

Washington, DC, where the Democrats aren't using the power they have to address the problems working families are facing. They have chosen to focus on a completely different set of issues.

For example, let's look at the recent reckless tax-and-spending bill. Our Democratic colleagues, although we have worked together constructively on bipartisan legislation, in this case decided to pass a partisan bill to spend \$740 billion strictly along partisan lines. All of this money and the tax increases that go along with it won't address the biggest problems families are facing anytime soon. In fact, they are likely to make the problems even worse.

At a time when many people are struggling to pay for gasoline for their cars, our Democratic colleagues decided to give well-to-do people who can afford \$80,000 electric vehicles a taxpayer handout of about \$7,500 at the expense of the working families who can't afford to buy an electric vehicle of their own at any price.

This ensures that gas prices will climb even higher. This bill will revive the old Superfund tax on American energy production. It will guarantee families will face higher electricity prices this winter by slapping a new methane tax on energy producers. And that is all just the climate portion of the reckless tax-and-spending bill.

Our colleagues decided that it was the smart thing to do to supersize the Internal Revenue Service and giving it even more manpower to invariably audit middle-class America and small businesses. And then they have doled massive handouts to some of their key constituencies like labor unions.

They have chosen to impose socialist price controls on prescription drugs, which will stifle medical innovation and prevent new, lifesaving cures from being discovered. And perhaps worst of all, they raised taxes on the middle class.

I know President Biden promised, and promised time and time again, to never raise taxes on anyone earning less than \$400,000 a year, and our Democratic colleagues still claim that this bill makes good on that promise. But that is simply not consistent with the facts. It is not true. The nonpartisan Joint Committee on Taxation has confirmed it.

The JCT found that taxpayers making far less than \$400,000 at some point get walloped by higher prices. That includes people making between \$30,000 and \$40,000 a year. You can read it yourself, the distributional tables, at the Joint Committee on Taxation website.

We know that inflation is outpacing wage growth, which means that workers already are receiving a silent pay cut or silent tax, thanks to overspending here on things that, frankly, are not priorities. And many of those same workers are going to pay even more in Federal taxes.

But perhaps the most insulting part of this reckless tax-and-spending bill

that our Democratic colleagues decided to pass unilaterally was they chose to call it the Inflation Reduction Act. Leading economic experts say this bill won't do a thing to address inflation, certainly, in the near term. In fact, over the next couple of years, they predict inflation is likely to get slightly worse.

But that is how things work in this parallel universe known as Washington, DC: Democrats see that families are being battered by inflation, but they don't actually pass legislation that will help. Our colleagues just want to use the plight to come up with a sympathetic title for a radical, partisan bill, and they are happy to stick middle-class Americans with the check.

The icing on the cake came a couple of weeks ago after this bill became law, when President Biden made an Executive decision to cancel half a trillion dollars in student loans. Any family knows, you can't just cancel debt. There is no magic wand that will make it disappear. Every dollar that was borrowed will eventually have to be paid back by someone, but President Biden has just shifted the burden on whom that someone will be. Now the middle-class taxpayers are on the hook yet once again.

Under President Biden's proposal, it doesn't matter if a person took out loans and repaid them already; in other words, did what they said they would do by repaying the money that they had borrowed. Whether they worked their way through school, whether they held two or three jobs, or chose not to attend college at all, their tax dollars will pay for someone else's college debt.

My point is there is a remarkable divide between what Washington Democrats are trying to accomplish and the problems middle-class families are actually facing. Families are struggling to put food on the table, and our Democratic colleagues are spending hundreds of billions of dollars on climate initiatives.

This reminds me of a few years ago, a social movement by the so-called Yellow Jackets—a mosaic of French working-class people who felt disenfranchised from the urban elite who, as they said, "can focus on the end of the world, while we're worrying about the end of the month." That is what average working families in Texas and across the country are concerned about: How do we get to the end of the month with enough money to put food on the table and gas in the tank?

Workers can't afford a full tank of gas, and Democrats are forcing them to subsidize electric vehicles for the wealthy. People are worried about how much their electricity bills will cost this winter, and Democrats imposed a new tax that will send those costs even higher. These policies aren't going to make life better for the middle class anytime soon. They aren't going to help families or businesses that are

trying to create jobs and opportunities for their communities. And it certainly isn't going to bring our economy roaring back to life.

The fact of the matter is, since Democrats took control of the government more than a year and a half ago, Texans' lives have gotten harder, not easier. Inflation has skyrocketed, wages have fallen, our economy fell into a recession, and the border is on fire. And our colleagues—certainly, the Biden administration—don't seem to care. In fact, they seem to block out the concerns of middle-class Americans so they can pursue an ideological agenda like there is no tomorrow.

When I am home in Texas, folks talk about the problems workers and families are facing every day. They don't want to send taxpayer handouts to wealthy people buying electric vehicles or help subsidize labor unions or payoff someone else's loans. The sooner our Democratic colleagues realize that, the better off we will all be. But then again, maybe it is going to take an election this November.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

(Ms. SINEMA assumed the Chair.)

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider calendar No. 1043.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Arianna J. Freeman, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOUTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 1043, Arianna J. Freeman, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Christopher Murphy, Tammy Baldwin, Tina Smith, Christopher A. Coons, Elizabeth Warren, Jeanne Shaheen, Jeff Merkley, Alex Padilla, Richard J. Durbin, Jack Reed, Gary C. Peters, Edward J. Markey, Sherrod Brown, Tim Kaine, Ben Ray Luján, Mazie K. Hirono.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 986.

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

The clerk will read the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Salvador Mendoza, Jr., of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

## CLOUTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOUTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 986, Salvador Mendoza, Jr., of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Ben Ray Luján, Jack Reed, Jacky Rosen, Tina Smith, Angus S. King, Jr., Patrick J. Leahy, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Alex Padilla, Chris Van Hollen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Elizabeth Warren, Jeff Merkley, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tim Kaine.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, September 6, be waived.

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

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

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

## CLOUTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOUTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 985, John Z. Lee, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Ben Ray Luján, Jack Reed, Jacky Rosen, Tina Smith, Angus S. King, Jr., Patrick J. Leahy, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Christopher A. Coons, Alex Padilla, Chris Van Hollen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Elizabeth Warren, Jeff Merkley, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tim Kaine, Cory A. Booker.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of John Z. Lee, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 326 Ex.]

## YEAS—48

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

## NAYS—42

Barrasso	Blunt	Braun
Blackburn	Boozman	Capito

Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cornyn	Inhofe	Rubio
Cotton	Johnson	Sasse
Crapo	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Lee	Scott (SC)
Daines	Lummis	Shelby
Ernst	Marshall	Thune
Fischer	McConnell	Tillis
Grassley	Moran	Toomey
Hagerty	Paul	Tuberville
Hawley	Portman	Wicker
Hoover	Romney	Young

## NOT VOTING—10

Burr	Murkowski	Sanders
Cramer	Ossoff	Sullivan
Duckworth	Risch	
Klobuchar	Rosen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASEY). On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.  
The majority leader.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

## MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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.

## TRIBUTE TO CAROLINE CORNELL AND DANIEL PATRICK LOGAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to highlight a truly feel good story straight out of my home State of Vermont, a story of how middle school friends and ski buddies from southern Vermont reconnected and fell in love after life took them mostly separate ways.

Caroline Cornell and Daniel Patrick Logan grew up in southern Vermont and were close, but platonic, friends while attending middle school and Burr and Burton Academy in Manchester, VT. After graduation, they remained in contact, but traveled transiently and independently. Their individual journeys took them across the world, from the Lost Coast of California to Thailand, Florida, and the Finger Lakes of New York. Their two separate, but eventually corresponding, life journeys involved transient living, Grateful Dead tribute bands, odd jobs, romance, heartbreak, and so much more. In retrospect, it may have been inevitable that time would turn these two lifelong friends into companions. And finally, in June of this year, they became husband and wife.

Caroline and Daniel have traveled far and wide, but like so many others before them, their love for each other, and our small, beautiful State, has brought them home to Vermont, the same place where their friendship began almost 20 years ago. Caroline and Daniel's story of music, travel, love, and fate was profiled in a July 1, 2022, article published in the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that