32 percent; the price of chicken is up 20 percent; and the price of pork is up 13 percent. Meanwhile, Tyson Foods, a major producer of chicken, beef, and hot dogs, increased its profits by 140 percent last quarter

to \$1.1 billion and gave its CEO a 22-percent pay raise last year to \$14 million. Meanwhile, the owner of the company, John Tyson, nearly doubled his wealth during the pandemic and is now worth some \$3 billion.

Do you want more corporate greed? Here it is. We are looking at outrageously high prices for prescription drugs, and, in fact, we pay by far the highest prices in the world.

Last year, Pfizer, Johnson & Johnson, and AbbVie, three giant pharmaceutical companies, increased their profits by over 90 percent—a 90-percent increase in profits—to \$54 billion. Meanwhile, the CEOs of just eight prescription drug companies made \$350 million in total compensation in 2020.

When we talk about corporate greed, we are also talking about massive levels of income and wealth inequality. In our country today, the 2 wealthiest people own more wealth than the bottom 42 percent of our population, and that is more than 130 million people. Two people own more wealth than 130 million Americans.

The top 1 percent now owns more wealth than the bottom 92 percent. Since the Wall Street crash of 2008, about 45 percent of all new income has gone to the top 1 percent. In other words, over the last many decades, there has been in this country a massive redistribution of wealth. Unfortunately, that redistribution has gone in the wrong direction: It has gone from the middle class and working families to the top 1 percent.

Now, I understand that is not an issue we talk about much here on the floor of the Senate, and that is not an issue we talk about much in the media, but it is an issue that must be talked about and, more importantly, must be dealt with.

Now, listen to this, which I think really says it all: During this terrible pandemic when many thousands of essential workers died on the job—they went to work in order to feed their families; they contracted the virus; and thousands of them died. During that same period of time, over 700 billionaires in America became nearly \$2 trillion richer. Working people die on the job because they have to feed their families, and 700 people—not a whole lot of people—became \$2 trillion richer. So that is where we are today. Desperate workers are dying because they are forced to go to work to provide for their families while the people on top are doing unbelievably well.

Today, billionaires like Elon Musk, Jeff Bezos, and Richard Branson are zooming off in their spaceships to outer space; they are buying \$500 million superyachts; and they are buying mansions with 25 bathrooms while half of our people live paycheck to paycheck. Is that really what America is supposed to be about?

We are discussing now, in the midst of this horrific, horrific war in Ukraine—there has been a lot of discussion about the Russian oligarchy,

and that is absolutely appropriate because in Russia, you have a handful of billionaires attached to Putin who own unbelievable wealth. But what do we think we have now in this country? It is an American oligarchy, as the distribution of wealth and income becomes worse and worse every day.

The American people want those of us in Congress to take action to address the unprecedented level of corporate greed and income and wealth inequality that we are seeing right now. They are sick and tired of large corporations making record profits and in a given year paying nothing—zero—in Federal taxes. They are sick and tired of billionaires paying a lower effective tax rate than a teacher, a nurse, a truckdriver, or a firefighter.

The American people want Congress to address corporate greed and make certain that the wealthiest people and most profitable corporations pay their fair share of taxes. Yet, this week, right now, what are we debating here on the floor of the Senate? We are debating legislation to provide some \$53 billion—billion dollars—in corporate welfare, with no strings attached, to the highly profitable microchip industry.

And, yes, if you can believe it—and I suspect there are people out there who really don't believe it, but I am telling you the truth—this legislation also provides a \$10 billion bailout to Jeff Bezos so that his company, Blue Origin, can launch a rocket ship to the Moon.

In terms of the microchip industry, let us be very clear. We are talking about an industry that has shut down over 780 manufacturing plants in the United States and eliminated 150,000 American jobs over the last 20 years while moving most of its production overseas. In other words, in order to make more profits, these companies shut down plants in the United States and hired cheap labor abroad.

And now, believe it or not, these very same companies that sold the American worker out, they are now in line to receive \$53 billion in corporate welfare to undo the damage that they themselves caused.

Do we need to expand the enormously important microchip industry in this country so that we become less dependent on foreign nations? The answer is, yes, absolutely. But we can accomplish that goal without throwing huge sums of money at these companies with zero, no protections, for the taxpayer—just here it is; take the money.

We are the only major country on Earth that does not guarantee healthcare to all of our people. Apparently, the American people are not entitled to healthcare.

We have the highest child poverty rate of almost any major country on Earth, which has gone up by 41 percent since January because of the refusal of some to extend the child tax credit. Apparently, our working families are not entitled to raise their kids in security and dignity.

We have 45 million Americans struggling with student debt because of the outrageous cost of higher education. Apparently, our young people are not entitled to quality education without undergoing financial distress or, in some cases, decades.

Those people are not entitled, but here we are today on the floor of the Senate because many of my colleagues think that the enormously profitable microchip industry is entitled to a massive amount of corporate welfare.

My guess is that five major semiconductor companies will likely receive the lion's share of this taxpayer handout. They will likely be Intel, Texas Instruments, Micron Technology, GlobalFoundries, and Samsung. These five companies, in line for a massive welfare check, made over \$75 billion in profits last year—made \$75 billion in profits—and now they are in line for \$53 billion in corporate welfare.

My understanding is that the company that will likely benefit the most from this taxpayer handout is Intel, and let us be clear, Intel is not a poor company. It is not going broke. It is not in a desperate financial condition; quite the contrary, in 2021, Intel made nearly \$20 billion in profit. We are talking about a company that had enough money to spend \$14.2 billion during the pandemic, not on research and development but on buying back its own stock to reward their executives and wealthy shareholders. We are talking about a company in line for a major welfare check that could afford to give its CEO, Pat Gelsinger, a \$116 million compensation package last year.

There are working-class people all over this country working 50 or 60 hours a week trying to keep their families afloat, paying their fair share of taxes, and providing \$53 billion in corporate welfare, a lot of which will go to a company that pays its CEO \$116 million in compensation and provided billions in stock paybacks.

We are talking about a company, Intel, whose CEO in 2003, Andy Grove, said that he had “no choice” but to continue to move jobs overseas as he predicted the United States would lose the bulk of its information technology jobs to China and India—which we have.

Now, do we really think that a highly profitable corporation like Intel needs a taxpayer bailout worth many billions of dollars with no strings attached?

But it is not just Intel. Another company that will likely receive taxpayer assistance under this legislation is Texas Instruments. Last year, Texas Instruments made \$7.8 billion in profits. In 2020, this company spent \$2.5 billion buying back its own stock while it has outsourced thousands of good-paying American jobs to low-wage countries and spent more than \$40 million on lobbying over the past 2 years.

But it is not just Intel. It is not just Texas Instruments. It goes on and on and on.

Providing \$53 billion in corporate welfare to an industry that has

outsourced tens of thousands of jobs to low-wage countries and spent hundreds of billions on stock buybacks with no strings attached may make sense to some people, but it does not make sense to me—nor do I think it makes sense to the American people.

Now, I understand that there will be a major effort to pass this bill as quickly as possible in order to move it to a conference committee and send it to the President's desk. So let me be very clear. I will not support any unanimous consent request to speed up the passage of this bill unless I receive a rollcall vote on two extremely important amendments that I have introduced.

The first amendment would prevent microchip companies from receiving taxpayer assistance unless they agree to issue warrants or equity stakes to the Federal Government. If private companies are going to benefit from over \$53 billion in corporate welfare, the financial gains made by these companies must be shared with the American people, not just wealthy shareholders. In other words, all this amendment says is that if these companies want taxpayer assistance, we are not going to socialize all of the risks and privatize all of the profits. If these investments turn out to be profitable as a direct result of these Federal grants, the taxpayers of this country have a right to get a return on that investment. That is not complicated nor is it a radical idea.

These exact conditions were imposed on corporations that received taxpayer assistance in the bipartisan CARES Act, which passed the Senate 96 to zero. In other words, every Member of the U.S. Senate has already voted for the conditions that are in my amendment.

Further, the CARES Act was not the first time that Congress passed warrants and equity stakes tied to government assistance. During the 2008 financial crisis, Congress required all companies taking TARP funds to issue warrants and equity stakes to the Federal Government.

In addition, this amendment would also require these highly profitable companies not to buy back their own stock, not to outsource American jobs, not to repeal existing collective bargaining agreements and to remain neutral in any union organizing effort. Again, this is not a radical idea. All of these conditions were imposed on companies that received funding from the CARES Act and passed the Senate by a 96-to-zero vote.

The second amendment that I have introduced would simply eliminate the \$10 billion bailout to Jeff Bezos to fly to the Moon. If Mr. Bezos wants to go to the Moon, good for him. He has \$186 billion in personal wealth. He became \$81 billion richer during the pandemic. He is the second wealthiest person in America. In a given year, Mr. Bezos has paid nothing in Federal income taxes.

If Mr. Bezos wants to go to the Moon, let him use his own money, not the taxpayers'.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

H.R. 4521

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, for generations, manufacturing was the lifeblood of communities across Ohio and throughout the country. It was heavily unionized, and the jobs paid well. It is not a coincidence that those two things go together. These jobs allowed generations of Americans to build a middle-class life.

I walked the halls at Mansfield Senior High School and Johnny Appleseed Junior High School with the sons and daughters of steelworkers and ironworkers and carpenters and machinists and auto workers and electricians. Workers, the parents of kids in my school—those workers—innovated on the shop floor. They propelled our economy to new heights. They allowed us to lead the world in developing new industries.

But Ohioans know all too well what happened next. Beginning in the 1970s and the 1980s, we stopped making things in our country.

Look at places like my hometown in Mansfield, OH. It is an industrial city of about 50,000 people, halfway between Cleveland and Columbus. Companies like Westinghouse, Tappan Stove, Ohio Brass, and General Motors closed down, one after another, after another.

Go to any town in Ohio, and people can name a similar list. They will measure, oftentimes, their local history in lost plants and lost jobs.

All over America, companies were moving production elsewhere in the name of efficiency. "Efficiency" was business speak for lower wages. Corporate America always wanted cheaper labor wherever they could find it.

First, they went to anti-union, anti-worker, low-wage States, often in the South. Then, when those wages weren't low enough, they moved overseas, first to Mexico and then to China.

When those companies moved out, they weren't replaced by new investment. The market fundamentalists would talk about creative destruction, but it wasn't followed by any construction, creative or otherwise.

That corporate greed was aided by decades of underinvestment, by bad trade policies, which these corporations lobbied this body for—successfully, unfortunately—in NAFTA, PNTR with China, and the Central American Free Trade Agreement. Then it was also followed by even worse tax policy, which these special interests also lobbied this institution for.

It all drove production overseas. It left us relying on other countries, too often our economic competitors. It exposed us to supply shocks. It gutted—ultimately gutted—the middle class in Mansfield, OH, and communities all over this country.

Ohioans and workers in historic industrial towns felt it first. Now, the

whole country feels it in the form of higher prices and empty shelves and months-long waits for products people need.

We need to make more things in America. It is not going to happen on its own, not when the economy of the last four decades was built on corporations hopping the globe in search of workers to exploit, not when countries like China prop up state-owned enterprises and steal our ideas and monetize them and use them to compete and often cheat against American businesses and American workers.

We need a concerted, coordinated effort to invest in our greatest assets: American workers and American innovation. That is what we do with this competition and jobs bill. We need to negotiate a final bill and pass this now. Ohioans needed this a year ago, a decade ago, a generation ago.

Look at what is happening even today in Bucyrus, OH.

There are few innovations more quintessentially American than the light bulb. Every elementary schooler learns that Thomas Edison, from Milan, OH, invented the light bulb at his lab in Menlo Park, NJ, and Ohio became the center of the light bulb industry.

But we have seen plants close across Ohio in Ravenna and Warren. We are told these plants are old and dated. They made the old-fashioned incandescent bulbs. Instead, now, they told us, Americans would make new, next-generation-type technology like LED bulbs. That is not exactly what happened—promises, promises.

We learned that two Ohio factories that were part of the LED light bulb supply chain in Ohio, in Bucyrus and in Logan, OH, were closing their operations.

Get this. They promised LED bulbs would be made in the United States. Today, 99—99, actually more than 99; 99 point something—percent of LED light bulb production is in China.

Think about that: 99 percent of this quintessential American invention is made in China.

When you move the entire production overseas, you move the shop floor innovation right along with it. Think about that. Much of our innovation comes because workers on the shop floor think about—as they are doing their work, they think about—better ways to produce this, and they think about making a better product. But corporate America, of course, underestimated the ingenuity of American workers or they just didn't care. So when plants moved overseas, the innovation of shops or innovation in America simply stopped.

Look at the semiconductor shortage. American research and development created the chips, and American companies did most of the manufacturing. Yet, over time, production, often fueled by incentives from foreign countries and sellout by politicians lobbied by corporate interests, moved those jobs overseas.

During the pandemic, companies across Ohio and the rest of the country shut down production lines and laid off workers because they couldn't get enough semiconductors. Whether you are the Ford Motor Company in Lima, OH; Whirlpool in Clyde, OH; Kenworth in Chillicothe, OH; Navistar in Springfield, OH, you needed those chips. In the semiconductor industry, we see the problem; we see the solution.

In the end of January, Senator PORTMAN and I flew to Columbus to join Intel to announce the largest ever investment in semiconductor manufacturing. It will create 10,000 good-paying jobs. Union tradespeople—5,000 over the next 10 years—will build this entire facility. It is possible because we are on the verge of passing a historic investment in American innovation and manufacturing.

The Senate called it the Innovation and Competition Act. The House calls it the COMPETES Act. Call it for what it is: It is the "Make It in America Act."

The bill includes the CHIPS Act to make investments like Intel in Ohio possible and to position us to lead the world again in this industry. It expands advanced manufacturing hubs and will create more of these hubs around the country, and it is a real coordinated strategy to invest in R&D.

We know our competitors like China spend billions propping up state-owned enterprises and investing in research and development. China has gotten pretty good at taking our ideas, monetizing them, and using them to compete against American businesses while paying their workers less and giving them fewer worker protection rights.

That is why, in the Banking and Housing Committee, we worked to make sure the bill includes powerful new sanctions for Chinese actors who steal trade secrets. It is why Senator PORTMAN and I are working to include our Leveling the Playing Field Act 2.0—to give American businesses updated and effective tools to fight back. We know that when we have a level playing field and when we harness the ingenuity of American workers, we can outcompete anyone.

It is time to make things in America again. Ohio has buried the term "Rust Belt." It is time for our whole country to bury the term "Rust Belt." It is long past time to pass a final "Make It in America" bill and send it to the President's desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session and vote on the confirmation of Executive Calendar No. 682, the nomination of Ruth Montenegro, under the previous order.