

This is what happens when you really have no vision for the future of the country. It is all about power, all about control.

Last month, the Harvard Kennedy School Institute of Politics released a poll showing that this distinction between agenda and vision actually matters to people. They found that 56 percent of young Americans, ages 18 to 29, disapprove of Joe Biden's job performance. That is correct; 56 percent disapprove. And just last spring, 59—that is right, 59—percent of young persons were still in his corner.

Look at what is happening. Look at that flip that is taking place.

The measure of success or failure for this administration shouldn't come down to how many boxes they can check off their wish list but how many young Americans look at what they are doing, and they say: I can't support this. This does not give me hope. This does not look good for my future.

Indeed, 56 percent of young Americans, ages 18 to 29, disapprove of the Biden agenda.

Right now, this age group, they are losing hope. That same Harvard poll shows that their top concern isn't the environment; it isn't abortion or *Roe v. Wade*; it is the economy. And why wouldn't it be? The current inflation rate is 8.5 percent. Last year, it was 2.6 percent.

How can anyone be expected to plan for their future if they are struggling to plan for next week's grocery run? They are paying a premium just to live.

Meanwhile, the President is asking them to sacrifice even more so he can check some more boxes on his to-do list that is all about this leftist agenda. It is not about the people; it is about power; it is about control.

Young Americans—and I would say all Americans, Tennesseans—deserve better than this. They deserve leaders who have a vision for the future of this country, who have the God-given common sense to see it through.

Joe Biden and the Democrats have been in power for more than a year. The window for blame-shifting and excuses is closed. It is shut. It is time for the President to abandon this self-destructive agenda and give the American people a fighting chance at reclaiming their own vision for the future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. KAINE. Madam President, in a moment, I am going to make a motion by unanimous consent to call up, and hopefully confirm, significant appointments in the Department of Defense.

We are in the midst of a war in Europe right now. It is hard to imagine that, and yet it is the case. Every day we see atrocities committed by Vladimir Putin's illegal invasion of Ukraine, but every day we also see the concerted

effort of the United States and NATO allies and other nations to provide dramatic support for the Ukrainian defense force and the Ukrainian people.

We honor the Ukrainians' resolve and heroism, and we feel proud of the role that the United States and other nations are playing in providing defense. And I hope we will take additional defense support up on the floor in the days to come. However, this is not easy work to do.

One of the positions that I am going to be seeking a UC on is the DOD Assistant Secretary for Sustainment, Christopher Lowman, who is a Virginian. He and his family live in Fredericksburg.

Mr. Lowman is, according to the committee, completely noncontroversial and very much desired in this position.

He was born in Germany, in a military family, grew up in Virginia, went to college in New Jersey. He was a U.S. marine beginning in 1984, and then after his Active Marine service, entered the Army civil service as an Army maintenance management intern in 1989. And he has been with the Army ever since.

His specialty is logistics. So this Assistant Secretary of Sustainment is kind of the peak logistics officer in the Pentagon.

He previously was the Acting Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology. OK. That is a title that is—you know, what does that actually mean? I will tell you what it means. When the United States is trying to get historic amounts of military aid across a contested border from allied countries into a war zone, we need people who know logistics. It may not be the sexiest part of the military mission, but it is part of the mission that is absolutely critical, and it is part of the mission where the U.S. military is second to none in the world.

If you wonder why the Russian military's grand plans to topple Ukraine in just a couple of days came to naught, you first say it is Ukrainian heroism, and you second say it is the support of our allies, but, third, you have to point out the Russian military has demonstrated that they haven't mastered logistics. The inability to maintain supply chains, the inability to do proper maintenance of tanks and other vehicles is one of the reasons that the Russians have not been able to accomplish their aims. So what this war in Europe is demonstrating is militaries that have the capacity to do logistics and provide supplies to people on the front end of the fight are critical to success.

Given the fact that the United States is the key to pulling together the international effort to provide support to the Ukrainian defense force, and given the fact that that mission depends upon having the best logistics in the world, why would we leave the chief logistics official at the Pentagon

position vacant in the middle of a war when the United States is playing this heroic role?

For that reason, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 477, 599, 777, 779, 780, 781, 861, and 886; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I find myself here on the floor again as my friend the Senator from Virginia, whose sincerity and urgency on this issue I don't doubt for a second, tries to move a whole slate of nominees to which multiple Republican Senators have objections. And let me give you a sense of why.

One of the nominees that my friend is attempting to move here, let's be clear, to do this without a vote—we could be voting on these nominees. The majority leader could schedule votes on them any time, but he hasn't done that. He hasn't done it in some of the cases for months.

This is an act—this is a request to suspend the regular order of the Senate and to confirm these nominees without a vote. Well, I, for one, am not going to consent to confirming without a vote people like Ravi Chaudhary. He is being nominated for Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Mr. Chaudhary, who appeared before the Armed Services Committee, on which I sit, as does my friend from Virginia—Mr. Chaudhary has proposed using AI technology—artificial intelligence—to track members of the military, identify them as extremists, and then have them expelled.

He said:

The key to disrupting them—

Meaning “extremists,” his word, people whose views he doesn't agree with.

The key to disrupting them is uncovering and understanding their initial behaviors, elements that are contained in their electronic footprints.

What Mr. Chaudhary has proposed to do is to use surveillance on members of the U.S. military to determine whether they might, in the future, commit acts that he might disapprove of and then to take action against these members of the military.

In 2015, he wrote this: that the military exhibits a “culture of xenophobic cronyism.” And he went on to say that there was a “xenophobic command climate” in the U.S. military today.

I said to Mr. Chaudhary, at the time when we had our hearing, that I cannot

believe that he would propose to use surveillance on members of the U.S. military to track their speech, to track their activity online, to track their movements online, all in an effort to decide if they might, in the future, commit acts that he disagrees with.

I submit to you, Madam President, not only is that wrong; it is blatantly unconstitutional—blatantly unconstitutional—and it is frightening. What is further frightening is that he would be nominated for a leadership position in the Department of Defense.

I call on the President of the United States to withdraw this nomination today, just as he should withdraw his unconstitutional disinformation board that he is attempting to force on the American people as we speak. This is the most radically anti-free-speech administration in American history. Their actions are an affront to the basic constitutional values of this Nation, including and especially the First Amendment.

I am appalled—appalled—at what this administration is doing—censoring American citizens, surveilling them—and now advocating it in the U.S. military, to the men and women who put their lives on the line?

So, no, I will not consent to have this individual, who never should have been nominated for this position, fast-tracked to be confirmed without a vote, without a single, solitary vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Kaine. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. Hawley. I think you have the floor, Senator; so, yes, I think—

Mr. Kaine. Will the Senator yield for a question?

It strikes me that the Senator's objection is you do not want to have this candidate—the bloc of them advanced without a vote. If I can guarantee that you get a vote on these nominations, will you drop your objection?

Mr. Hawley. Can I respond to that?

Mr. Kaine. Yeah. I mean, I know you will vote no. You have made it plain. But if I can guarantee you would get a vote, will you drop your objection?

Mr. Hawley. On all eight of them, Senator?

Mr. Kaine. Yeah.

Mr. Hawley. To have a vote on the floor?

Mr. Kaine. Yes.

Mr. Hawley. I would be happy to take a vote on the floor on all eight nominations.

Mr. Kaine. And that is what my point is. We are not fast-tracking these without a vote. This is a motion to allow a vote en bloc on the floor. So you will have an opportunity to vote against Mr. Chaudhary or all of these. This is not a motion to immediately approve them without a vote. It is just a motion to bring them up so that you and others can vote on these nominees. That is all I am seeking.

And so my request, basically, would guarantee you a vote on all of these

nominations if you drop your objection.

Mr. Hawley. Is this a recorded vote on the floor, Senator?

Mr. Kaine. It would be a—yes. It would be en bloc, but it is a recorded vote, is my understanding.

And, again, Madam President, just to clarify, my motion is only that the Senate be allowed to vote on these nominees: Alex Wagner for Assistant Secretary of the Air Force; Ashish Vazirani for Deputy Under Secretary of Defense; Christopher Lowman, Assistant Secretary of Defense; Lester Martinez-Lopez, Assistant Secretary of Defense; Agnes Schaefer, Assistant Secretary of the Army; Franklin Parker, Assistant Secretary of the Navy; Musetta Tia Johnson, Judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces; and Ravi Chaudhary, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

I understand my colleague will vote no, but all I am moving is for the Senate to be able to have a vote on these nominees.

Mr. Hawley. Senator, you want to vote on all eight at one time; you don't want to vote on each one?

Mr. Kaine. My motion is to consider them, yes, en bloc; but it would be a recorded vote, is my understanding.

Mr. Hawley. What I propose to do here is—there are multiple Senators on this side of the aisle besides myself who have objections to different multiple of these. What I propose to do is object to this now, but I think we can work something out on this going forward.

So I think—do I have the floor now?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia has the floor, and there is a pending unanimous consent request.

Mr. Hawley. OK. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. Kaine. I appreciate the objection being heard, and I would just say to my colleague, I hope we could work out a deal that would enable us to have a floor vote where my colleague could vote as he chooses on these nominees. This was not an attempt to bypass a vote; it was just an effort to have a vote where everybody can be recorded on the nominees. I hope we can work that out.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

ISSUES FACING THE NATION

Mr. Blunt. Madam President, I want to continue to talk about some of the challenges the administration is facing and the country is facing. Let me talk for just a little bit about the border, about the economy, and about our ongoing concerns on COVID.

First of all, the border—we have had a number of people come to the floor and talk about the border, the problems at the border. Many of these problems were really self-inflicted on day 1. The President, on the first day of his Presidency—and I chaired the inauguration on January 20. Hours after

that, the President decided to stop building the wall.

I was never an advocate of needing a wall everywhere along the southern border, but we had a wall in lots of places already. It was doing some good, but it wasn't doing as much good as it needed to do. And just the idea that we—with the material on the ground and the old wall torn down—would decide to stop building the wall, I think, started these problems.

And if that wasn't enough, then-President Trump had made arrangements, the State Department had made arrangements—everybody involved—with Mexico to have people who were applying for asylum wait for their court date in Mexico. It was my view at the time that we should do anything we could to help the Mexican Government make that work because the alternative was people would come into the United States and not show up for an asylum date later.

In Mexico, they have learned that they weren't going to qualify for asylum because fewer than—9 out of 10 people, roughly, will not qualify. You found that out before you got into the United States and successfully had entered our country, even though you weren't eligible to. If you were waiting in Mexico and you found a lawyer to talk to and maybe even a way to hear your case in some way there, you would find out that you weren't going to qualify for asylum 8½ times or 9 times out of 10, and that is where you should have found that out.

To come in the country and wait for months to have a court date that you may or may not show up for just simply has not worked, and everybody that understands this system understands it doesn't work. And everybody that understands the obligation of a government understands that a government has some obligation to control its own borders, and you don't control your own borders by having people come into the country that aren't legally eligible to come into the country and then just stay here. So that policy produced real chaos.

And then title 42, under the public health law, was another thing that we put in place, as we put all kinds of other COVID-related protections in place. And now we want to eliminate title 42. The only place, apparently—if you follow the CDC closely right now—that we don't need to up our game on COVID protection is the border of the United States.

None of these things makes sense. We have too many people who have been encouraged wrongly and told: You come to the United States, you ask for asylum, they let you into the United States, and then you don't show up for your asylum hearing.

I am for legal immigration. I am for solving the Dreamer problem. I am for doing a lot of things that we need to do to make our immigration laws work properly.