

And these firms have power over hundreds and hundreds of corporations in every sector of our society and many millions of workers.

So why do we want to see the trade union movement grow? Why do we want to see more and more workers entitled to negotiate decent contracts? The answer is pretty obvious, and it is because unions provide better wages, benefits, and working conditions for their members. That is what unions do—not complicated.

In fact, union workers make, on average, wages that are about 20 percent higher than their nonunion counterparts. They also have much better healthcare benefits and far better pension plans than nonunion employees. That is why it makes sense to join a union and why it makes sense for us to do everything that we can to grow the trade union movement in this country.

I know there are some folks out there who are not union members, and they are saying: Well, it doesn't really impact me.

You are wrong. It does—because when unions gain better wages and better benefits, it means that companies in the nonunion sector have got to begin to some degree to match them. So when wages go up for union workers, they go up for all workers in this country.

Further, unions give workers some degree of control over their work lives and make them more than just cogs in a machine. Today, millions and millions of people go to work, and they have no power whatsoever about what happens to them on the job. They can be fired arbitrarily. They can learn that they have to come to work the next day, when they thought they had that day off, and they have no say in any of that. So what unions do is end the ability of companies being able to arbitrarily fire workers for any reason and to impose any schedule that they want on their employees. In other words, unions give workers some degree—some degree—of control over their work lives.

Similarly, when large corporations have enormous political power through the many billions of dollars they spend on lobbying, on campaign contributions to both political parties, and on advertising, unions have the capability—because there are many millions and millions of people involved—to fight back and create a legislative agenda here in Washington and in State capitals that work for all Americans and not just the few.

What these recent union victories tell me is that working people all over this country are sick and tired of being exploited by corporations that, today, are making recordbreaking profits. They are sick and tired of billionaires like Jeff Bezos and Howard Schultz—the founder of Starbucks—becoming obscenely richer during the pandemic while they, the workers, put their lives on the line working for inadequate wages, inadequate benefits, and unfair working conditions and schedules.

Let us be clear. If you think that the union victories—recent victories—at Amazon and Starbucks are an aberration, you would be sorely mistaken. During the last year, I have been proud to work with and stand in solidarity with courageous workers all across this country who have been on strike or who are engaged in union organizing efforts. I am talking about the United Auto Workers which went on strike at John Deere in Iowa, Illinois, and Kansas to protest against massive cutbacks to retirement benefits and totally inadequate pay raises. I am talking about the United Steelworkers that went on strike at Special Metals in West Virginia—a company owned by Warren Buffett, worth \$127 billion. They were on strike to fight for decent wages and decent benefits.

I am talking about bakery workers who went on strike at Kellogg's, Nabisco, and the Jon Donaire ice cream cake factory in California, fighting for justice, dignity, and respect.

I am talking about the United Mine Workers who are still on strike at Warrior Met in Alabama, a company owned by BlackRock, the largest Wall Street investment firm in this country, managing \$10 trillion in assets.

I am talking about United Food and Commercial Workers who went on strike at the King Soopers grocery store chain owned by Kroger's in Colorado.

I am talking about graduate students and adjunct professors at MIT who are waging a strong union organizing effort on that campus.

Today, I want to continue to express my support and admiration for these workers who are not only organizing for themselves and for their coworkers but, in fact, are organizing for all of us, because when you have a strong union movement in this country, you stand the possibility of having a strong middle class.

While we may not hear much talk about the struggles of the working class in communities all across this country, what we should be clear on is that these struggles are real and are gaining momentum.

The union struggles that we are witnessing have taken place against corporate greed, which determine whether or not workers in our country have decent wages, decent benefits, and decent working conditions. It really is, I have to say, a bit obscene to take a look at these companies, owned by some of the wealthiest people in this country, who are becoming much, much richer, and all the while, they are trying to lower wages and take back benefits. It really is absolutely disgraceful.

So, Madam President, as a strong defender of the trade union movement, what I understand is that when unionized workers do well in raising the bar for economic and social justice, we all do well. Their success is our shared success. And, as I said a moment ago, make no mistake about it, we will never have a strong middle class in this

country, with decent wages and decent benefits, where workers can afford to pay the rent and send their kids to college and take a few weeks off with paid vacation—that is not going to happen unless and until we have a strong labor movement in this country.

This is the bottom line: In the year 2022, the United States and, in fact, the rest of the world face two very distinct political paths.

On one hand, there is a growing movement toward oligarchy, in which a small number of incredibly wealthy and powerful billionaires own and control a very significant part of the economy and exert enormous influence over the political life of our country, and that is precisely what we are seeing today. The rich get richer, and with their wealth, they buy and sell politicians, put huge amounts of money into the political process, huge amounts of money into lobbying, huge amounts of money into TV ads and other ways to influence people.

So that is one direction that this country can continue to move in, but there is another direction. That other direction is opposition to oligarchy and corporate greed, and it is the creation of a movement of working people and young people who are today, in ever increasing numbers, fighting for justice—economic justice, racial justice, social justice, environmental justice—and they are fighting for justice in a way that we have not seen in years. It is that growing trade union movement that makes me so very hopeful for the future of this country, and it is a movement that I hope all of us will strongly support.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, pursuant to S. Res. 27, the Judiciary Committee being tied on the question of reporting, I move to discharge the Judiciary Committee from further consideration of Ketanji Brown Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions of S. Res. 27, there will now be up to 4 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with no motions, points of order, or amendments in order.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

TOXIC EXPOSURE

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I come to the floor this Monday afternoon to speak about the importance of

our committee, a committee that the Presiding Officer serves on, and the importance of passing toxic exposure legislation to deliver the right care and the right benefits to the right veterans in the most veteran-friendly way possible—to deliver the right benefits to the right veterans in the most veteran-friendly way possible.

Our military men and women are willing to sacrifice much for our country. We must match that level of commitment by crafting thoughtful and effective solutions to make certain we provide the best outcomes, care and treatment, and benefits for those who have served our Nation.

In the past 2 years, I have heard testimony from nearly every veteran service organization emphasizing the importance of fixing the process the VA uses to provide healthcare and benefits to toxic-exposed veterans and the need to grow our knowledge to help care for the toxic wounds of war.

There have been calls for Congress to act more quickly, and I respect those calls. Our committee hears those calls. We are in lockstep on the challenge here and the need for a solution that is veteran centric. There is bipartisan consensus on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs that a phased approach—delivering healthcare now and reforming the benefits system next, in fact, as we go now—is the most effective pathway forward.

The Senate has already acted on the first step, and we are actively participating and partnering with the Department of Veterans Affairs on the second.

Senator TESTER, the chair of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I have been working together to craft a fair and transparent process for toxic-exposed veterans, beginning with the Health Care for Burn Pit Veterans Act, which unanimously passed the Senate and was sent to the House in February. This bill remains the quickest way to make certain that sick veterans who are suffering from the effects of exposure to toxic substances are immediately eligible for lifesaving healthcare.

For 6 weeks—for 6 weeks—this bill has sat in the House of Representatives rather than being sent to the President's desk to start making an impact on those sick and ailing veterans.

President Biden has called in March—I think it is March 12—called for the House to pass this legislation and is committed to signing it into law.

This legislation was cosponsored by every single member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and each of my Senate colleagues showed their support of this legislation by voting yes. This legislation was crafted by the efforts between Senator TESTER and I and members of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs. The VA Secretary has stated this bill would deliver outcomes that he cannot achieve without congressional action.

Again, the President called for this bill to be sent to his desk, so he can

sign it, and last week, at a hearing before our committee, Secretary McDonough reiterated both of these facts, underscoring the need for action. However, the House has yet to take up this important piece of legislation and, rather, sent us the PACT Act. While the PACT Act includes the critical Health Care for Burn Pit Veterans Act, signaling broad support—again, signaling broad support in the House for this legislation, it also includes late additions that lack adequate review and provisions that will stretch the VA beyond its operational capacity, making it uncertain that veterans will be able to quickly access the benefits.

The PACT Act needs to be amended. Secretary McDonough said as much before our committee last week. During that testimony, I learned about ways the PACT Act needed to be amended, and I heard about the importance of incorporating the results of the VA's ongoing pilot model, designed to determine how to better address the healthcare needs and benefits of our veterans.

If Congress acts too hastily and legislates prematurely—again, it is hard to envision a Congress ever acting too hastily. We are slow in what we do, and I again understand the need for quick action, but if we do legislate prematurely, we could end up with a situation similar to what veteran caregivers are now experiencing.

In the MISSION Act, we passed legislation giving veteran caregivers greater opportunities to care for those family members, but that system, as we saw in a hearing just a few weeks ago, is not working for veterans, and witness testimony before our committee is among the most compelling that we have ever had about the faults of the way that legislation is being implemented by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

A caregiver of a post-9/11 Army vet stated about the Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers program.

The program should have been a blessing. However, the program has become unpredictable, stressful, and, frankly, dehumanizing.

I invite those who did not view this hearing to find it and watch to see a glimpse of the future we are seeking to avoid by making certain we get this right.

The VA developed its pilot model last year to evaluate and implement presumptions for service-connection resulting in the establishment of 12 presumptions for respiratory ailments thus far. The Secretary has cited the collaboration among the best scientists to devise and execute this model.

Its potential has been demonstrated, and we should continue to review it in its entirety and allow for the process to conclude, which is to happen very shortly. The legislation we pass should not fail to take into account the work that is going on at the Department of Veterans Affairs utilizing input from veterans and the science and medical expertise of others.

The VA concluded this pilot last week, and I look forward to examining this pilot in depth to help improve legislation while mitigating disruptions to the VA's work in caring for all of our veterans. Whether statutory or regulatory, reform must establish a consistent threshold of scientific evidence, and the decision-making process must be transparent for all who were involved in the care of veterans.

Veterans who are sick and suffering have waited long enough, and they should be able to access healthcare without further delay. And when the Department completes its ongoing work, Congress can then meet the needs of veterans with the benefits they deserve.

When our men and women suffer the consequences of military service, it is our responsibility—it is our responsibility—to see that they receive the healthcare and benefits they earned. It is the right thing to do, and it is the cost of going to war. We have no option.

I highlight this for my colleagues, ask the House to proceed in passage of the legislation we sent them with unanimous consent, and I look forward to an expeditious resolution of the process the Department of Veterans Affairs is going through to make sure we know all the facts so that the legislation is right and we avoid pitfalls we have seen in other circumstances.

And with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UKRAINE

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, over this last weekend, the world saw a much clearer picture about the atrocities being committed by Russian forces in Ukraine.

As Russian troops withdrew from certain areas in the north, around Kyiv, Ukrainian forces are moving into these cities for the first time in weeks.

In Bucha, a city just north of Kyiv, devastating images showed the carnage from the Russian occupation. Photos showed burned-out apartment buildings, bodies lining the streets, and mass graves. It appears that some of the victims died execution style, with their hands tied behind their backs.

The world can be under no illusion about Putin's barbarity. Russian forces have targeted residential neighborhoods, humanitarian evacuation routes, and even a bread line. The discovery of hundreds of dead civilians in Bucha underscores the urgent need to hold Putin accountable for his crimes and to help the Ukrainians defend their country.

Of course, people around the world have united in condemnation of Putin's heinous actions, but those statements must be accompanied by further action. Putin really doesn't care whether we like him or not. He has his own plans and his own aims.

We need to take additional actions that impose even greater costs on Russia. Following Russia's unprovoked invasion, the United States and our allies

imposed powerful sanctions on Russian businesses and oligarchs and cut off Russian banks from the global financial system.

The goal, of course, is to make it impossible for Putin to fund his war machine. And in the beginning, the results were encouraging. In the immediate aftermath of the invasion, the ruble plummeted to a record low, but, unfortunately, in the last few weeks, it has slowly rebounded.

One of the biggest drivers of that stabilization is Russia's sale of oil and gas. Fortunately, the United States is no longer one of its customers, and I hope we never will be again.

Our European allies depend on Russian energy to keep the lights on, but even they are reevaluating their energy dependency and looking for alternative energy producers. Poland has committed to ending its import of Russian energy by the end of this year, and I hope more countries will follow suit. But we can't sit around and just wait for that to happen. We need to do more to raise the cost of this war, this unprovoked invasion on Ukraine.

Every day Putin persists, more innocents die. It appears Russia has found a loophole in some of our current sanctions. The Russian Federation is buying gold to offset the devaluation of the ruble and then selling gold on the international markets in exchange for high-value currency. In short, Russia is laundering money through the international gold markets, and we need to stop it.

That is why a bipartisan group of Senators, including myself, have introduced the Stop Russian GOLD Act that would bring an end to this circumvention of our sanctions. This legislation would apply sanctions to parties who help Russia finance their war by buying and selling this blood gold.

That means anyone who buys or transports gold from Russia's central bank holdings would themselves be the target of sanctions—a big deterrent for anyone considering doing business with Russia.

We need to take every measure possible to cut the financing of Putin's war machine, and this is one important way to do so.

This is not just a matter of countering Russia or supporting Ukraine, we must remain clear-eyed in our efforts to do both. We have to do both. Of course, the ultimate goal is to help Ukraine vanquish Russian forces entirely. The United States and our allies have already provided a large quantity of military assets to Ukraine. And there is no question: These resources have been critical in the Ukrainians' success so far.

But there is no substitution for the will to fight and the leadership being provided by President Zelenskyy. That, I believe, has been the difference—and certainly not what Vladimir Putin anticipated.

But as we continue to hear from President Zelenskyy and our partners

in Europe, we know we need to do more, and we need to do it faster. I know it is easy to think, well, we will just let the supply chains and the logistic systems work as they always have, but we are not being bombarded by Russian artillery or being attacked by cruise missiles, as are the Ukrainians.

Last month, I traveled to Poland and Germany with Senator ERNST and a bipartisan group of Senate colleagues to hear directly from those who are most in harm's way.

The primary message we heard was: We need more. We need more humanitarian aid; we need more weapons; and we need it faster—more Stingers, more Javelins, more air defenses, more lethal aid, including the need for aircraft.

I remain somewhat confused and disappointed that the Biden administration still publicly refuses to transfer MiG-29 aircraft to Ukraine so that they can use them.

I know it is easy for us to sit back and say, Well, they really don't know how to use them, or they don't need them, but the fact is Ukrainian pilots are trained to fly these Russian aircraft—and who are we to deny President Zelenskyy and the valiant Ukrainians whatever they think they need in order to do the job?

President Biden explicitly said Putin "can't remain in power." But then his administration seems to blame something like a simple transfer of aircraft as too provocative.

This doesn't make any sense. We can't play into Putin's hand by withholding needed or desired military assets to Ukraine. We in Congress need to play our part as well to make sure that anything and everything we can do to help the brave Ukrainians, we are doing. And we can't move at the speed of the normal bureaucracy.

Every day, Ukrainians are being killed—both the military and civilians alike—by Putin's war machine. They need help now, not after the Senate's next work period, not after the Biden administration succumbs to a public pressure campaign. They need help now.

Unfortunately, Congress doesn't have the authority to insist upon the transfer of the Polish MiGs, but we can remove some of the redtape that prevents the timely transfer of other defense articles Ukraine needs. Mr. CARDIN, the senior Senator from Maryland, and I have introduced bipartisan legislation called Ukraine Democracy Defense Lend-Lease Act to ensure that Ukrainian forces have the resources they need to win this fight.

Our bill is rooted in the same principles as the original Lend-Lease Act in World War II that was largely responsible for supplying Britain and our other allies the planes, the ammunition, and the weapons they needed in order to defeat Nazi Germany. President Roosevelt, at the time, vowed to transform the United States into the arsenal of democracy, and the Lend-Lease Act was one way we did that.

I think it is important, particularly at this perilous time, for us to send another strong bipartisan message that we are not just in this for the short haul, we are in this for the long haul, for however long it lasts, for however long the Ukrainians are willing to fight to defend their country against this invasion, and this is one way we can do it.

This legislation authorizes the President to enter into lend-lease agreements directly with Ukraine and provide Ukrainian forces with the lethal weapons needed to defend their sovereignty.

Part of the difficulty of transferring these weapons is the supply chains and production lines for the weapons that are being used at a high rate.

What the Lend-Lease Act would do would be to send the message that, again, we are in this for the long haul, and the manufacturers of these weapons can be assured that if they are willing to be part of that arsenal of democracy, they won't be left hanging or left high and dry.

In short, this will also allow us to answer Ukraine's call to provide more of what they need and get it to them as quickly as possible.

So far, more than 20 Senators from both sides of the aisle have cosponsored this legislation, and I hope we can pass it and pass it soon. This is an emergency. We don't have time to dither, and Congress has the opportunity right now to do more to provide support to Ukraine.

So I say, let's pass this legislation and ensure Ukrainians have what they need when they need it. It is absolutely critical for the Senate to pass this legislation, and it doesn't matter which route they take to the President's desk. They could move as stand-alone bills or as part of a larger package of bills or as amendments to a bipartisan piece of legislation that passed the House last month. The actual vehicle isn't important. What matters is that we get these bills to the President's desk as soon as possible. Every day that goes by without action on our part is a day wasted and another day that innocent Ukrainians are being killed.

To have the best shot at winning this conflict, Ukraine needs two things: a strong defense and a weak opponent. This week, the Senate has an opportunity to pass two bipartisan bills that address both of those efforts, and I hope we will do so this week.

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

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

INFLATION

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, it has just come over the wire—the news

just broke in the last couple of days—that corporate profits are at the highest they have been since 1950. In other words, corporations are making more money in the calendar year 2021 than any year since 1950. That is 70-plus years. Corporate profits are through the roof.

We also know—and that came out today—the Wall Street Journal, a very pro-business, pro-corporate America newspaper, pointed out that CEO compensation has gone up stratospherically.

We know, as the Presiding Officer from Illinois has pointed out in the past, too, that corporate profits have continued to go up, that CEO pay has been stratospheric, and that workers' wages have essentially been flat.

We also know that corporations—especially oil companies, shipping companies, meatpacking companies, and drug companies—have raised their prices dramatically higher than inflation.

So what we are seeing is that corporate profits are the highest in 70 years; CEO compensation is the highest ever—big raises last year; and prices have gone up, especially in those four industries, because they have essentially taken advantage of the pandemic, the opportunity during the pandemic for them to raise prices.

So one of the biggest reasons we have inflation is not because we invested in the American people with the Recovery Act and the bipartisan infrastructure bill; one of the biggest reasons for inflation is corporate executives saw an opportunity during the pandemic. All these supply chain issues, all these problems of outsourcing jobs to China—in the meatpacking industry and the oil industry and the prescription drug industry, in industry after industry—the shipping industry—these CEOs are thinking they can raise their prices more. So they have raised their prices more, their profits have gone up, executive compensation continues to go up dramatically, and then they blame inflation on the President or blame inflation on the Congress or whatever.

The fact is that these companies have abused the public trust, as we know, by dramatically raising prices in one of the most difficult times in our Nation's history, during this pandemic. They should be ashamed of themselves, but many of them brag to stockholders "Look how well we are doing," and that is a serious problem.

In fact, there is a company in Ohio that not too long ago announced—a big, storied U.S. company, Goodyear—that they were going to expand manufacturing in the United States. Do you know what happened? Their stock price went down because these companies decided that maybe that is not such a good thing. The stockholders decided it.

Starbucks' CEO has come back—the CEO and the founder—and he announced that his company was going to

cut back or eliminate some of the executive compensation, some of the stock buybacks. His stock price went down.

So investors are saying: Yeah, we love our country, but if it is going to help workers, maybe we are not so excited, or if it is going to help communities, maybe we are not so excited.

It is sort of capitalism upside down. We know from this President and from what we are doing, our economy is growing faster than China's—first time in 20 years. We know that the President and the Senate and the House are putting workers in the center of our economic policy. But we know CEOs aren't following that playbook. They are squeezing workers as hard as they can. They are paying themselves more in stock buybacks. Their profits are up. Their stock prices, when they talk—we know all those things. Yet CEO behavior simply hasn't changed.

Our mission as Members of this body is to continue to invest in workers, to continue to invest in the middle class, to continue to advocate for the dignity of work, and continue to put workers in the center of our economy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

BORDER SECURITY

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, last week, the Biden administration announced their truly incomprehensible decision to suspend the use of title 42 authority along the southern border. Now, this is just the last in a long line of decisions that this White House has made that defy both reason and a mountain of evidence suggesting they are about to make a deadly mistake.

Even with those title 42 protections in place, this February was the worst February for illegal immigration and border crossings in almost 20 years. The past year was the worst year for illegal border crossings since at least 1960, and according to public reports, the Department of Homeland Security predicts that it is only going to get worse. We will soon see the crossings increase.

They are preparing for up to 18,000 attempted border crossings per day. That is right—18,000 attempted crossings per day. Now, I want to put this in perspective for you. About 90 percent of the 345 towns in my State of Tennessee have a population smaller than 18,000 people—smaller than the number of people DHS expects are going to try to enter the country illegally every single day. This is chaos. This is border chaos. Think about this: That is like a small Tennessee town every single day of the week, of the month, of the year.

So we have to ask ourselves, how long can we sustain this? And when we look at this border that is in chaos and 18,000 a day—a small town a day coming into the country, trying to claim asylum, illegally entering the country. And we have evidence that this is going to escalate sooner rather than later. And this is the moment that the Biden

administration chooses to strip away one of the most important and effective border control tools that we have at our disposal—take it away just as we know that people are coming to the border in record numbers.

And how do we know this? We know that the cartels are now working in countries all across the globe. They are doing this because they are saying: Hey, now you are really going to get in. Pay up. Make the cartels richer because you know this, President Biden—he is all for doing away with the border. He is all for opening that border up and saying: Come on. Come on.

I think that we have to keep in mind a few things. Now, when you keep that in mind—those 18,000 people a day—think about the new set of statistics that we have coming from Border Patrol this month. So far this year, CBP officers in Memphis have seized more than 2,500 pounds of drugs. You know, I had a sheriff tell me: We used to look at drugs in grams and ounces. Now it is all in pounds because of the quantities coming across this border because of Joe Biden's policies.

During the last 2 weeks of March, officials in El Paso seized more than 100 pounds of drugs and arrested 37 fugitives. Those fugitives weren't petty criminals. Among them were a murderer, a pedophile, a fraudster, a counterfeiter, and multiple drug dealers. Yes, that was 2 weeks, and that is what they had right there in El Paso. These are the ones they could identify. And, in addition to the drugs, 37 fugitives from justice were trying to enter our country and escape justice in their country. It is an open door. This is dangerous—very dangerous.

On March 29, in a separate drug bust, Border Patrol seized more than \$400,000 worth of meth, fentanyl, and heroin. That is right. That was 1 day, one drug bust. And over the course of a 24-hour period ending on March 30, Border Patrol stopped five migrant smuggling events and arrested 140 people.

Now, I thought it was interesting that CBP chose to use the term "migrant smuggling" for that one, but I think we should call it what it is: It is human trafficking—5 human trafficking events, 1 day, 140 people.

You know, I just have to say, what in the world does this administration think is going on at that border? Why will the President not go down there? Why will he not empower people to do their job? Why will he not build a wall, put surveillance, apprehend people, turn them back? But to knowingly let them come into this country, to know that cartels are working around the globe, that they are going to get rich on this—it is kind of like the Biden bonus for the cartels. The doors are open; bring them.

This is unbelievable—absolutely unbelievable. These drug dealers and human traffickers spend their days running back and forth across that border under the watchful eye of the cartels. The cartels are in control on the

Mexico side of this border. You do not come across unless you have paid the cartel.

And those cartels are going to use those 18,000 people, the equivalent of a Tennessee town—90-percent of our towns are 18,000 people or less—coming across, being used by the cartels as human shields. What kind of compassion is this? What kind of protection for the American people is this? It is disgusting.

We know that these cartels are going to be able to push these people into the interior, and then those people are going to lose themselves in this wave of humanity, because that is what they have been doing for the past 15 months.

Meanwhile, here in Washington, Democrats have spent 15 months attacking border security as a racist barrier to their open borders agenda. Their spin isn't rooted in reality, but neither is their current ambition to throw open the border in the name of optics. I want to be clear here. If the Democrats indeed abandon title 42, they might bump up their approval numbers with the liberal base, but they are also inviting a humanitarian catastrophe on a massive scale.

Yes, indeed, as I was out in East Tennessee, up on the Upper Cumberland Plateau, this Friday, what I heard from every single law enforcement officer, every county mayor was that, now, because of the human trafficking, the gangs, drug trafficking, sex trafficking, every single town is a border town. Every State is a border State, because all these people coming across the border are coming to your community with their drugs, with their gangs. And if we empower the cartels and open the floodgates to drug dealers and human traffickers, we are not just putting our own communities at risk, we are endangering the thousands of women and children that these criminals are hiding behind because they are trafficking them. So much for their optics.

I think it is clear by now that the Biden administration is almost entirely controlled by the activists who helped him gain power. When people back home ask me to describe what it is like working in the Senate these days, I tell them it feels like a food fight between liberal special interest groups. The Democrats are just throwing spaghetti against the wall, waiting to see what sticks.

Now, they have made a real mess, but they can't seem to gain traction on anything. So why is that? Well, because the reality of the situation in New York and California and Illinois tells the people all they need to know about what is in store for the country if the Democrats get what they want.

They are working with a truly miserable track record. Take a look at it: 7.9 percent inflation. The prices are going up, whether it is at the gas pump or the grocery store. Zero commitment to border security—we are seeing that played out in realtime. Embassies in Afghanistan and Ukraine are left to

rot. That is right. He pulled people out. He pulled people out and left a lot of our people behind—and a nominee for the Supreme Court who is proudly untethered to the Constitution.

Joe Biden really has earned that 55 percent disapproval rating; hasn't he?

Unlike our friends in the mainstream media who think this is all a joke, the American people are taking this very seriously. For them, common sense isn't political. It is practical, and it is necessary. They don't need an activist or a journalist or a comedian to tell them what they believe. They know everything that Joe Biden and his administration and the Democrat control of the House and Senate—everything they have touched has turned to dust, is on a downward slide—everything. Just look at this. Look at what they have done in a very short period of time.

They also know, when it comes to our Supreme Court Justice nominee—people in Tennessee know what a woman is. They don't need a biologist to tell them. They know that reckless government spending is making their life more expensive every day and, in some cases, unaffordable. And they know full well because many of them have worked, been a part of our military, volunteered to serve. They are people who have come home, and they are working in law enforcement. They know and will tell you that peace comes through strength, not through surrender, and they are not going to tolerate a government that claims ignorance of all this, that wants to do happy talk and say: Everything is going to be just fine. Don't believe your eyes. Don't believe your eyes. Don't believe that price at the gas pump. Oh, the grocery store shelves, they are full—even though the produce aisles may be mostly empty.

They know that the woke mob is knocking at their door, and they know the consequences and what it means to them.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam 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 KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, it was just a short time ago in the Senate Judiciary Committee that we voted to advance the nomination of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to serve as the next Associate Justice on the United States Supreme Court.

In the coming days, Judge Jackson's nomination will come before the full Senate. We are on track to confirm her this week.

Judge Jackson is an outstanding nominee. She has earned support across the political and ideological spectrums, and her qualifications are

second to none. Most importantly, Judge Jackson's record on the bench is one of evenhandedness, impartiality, and independence.

Despite this, not a single Republican on the Judiciary Committee would vote in favor of her nomination. I am disappointed—not surprised, but disappointed. As a result, Judge Jackson will be the first Supreme Court nominee in the modern era to require a discharge from the Judiciary Committee. It is unfortunate, in one respect, given that she is more prepared to serve on the High Court than, perhaps, any nominee in living memory, even by the standards of our Republican colleagues.

During the Trump administration, Senate Republicans laid out what they viewed as being the standards for supporting a Supreme Court nominee. In their own words, a nominee to the High Court should be confirmed if they meet three criteria. Let's take a look at those criteria.

First, Republicans have argued that you must have mainstream, bipartisan support for a nominee. For instance, in speaking out about then-Judge Gorsuch, the senior Senator from Texas said that Gorsuch was "a mainstream nominee unanimously supported by Democrats in the past."

Well, lucky for them, Judge Jackson is well within that judicial mainstream, and she has the receipts to show it.

Judge Jackson is supported by multiple Federal judges appointed by Republican Presidents, including Judge Thomas Griffith, Judge Michael Luttig, and Judge Bruce Selya. She is supported by dozens of conservative lawyers, including former Secretary of Homeland Security Michael Chertoff, former Deputy Attorney General Donald Ayer, and former Solicitor General Charles Fried. She has broad support from law enforcement organizations and former prosecutors.

They keep saying: Oh, she is soft on crime. She has the endorsement of the largest police organization in America—the Fraternal Order of Police—and the International Association of Chiefs of Police and 87 former assistant U.S. attorneys who have prosecuted a range of criminal offenses here in the District of Columbia. Soft on crime? The prosecutors don't think so.

And, like Judge Gorsuch, Judge Jackson has been unanimously supported by Senate Republicans, especially since she was confirmed unanimously by the Senate not once but twice to be a member of the U.S. Sentencing Commission and a district court judge.

In short, Judge Jackson has had mainstream, bipartisan support right here in the Senate over and over again.

The second standard laid out by Republicans during the Trump administration was that a Supreme Court nominee must have exceptional legal credentials.

We went for 4 straight days. She faced 24 hours of questioning—24 hours

of question after question after question, written questions, oral questions—over and over. How many questioned her qualifications to be on the Supreme Court? None. Not one.

In 2018, for instance, the Republican leader called then-Judge Kavanaugh an “absolute all-star,” specifically mentioning he was a Yale undergrad, Yale Law, and had impeccable credentials.

Judge Jackson passes that same test. She clerked at every level of the Federal judiciary. I can tell you, as a lawyer, that to be a clerk for any judge has great honor and distinction. To be a clerk on all three levels of the Federal court, including the Supreme Court, is extraordinary. It just hardly ever occurs. It did for Judge Jackson.

She served as a Federal public defender, a staff attorney, a commissioner on the Sentencing Commission, and as a lawyer in private practice. Her resume is absolutely star-studded in terms of legal experience. For almost a decade, she served on the Federal bench, handling some 1,100 matters, issuing 600 written opinions. Do you want to know what she thinks about an issue? how she thinks about an issue? Just read the written opinions on every type of legal issue imaginable that came before her.

Altogether, Judge Jackson meets, if not exceeds, the qualifications of previous nominees, and the Senate Republicans have enthusiastically supported them. They should support her.

The third and final standard Republicans have articulated for supporting a Supreme Court nominee is they must have a judicial record and a reputation of evenhandedness.

In 2020, for instance, the Republican leader highlighted then-Judge Amy Coney Barrett’s “openminded judicial temperament,” Amy Coney Barrett.

Well, by the very same metric, Judge Jackson easily passes muster. Her record on the bench is clearly one of impartiality and independence. She has ruled for and against the Presidents of both political parties. She has ruled for prosecutors and ruled for criminal defendants. She has ruled for employers and employees. In her nearly 10 years on the bench, Judge Jackson has displayed no political or ideological favoritism.

Some people on the far left are upset that she isn’t more of an advocate for their point of view. She takes a balanced approach to it. She has never allowed her personal views to influence any outcome, and she has been a model of judicial restraint. She has been guided by precedent, by fidelity to the rule of law, and by an unyielding belief that the Constitution must work for all Americans.

I was listening when Senator McCONNELL came to the floor and announced that he would not vote for her. The No. 1 reason: She wouldn’t take a position on packing the Court—packing the Court. That is a question of changing the composition of the Supreme Court, the number of Supreme Court Justices.

There has only been one elected official in recent memory who has changed the composition of the Court—Senator McConnell. You will remember, with the Scalia vacancy, he kept it vacant for more than 8 months and denied President Obama the opportunity to fill it.

What about the issue of the future composition of the Court? Is that a requirement for someone to be supported by the Senator from Kentucky? Obviously not. Amy Coney Barrett wouldn’t answer the question. She wouldn’t give an opinion. She, like Judge Jackson, said: That is a matter of policy. That is for Congress to decide—and it is.

Judge Jackson easily passed the three tests the Senate Republicans established for supporting a Supreme Court nominee, and she passed the tests with flying colors. She is, simply put, one of the Nation’s brightest legal minds. She has outstanding credentials, an unimpeachable character, and an unwavering dedication to the rule of law. She is smart, and it shows.

Judge Jackson also has the temperament. I can’t tell you how many times during the course of the 24 hours of questioning she faced last week in the Senate Judiciary Committee that I thought: That is it. I am going to look up at that table, and she is going to stand up and say, “Enough. My family, we are going home. We have had it.” She never did—cool under attack, calm under pressure, solid as a pillar.

She has the acumen, the skill—the kind of attributes we demand from a Supreme Court nominee—and she has devoted her life to serving her country, always working to uphold and honor the Constitution. She is dedicated to protecting judicial independence, advancing freedom and liberty, and to making the Court, its work, and its decisions accessible to all Americans.

She told that story of when she was up for the circuit court—that her opinions were long, she said, because she wanted everyone to understand her thinking from start to finish—no mystery here—and that she wanted the people appearing before her to understand what just happened in that courtroom. Why did they win? Why did they lose? What were the issues that were at stake? What did she think about? She takes the time to explain it because she believes in the law, and she wants all of us to understand and believe it as well.

I am going to proudly cast my vote to discharge Judge Jackson from the Judiciary Committee. Later this week, I am going to proudly cast my vote to confirm Judge Jackson as the first Black woman to sit on the U.S. Supreme Court.

Let’s not hurry to leave for an Easter recess—and I am as anxious as everyone to be with our families—and overlook the obvious. This is a seminal moment in American history. We are breaking down a wall that has been standing for too long. There have been 115 Supreme Court Justices in our his-

tory, and 108 look like me: a White guy. The others are representing women, representing Latinas, and others. They are, of course, very important in history. This is too.

Judge Jackson is going to be an important part of America, and she is going to inspire a lot of people, particularly young women, to aspire to greatness.

She was discouraged, if you will remember her testimony. She went up to Harvard and toured it during a national debate team appearance. She liked it so much that she went back to her high school counselor in Florida and said: I think I want to apply to Harvard.

The counselor said: Listen, honey. Don’t do that. You are going to be so disappointed. Let’s think about some other choices for you.

She did it anyway. She was accepted and went up there, knees shaking, wondering if she could cut it. She not only cut it; she set records in terms of achievement, particularly for a person with her background. Her dad worked as a schoolteacher, went to law school, and convinced her that law was the future for her as well.

She has told so many wonderful stories about her family. This is an exceptional woman. She has lived an extraordinary life. She has a beautiful family. She has written a record we can all be proud of. Let’s discharge this nomination from the Judiciary Committee and bring it to the floor this week. Let’s make history—the right kind of history for America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

UKRAINE

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, it hardly seemed possible that the reports and images from Ukraine could grow even more horrifying, but they actually have.

In recent days, Ukrainian troops have reclaimed the town of Bucha from the illegal and illegitimate Russian invasion. And in the wake of the retreating Russians, the Ukrainians and the press have reported evidence of evil, wanton torture, rape, and murder of civilians. There are reports of mass graves, of people executed with their hands bound behind their backs. The photographs and reports are sickening and appalling.

Since before Putin even began his escalation, I have spent months pushing the Biden administration and our allies and partners to get as much lethal assistance possible to the Ukrainians as quickly as possible. I have supported

many of the steps our President has gotten around to taking, but in almost every case, I wish he had acted sooner and more boldly.

We know of the horrors committed by Russian forces in Bucha because the Ukrainian military reclaimed the town after pushing back the Russians. These latest revelations must only strengthen and intensify our resolve to get the Ukrainians what they need, on the timeframe they need, to liberate more towns currently under Russian control, to prevent Russia from committing new atrocities, to fight and to actually win this war.

This also further reinforces what I wish more of our European friends realize: This is a time for choosing. This is not a time for business as usual, and there can be no return to business as usual whenever and however the dust settles.

Europe must move more urgently to decouple from Russia. Yes, this will entail some short-term economic pain. Yes, their own shortsighted energy policies have left their countries entirely too dependent. But there are times when geopolitical realities and moral imperatives must outweigh short-term financial costs. Our partners should recognize that such a time is staring them right in the face, so should our own American private sector.

Internationally, I am sure there will be much virtue-signaling rhetoric over the atrocities committed on Ukrainian soil by Russia. Let us be honest that referrals to the International Criminal Court or invocations of the U.N. Human Rights Council may make people's consciences feel better but will not curtail the atrocities or stop the violence. Only victory in Ukraine can do that.

Finally, the outpouring of outrage at these atrocities should prompt a second look at other terrible actions that the world has come to simply shrug and accept.

The Biden administration is right to ask the U.N. to expel Russia from the Human Rights Council, but they shouldn't stop there. The world that rightly recoils in horror at the photographs from Ukraine should not look the other way past Xi's concentration camps for the Uighur people. The modern totalitarianism of the People's Republic of China is no less abhorrent because it is sanitized and it is organized. The world's worst abusers of human rights do not deserve to sit on such a Council.

BORDER SECURITY

Madam President, now on another matter, our southern border is already in crisis on Democrats' watch. And on Friday, the Biden administration announced they are going to throw open the floodgates even wider.

In December 2020, right before President Biden took office, he said it would be "the last thing we need" if we were to "end up with two million people on our border." But in 2021, on his watch,

under his policies, that is exactly what America got.

Last year saw a record-shattering 2 million arrests on our southern border; 2 million people—more than the population of 13 whole States—from at least 160 different countries. And those are just the people who actually got caught. And 2022 is already on track to be even worse. As we speak, border officials are encountering roughly 7,000 persons each day, and the Department of Homeland Security predicts this pace could more than double.

The Biden administration's own officials say they are contingency planning for 18,000 encounters every single day. For perspective, that pace would be equivalent to 6.6 million—6.6 million—per year, a population larger than all but 17 of our States.

Now, thus far, the Biden administration kept using a legal tool called title 42, which they inherited from the prior administration because of the COVID pandemic.

Title 42 provides a shortcut for swift border enforcement. It has given the administration a fast track to turn people around as they arrive.

In February, more than 91,000 people were immediately turned around under title 42. Another 73,000 were allowed to stay and navigate our system.

So, without title 42, instead of adding 73,000 illegal immigrants to our system alone, we would have added more than double that—160,000—in just 1 month. But, on Friday, the Biden administration announced an unbelievably bad decision. They are going to further cave to the far left that wants open borders. They are going to cancel title 42 this spring with no real border security plan to replace it.

This is such an absurd decision, such an unforced gaffe, that even some of our Senate Democratic colleagues have come out swinging. Our colleague from West Virginia correctly described this as "a frightening decision" to abandon "an essential tool" when "we are already facing an unprecedented increase in migrants." Another Senate Democrat said, "This is the wrong decision." A third said it "shows a lack of understanding about the crisis at our border." A fourth said the move "will likely lead to a migrant surge that the administration does not appear to be ready for."

The problem is that these same Senate Democrats have backed this far-left administration over and over again on immigration. Every single Democratic Senator supported both Secretaries Mayorkas and Becerra. Every single Democrat Senator voted against preserving "Remain in Mexico," voted against defunding sanctuary cities, and voted against an amendment that would have funded the full enforcement of all immigration laws.

Later this week, we expect every Democratic Senator to vote to confirm a Supreme Court nominee who is a proven judicial activist on this very issue. Judge Jackson has gone beyond

the judicial role to rewrite immigration policy from the bench and make it even more liberal. In one case, she ignored the plain text of the law to reach a more liberal outcome. She even tried to force a nationwide injunction on the entire country. Judge Jackson went so far beyond the law to remake immigration policy that even the liberal DC Circuit had to overturn her mistaken ruling. An Obama appointee wrote the decision that overturned Judge Jackson.

So I am glad to see our Democratic colleagues belatedly waking up to the border crisis and beginning to pressure the administration. Fourteen months late is better than never. But votes speak louder than press releases. The measure of a Senator's position isn't our rhetoric; it is actually our votes.

If our colleagues who have stood in lockstep with President Biden's border crisis thus far are serious about turning over a new leaf, they can start with the Supreme Court vote later this week.

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

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in a few moments, the Senate will begin to make history this week by voting to discharge the nomination of Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson out of the Judiciary Committee so we can confirm her as the next Associate Justice of the Supreme Court.

This procedural step should be entirely unnecessary. There is no question—no question—that Judge Jackson deserves a strong bipartisan vote in committee, but sadly, despite the judge's qualifications, not a single Republican on the committee voted to report her out of committee.

So we shouldn't have to be taking this step, but we are moving forward all the same without delay. Despite Republicans opposing her in committee and despite this procedural vote tonight, the end result will remain unchanged: Judge Jackson ultimately has enough support to get confirmed on a bipartisan basis, and the Senate is going to keep working until this nomination is complete.

In closing, I want to emphasize something I said earlier today. This is a joyous and history-making moment for the Senate—a historic one. One hundred fifteen individuals have come before this Chamber for consideration to the highest Court in the land, but none—none—were like Judge Jackson. Like many before her, Judge Jackson is brilliant. She is esteemed. She is highly accomplished. But never, never has the Supreme Court had a Black woman bear the title of "Justice."

Imagine the impact this will have on our democracy. Imagine what it will mean for young people across the country to look at our courts and see them better reflect our Nation's makeup. Judge Jackson's brilliant record will surely light a fire of inspiration for others to follow in her footsteps, and our country will be all the better for it.

So let us move forward with this brilliant, this resoundingly qualified, this historic nominee to the highest Court in the land, and let us work together to finish the job of confirming the judge by the end of this week.

VOTE ON MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time remaining be yielded back, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

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

All time having been yielded back, the question occurs on agreeing to the motion to discharge.

The yeas and nays were previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 126 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—47

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 47.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to S. Res. 27 and the motion to discharge having been agreed to, the nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The majority leader.

MOTION TO DISCHARGE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, pursuant to S. Res. 27, the Banking Committee being tied on the question of reporting, I move to discharge the Banking Committee from further consideration of Julia Ruth Gordon, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Housing and Urban Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the provisions of S. Res. 27, there will now be up to 4 hours of debate on the motion, equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, with no

motions, points of order, or amendments in order.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Republican leader, that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 783, James C. O'Brien, of Nebraska, to be Head of the Office of Sanctions Coordination, with the rank of Ambassador; that there be 30 minutes for debate equally divided in the usual form on the nomination; and that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. 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.

NOTICE OF A TIE VOTE UNDER S. RES. 27

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to print the following letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC.

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN1783, the nomination of Ketanji Brown Jackson, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, having been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee, with a quorum present, has voted on the nomination as follows—

(1) on the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed, 11 ayes to 11 noes; and

In accordance with section 3, paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote, and ask that this notice be printed in the RECORD pursuant to the resolution.

RICHARD J. DURBIN.

NOTICE OF A TIE VOTE UNDER S. RES. 27

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to print the fol-

lowing letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC.

To the Secretary of the Senate:

PN1684, the nomination of Arianna J. Freeman, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, having been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee, with a quorum present, has voted on the nomination as follows—

(1) on the question of reporting the nomination favorably with the recommendation that the nomination be confirmed, 11 ayes to 11 noes; and

In accordance with section 3, paragraph (1)(A) of S. Res. 27 of the 117th Congress, I hereby give notice that the Committee has not reported the nomination because of a tie vote, and ask that this notice be printed in the RECORD pursuant to the resolution.

RICHARD J. DURBIN.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATION

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

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

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

DEFENSE SECURITY
COOPERATION AGENCY,
Arlington, VA.

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

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 22-14, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Bulgaria for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$1.673 billion. After this letter is delivered to your office, we plan to issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale.

Sincerely,

JAMES A. HURSCH,
Director.

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 22-14

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

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Bulgaria.