

legal detention facility at Guantánamo.

Let's get a few things straight. The American people are safer and more secure because monsters like Khalid Shaikh Mohammed are off the battlefield and behind bars where they belong. When the Obama administration wanted to bring these terrorists to America, introduce them into the American judicial and prison systems, the Congress, on an overwhelming, overwhelming bipartisan basis, said no. But the progressive leftists in the Biden administration don't seem to care. They seem more concerned about the views of European human rights activists than about key national security concerns and complex legal questions.

So new reports suggest that President Biden and his team are trying to cut plea deals with these terrorists and war criminals. They want to cut these guys deals.

What would the deals look like? No one knows. They won't tell anybody. Would they be transferred into our own taxpayer-funded justice system for American citizens? Are we going to have hardened terrorists moving through the streets of Manhattan, with terrorist lawyers getting the rights and access that pertain to defense counsel?

Mayor Adams is already saying New York can't cope with President Biden's open southern border, and now the NYPD could have to babysit terrorists as well? Or is the plan military commissions, in which case, what concessions is the President planning to make to these murderers to get their activist lawyers to accept that forum?

Or does the administration intend to follow the Obama administration's model and rely on third parties and other countries to do the dirty work of detention? Well, of course, if you are going to send these people to other countries, that requires allies who are reliable, responsible, and actually willing to take these terrorists. Does President Biden plan to gamble on an Iraqi Government that is increasingly under the influence of Iran? Or do they want to double down on detention facilities run by Syrian Kurdish partners in areas that are not yet under the control of the Assad regime?

There is already no plan for Europe to reabsorb their citizens who fought for ISIS and are currently detained by the SDF. We are going to add to those ranks?

There is a huge long list of practical problems the administration needs to consider before they toy with risky plans to shutter a perfectly good facility at Guantánamo Bay for no good reason. The Biden administration has got to rediscover some common sense.

Now, I understand that liberal activists are willing to leave innocent American families in greater danger in exchange for a little bit of leftwing symbolism, but our Commander in Chief has a higher duty.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

NATIONAL STALKING AWARENESS MONTH

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 13, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 13) raising awareness and encouraging the prevention of stalking by designating January 2023 as "National Stalking Awareness Month".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

E-CIGARETTES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have served in the House and Senate for a number of years. One of the issues that has always been of interest to me is tobacco. I lost my father to lung cancer when I was 14 years old. He was 53. Two packs of Camels a day, and he died of lung cancer. I have thought about that a lot throughout my life.

When I was elected to the House of Representatives, I decided to start asking a few questions about tobacco and government subsidies and government policies. It was not the most popular position I ever took within the House of Representatives. There was generally a rule—or at least a custom—of never raising the issue. I did. It resulted in a decision by the House of Representatives that surprised almost everyone.

I introduced an amendment to ban smoking on airplanes. It was opposed by not only my own party leadership but the leadership of the Republican Party. Yet we prevailed. It turned out that the Members of the House of Representatives represented one of the largest frequent flier clubs in America, and they were sick and tired of second-hand smoke in airplanes.

I called on Senator Frank Lautenberg of New Jersey to be my ally on this side of the Rotunda, and he was successful in passing the legislation with me, which was signed into law.

People started asking obvious questions about secondhand smoke: If it is dangerous in an airplane, why is it not dangerous on the train, the bus, at a hospital, in an office building, in a restaurant?

So, to my surprise, this measure to make clean air more prevalent on airplanes ended up being a tipping point in American history on tobacco policy. Everything started changing—and fast.

Lives were saved. People were discouraged from smoking. Tobacco companies, which had been untouchable to that point, were not only touchable, they were vulnerable. And they had to sit down and devise a new policy to make money.

Now, the premise of tobacco was to entice young people to start smoking at an early age, and the chemicals in tobacco, like nicotine, were addictive. People knew, in the tobacco industry, that if you could drag kids into smoking at an early age and get them addicted, they might face a lifetime with that addiction and, ultimately, die from it, but they would have loyal customers to the tobacco companies, and they would continue to make money.

When we started raising questions about tobacco, the tobacco companies needed an alternative. They found it. Do you know what it was? It was e-cigarettes and vaping. The tobacco companies made big investments in these companies—selling them as a new marketable product that was a lot safer—though, it wasn't—and creating addictions among children by advertising and selling fruit-flavored, bubble gum-flavored vaping devices that looked an awful lot like something you would carry around for your computer.

Visit a high school in America today in your State or visit a junior high or a middle school, for that matter. Ask the teachers and administrators what the prevalence is of vaping and e-cigarettes among the kids in these schools. You will be shocked to learn that kids mistakenly believe that these are harmless; yet they are extremely addictive—e-cigarettes and vaping.

So I contacted the Food and Drug Administration, which has the legal authority to regulate these products, and said: What are you going to do about it? Well, they weren't quite sure what to do about it. That is why I have come to the floor today—to tell you, up-to-date, what was just announced.

The decade-long delay from the Food and Drug Administration to properly regulate vaping and e-cigarettes is in a league of its own in the modern history of that Agency. You see, under the law known as premarket review, no tobacco product—and vaping is a tobacco product using tobacco chemicals like nicotine—is permitted on store shelves unless the producer, the manufacturer, proves—listen—proves to the Food and Drug Administration in advance, prior to selling the product on the market, that it is "appropriate for the protection of public health."

For years, the Food and Drug Administration, despite this charge under the law, has ignored it. Instead, they sit back as millions—millions—of e-cigarettes in fruit, mint, candy flavors, even with cartoon images, are illegally flooding the market and addicting America's children. The Food and Drug Administration watched as this happened. It was so bad that in year 2019—4 years ago—a Federal judge intervened, ruling that the Food and Drug

Administration “decided not to enforce the premarket review provisions at all.”

In other words, the court found what I have just said to be the fact. The law said you need approval ahead of time before you can sell this product. The industry—the tobacco industry, the e-vaping industry—ignored it and sold these products nationwide, addicting these children and ignoring their responsibilities under the law.

So, in 2019, this Federal court ordered the Food and Drug Administration to enforce the law, to review all e-cigarette applications, as the law requires, and gave them a deadline—a deadline—to get it done that was almost 2 years later, September 9, 2021. That was more than 16 months ago, and, still, the Food and Drug Administration has not finished its job. In that time, while the FDA has dithered, dallied, and delayed, more than 1 million of America’s kids have started vaping.

How could our Federal regulators be so passive and so ineffective?

Then, on Tuesday, this last Tuesday, in a stunning filing to the Federal judge, the Food and Drug Administration disclosed that it will take another 6 months—another 6-month delay—to fulfill the public health duty announced by the court years ago and that the Food and Drug Administration will not finish reviewing applications for the most popular e-cigarettes until the end of 2023—another outrageous delay.

I don’t think I have ever heard of a Federal Agency defying a court order for 2 years. I am going to leave it up to the Federal court to assess this development.

How can this Federal Agency knowingly, willingly, ignore this court order to protect America’s children? How can they ignore the fact that the law requires their approval of a product before it goes on the shelf? And these products are being sold across America without that approval.

To this Senator, the Food and Drug Administration’s deference to the tobacco industry, at the risk of 1 million more children getting addicted to nicotine over the next year, is just plain outrageous and indefensible.

The Food and Drug Administration has one choice, three words: Follow the law. Immediately halt these unauthorized sales of these e-cigarettes on the market—not next year, not next month—immediately, today. Otherwise, this Agency and the people who guide it bear a responsibility for the result, and that result is the addiction of children to a product which will harm their health. Otherwise, the Food and Drug Administration is complicit in endangering the health of America’s kids.

Think about that for a second. An Agency created over a century ago to protect American consumers is, in fact, failing to protect the most vulnerable American consumers—our children.

The Food and Drug Administration has the authority today, before the end

of this business day, to order these vaping products off the market—period.

Do it. Don’t wait until some attorney talks you out of it at the Food and Drug Administration. Protect America’s kids. Tell the tobacco industry: Sorry. The party is over. You must prove that what you sell is in the interest of public health. We are going to protect kids first and deal with the lawyers later. End the free pass. Follow the law. Do not allow these tobacco companies one more day of preying on our children.

(The remarks of Mr. DURBIN pertaining to the introduction of S. 126 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FARM BILL

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, 2023 will be a big year on the agriculture front as we work to draft the next farm bill.

Farm bills are always a major priority for me given the essential place agriculture holds in South Dakota, and I have been gearing up now for the 2023 farm bill since last year when I began holding a series of roundtables with agriculture producers to hear firsthand what farmers’ and ranchers’ priorities are right now and what they need from the 2023 farm bill.

I introduced multiple bills last Congress that I hope to get included in this year’s legislation, including bills to strengthen and improve the Conservation Reserve Program, and address the needs of South Dakota livestock producers—and of producers around the country.

Livestock production has long been an integral part of South Dakota’s agriculture heritage, including cattle ranching in our West River communities; and one of my priorities for this year’s farm bill is to address some of the challenges facing South Dakota’s livestock producers in getting their products to Americans’ tables.

The last few years have revealed vulnerabilities in our food supply chain that have had an outsized impact on livestock producers. Early in the pandemic, some meat processing plants were temporarily closed, and these closures led to bottlenecks in processing and delays to process livestock. The results were supply shortages and empty cases at the grocery stores—shortages that weren’t caused by a shortage of livestock but by a lack of processing capacity to get meat ready for sale.

Between processing bottlenecks and meatpacker concentration, it has be-

come clear that livestock producers need more processing options. One way we can reduce producers’ dependence on the big packers is to expand smaller meatpackers’ processing capacity. That is why I am currently working to reintroduce my Strengthening Local Processing Act.

My bill would help small processors invest in the infrastructure necessary to expand their capacity as well as direct Federal dollars to education and training programs that will bolster the industry’s workforce and build the next generation of meat processors and butchers.

My bill would also allow more State-inspected meat products to be sold across State lines, which would open up new markets for small meat processors and the farmers and ranchers who supply them.

If there is one thing that can be said for sure about South Dakotans, it is that we take our beef seriously. With almost 14,000 beef operations and 3.8 million head of cattle in our State, it is safe to say cattle production is alive and well in South Dakota and helping to fill dinner plates all across America.

And something I consistently hear from folks around the State is that we need to reform our beef labeling system. South Dakotans, like many Americans, simply want to know where their food—and their beef, in particular—is coming from. And that can be pretty hard to do under our current system. Under our current system, beef that is neither born nor raised in the United States but is simply finished here can be labeled “Product of the U.S.A.,” even if the only American thing about the beef is the plastic it is wrapped in—if that.

This is unfair to American cattle producers, and it is misleading to consumers. Congress has repeatedly tried to address this issue in the past. The 2002 and 2008 farm bills included mandatory country-of-origin labeling for beef, but the World Trade Organization ruled against the United States, and Congress ultimately repealed this requirement, which I opposed.

But that doesn’t mean we should give up on transparency and labeling. That is why this week I reintroduced my bipartisan American Beef Labeling Act to require the U.S. Trade Representative to develop a World Trade Organization-compliant means of reinstating mandatory country-of-origin labeling for beef.

When you see a label on your beef, you should be able to trust that it means what it says. And I plan to get my American Beef Labeling Act included in the 2023 farm bill so that consumers can be confident that any beef labeled “Product of the U.S.A.” really came from American cattle producers.

Whether it is a farm bill year or not, South Dakota farmers and ranchers are always at the top of my mind here in the Senate. As a longtime Member of the Senate Agriculture Committee, I am fortunate to have a platform that

allows me to address the needs of South Dakota ag producers. And I am looking forward to working with my colleagues on the Ag Committee and in the Senate as a whole to deliver a farm bill that addresses the challenges facing South Dakota farmers and ranchers and farmers and ranchers around the country.

Agriculture is a tough industry. It is backbreaking work in all weather, living with the constant risk that a storm or a drought or an early freeze can wipe out herds or crops—sometimes in an instant. Then add market fluctuations, processing, transportation challenges, and our current inflation crisis—it is not an easy life.

But despite its many challenges, it is a proud tradition. And through it all, our Nation's farmers and ranchers persevere. I am proud to represent South Dakota's farmers and ranchers here in the U.S. Senate. I will do everything I can to ensure that this year's farm bill meets their needs and does everything it can to make their life a little easier so that they can continue to feed our Nation and the world.

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

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

NATIONAL HUMAN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION MONTH

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, January is National Human Trafficking Prevention Month, and it is a great opportunity to improve awareness about the scourge of human trafficking and redouble our efforts to end it.

Throughout my career, I have worked with law enforcement, nonprofits, and advocates of all stripes to try to crack down on human trafficking and strengthen support for human trafficking survivors. These experts have helped me identify steps that we together can take in Congress to end modern slavery.

I am proud that one of those bills was signed into law earlier this month. The Abolish Trafficking Reauthorization Act, which I introduced with Senator KLOBUCHAR, the Senator from Minnesota, is officially the law of the land. This law extends critical support to survivors of human trafficking, provides resources for law, funds prevention research, and promotes increased reporting to prevent human trafficking. It is a step in the right direction in our fight to end modern slavery, and I was glad to discuss the importance of this law with advocates and experts in Texas just a couple of weeks ago.

On January 11, National Human Trafficking Awareness Day, I had the pleasure of sitting down with some remarkable people in Dallas who are leading

the fight. We gathered at the Letot Residential Treatment Center, which provides a full range of services to human trafficking survivors, specifically girls between the age of 13 and 17. Letot offers safe shelter, which I have learned is perhaps the most important thing, a safe place for these survivors to actually live. But it also provides education, job training, and mental healthcare to these young victims to help them find a clear path forward one day at a time.

I had visited the same facility a few years ago to learn about the work they do, and I was encouraged to note their continued impact in Dallas County, one of our largest counties in Texas.

I also learned about the dedicated work of New Friends New Life, which helps exploited girls, women, and their children to rebuild their lives and to move forward toward a brighter future. The organization also promotes a men's advocacy group, which raises awareness and mobilizes men to take action against sex trafficking and exploitation.

In addition to learning more about the impact of these organizations, I was able to hear from local law enforcement, including Dallas District Attorney John Creuzot. John noted that Texas is No. 2 in the Nation when it comes to human trafficking and added that Dallas is a major hotspot because it is at the crossroads of so many interstate freeways.

Rescuing victims of human trafficking, disrupting trafficking operations, and pursuing justice is a major focus for law enforcement. For sex trafficking in particular, they are working with groups like Traffick911 to free young people from this terrible life. I am blown away by the incredible work being done in North Texas to support survivors and ensure justice is served. What I heard from these survivors really underscored how critical these efforts are.

One of the women I heard from was Dr. Tanya Stafford, an inspiring and passionate advocate for survivors of human trafficking. Tanya told us she was only 13 when her mother sold her to a man for drugs. You heard that right. When she was 13 years old, her own mother sold her to a man for drugs. Then, for 10 years, she was hidden in plain sight until, finally, a neighbor intervened. As Tanya put it, "she saw something, she said something, and she did something."

Every single day, concerned neighbors and friends call tip lines and help victims like Tanya escape from human trafficking. Incredible organizations like Letot Residential Treatment Center and New Friends New Life help these victims of human trafficking rebuild their lives. Law enforcement and groups like Traffick911 help to free victims from human trafficking.

The brave survivors are what have impressed me most of all. To have these survivors talk about their own personal story, with all of the potential

for embarrassment that suggests, speaks to me to the courage of these survivors, who are willing to use their own personal example to help save others from a similar fate.

It was inspiring to hear them talk about overcoming the incredible trauma and adversity. Their stories are a reminder of why it is so important for us to continue this fight, and that includes everything from awareness and education to legislating here in Congress. There is no better time than Human Trafficking Prevention Month to build on these efforts.

I want to thank the experts, the advocates, and the survivors, as well as all of our Senate and congressional colleagues who are leading on this fight.

RESPECT FOR CHILD SURVIVORS ACT

Madam President, the day after my conversation in Dallas, I traveled to Houston, another one of our major metropolitan areas, to discuss a new law that will have a big impact on child sexual abuse victims. The seed for this legislation was first planted in September 2021, when the Senate Committee on the Judiciary held a hearing on the repeated failures of the FBI's investigation into the Larry Nassar case.

U.S. gymnasts delivered powerful testimony about the FBI's mishandling of their investigation and inspired a bipartisan push to fix the broken process that failed them and countless other victims.

Again, Senator KLOBUCHAR and I worked with law enforcement, victims' rights groups, and all our colleagues here in the Senate to identify reforms that would actually make a difference. Those discussions eventually led to the Respect for Child Survivors Act, which was signed into law earlier this month. This law mandates the use of multiple disciplinary teams, or MDTs, in FBI interviews with child victims.

Just by way of footnote, most of these kinds of cases are investigated at the local or State level, and, frankly, most local level law enforcement have worked with the child advocacy centers around Texas and around the country to try to minimize the repetition of the trauma on these child victims and to help preserve testimony needed to convict their abuser. But the FBI has a much bigger portfolio and, generally, is not trained in how to deal with these victims of sexual assault, particularly child victims. Now this new law mandates training for the FBI.

These MDTs, the multiple disciplinary teams, that they will now work with, include mental health and medical professionals, caseworkers, and other individuals who advocate for a child's well-being. The primary goal, of course, is to protect these young victims and ensure that they are not retraumatized during the investigation, which is going to be intrusive by its very nature.

There is a mountain of evidence, thank goodness, that this approach actually works. During the discussion in Houston, I sat down with a full range of

experts on this topic at the Children's Assessment Center, which is a pioneer in the successful use of MDTs. For more than 30 years, it has cared for sexually abused children and, in the process, established the gold standard for the right way to protect victims of child sexual abuse.

The folks I spoke with and listened to that day stressed the importance of this approach. For example, Houston Police Lieutenant John Colburn said that the partnership between law enforcement and the Children's Assessment Center makes a "tremendous difference." He said that children are able to share their experiences in a more comfortable way, and law enforcement can take peace in the knowledge that these incredibly difficult conversations are happening with trauma-informed experts who are equipped to handle them properly.

That is why this legislation is important.

One of the individuals we heard from was Rebecca Whitehurst, a former U.S.A. gymnast and one of the hundreds of survivors of the Larry Nassar episode.

She said:

It is deeply gratifying to know that you have listened to our voices and learned from our experience to ensure that systems improve and that justice is served.

Rebecca concluded her comments by saying:

Children should be totally protected from those who [would] harm them, and those who [would] fail them should be held accountable.

I couldn't say it better myself.

With this new law on the books, I am confident that the FBI will be better prepared to handle similar investigations in the future with compassion and efficiency and ultimately bring perpetrators to justice.

This was all possible because of the brave gymnasts who testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee a year and a half ago. They showed tremendous courage by speaking out, by talking about personal, intimate matters that were necessarily embarrassing to them, but they overcame that, knowing that they could well make a difference for some future gymnast or some other child sexual assault victim in the future. I hope they will take some comfort in knowing that their stories brought about this change.

We need to ensure that the FBI's mistreatment of these victims and their reports is not repeated in the future, and this law will help make sure that goal is accomplished.

Like so many of us—we learn from our constituents. We learn from men and women who take the time to share their experiences with us, and I am grateful to those who did so in Dallas and Houston and, again, especially the survivors. They are doing incredible work to root out human trafficking and support survivors and ensure that justice is served.

I am proud of what we were able to accomplish last Congress to strengthen

their efforts, but there is still more work for us to do. I appreciate all of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle and both sides of the Capitol who have worked together on these efforts in the past, and I am eager to accomplish even more this Congress.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Michigan.

DEBT CEILING

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I rise today to express concerns other colleagues on this side of the aisle have as well, that in the midst of what is the most robust economic turnaround and growth in a generation, with wages up and unemployment down and almost 11 million new jobs created, most of those small businesses—we love that in Michigan. I know the Presiding Officer does in Maine as well. With all of the positive indicators and with all of our efforts to bring down costs, because that is the big thing for people right now, bringing down their costs—and this month, the good news is a \$35 cap on insulin for anyone on Medicare. A senior citizen who is a diabetic—a \$35 cap on insulin.

We need to do more to bring down costs, but instead of joining with us, the new House Republican majority has decided, well, let's see, when things are turning around for the American people, I know—let's crash the economy. Let's say we are not going to pay our bills. Let's cause interest rates to go up. Let's cause people to be hurt, maybe jeopardize people getting their Social Security, Medicare, veterans' benefits, or paying the military. This makes absolutely no sense.

I know it is difficult, this antiquated thing called the debt ceiling, because, really, it is about whether or not we are going to pay our bills. So we decide as a family we are going to get a mortgage, and then 2 years into it, we decide, you know, I think we are going to stop paying the mortgage. I don't want to pay my bills anymore on that. And we just stop paying bills. I mean, our country can't just make commitments to families, to veterans, to the military, to seniors, to children, to other countries, and say: Nah, I think we will just stop paying our bills. It is outrageous, it is irresponsible, and the consequences, as we know, will literally crash our economy.

So what do the Republicans say they want to do? In return for not crashing the economy, in return for the United States meeting its obligations and paying its bills, what do they want to do? What do they say that somehow we have to agree to?

Well, the first thing they have already done, which is an extension of

how their focus is very much on keeping money in the pockets of the wealthy and the well connected, the very first bill—they are talking debt. Oh, we have so much debt. We have all this debt. The first thing they do, the very first bill, very first week, may have been the first day—I am not sure—after the 15 votes to create a Speaker, they turn around and they pass a bill that will add \$114 billion to the national debt—\$114 billion to the national debt. Why? Because they think that if you are a wealthy tax cheat, you should be able to continue doing it. So they want to take away the capacity for the IRS, for investigators to go after the tax cheats.

Now, they are OK if you are going after a poor person who is on the earned income tax credit. In fact, they are OK with the fact that the most audited county in the United States right now is in Mississippi, Humphreys, MS. Forty percent of the residents are poor, Black residents, and they have the highest audit rate. They are on the earned income tax credit. Now, that is OK, but don't go after our buddies—oh no. They are the ones with all the accountants and the attorneys. You know, we have seen it play out with the former President of the United States. Do everything you can not to have to pay your fair share of taxes.

Now, we as Democrats know that everybody should have to pay their fair share, and, in fact, in the Inflation Reduction Act, we made a big step on that point where the corporations are not paying. But what do they want? OK, protect tax cheats.

Then they say: Well, we have to cut Social Security and Medicare. We can't afford that anymore.

A great American success story. Lifted over half the country's retirees out of poverty. A great American success story—brought to you predominantly by Democrats, I should say—but they say: Let's cut Social Security and Medicare before we pay our bills, because we have too much debt. Even though we can add to the debt for rich people, we need to cut Social Security and Medicare.

Then the one that is like on top of everything else, when they all ran on how costs were too high in the election—I mean, we are the ones fighting to bring down energy costs, \$1,000 per family back in their pockets, \$35 cap on insulin for seniors right now—right now, happening right now.

So what do they say we should do to deal with the debt they are talking about? Oh, let's have a 30-percent sales tax increase. Let's increase the cost of an automobile by \$10,000. That is pretty personal to me, coming from Michigan. We make a lot of those vehicles. We are pretty proud of making those vehicles. People drive those vehicles. A \$10,000 increase on somebody—try to have a car to get the kids to school, get people to work, and so on. Increase the cost of a house. We don't know what all of this is. Food, electric bills, transportation—we don't know what it is.

But now we are at a point where they want to say: We are not paying our bills unless you do what we want. So now the question is, OK, pass the bills. Show us what you have got. You want this? Vote on it. Vote on it. Pass your agenda. You already voted on step 1, adding to the deficit about \$114 billion. So you have all these other ideas that will hurt seniors and children and the majority of Americans, hard-working Americans, but if that is what you think, if that is really what you think, then pass the bills. Pass the bills.

So what they really don't want to tell you while they are talking about all of this and talking about how we have a high national debt, which we do, and we need to come together and continue to do things to address that, what they don't tell you—the dirty little secret is that almost 30 percent of the national debt was accumulated during 4 years of President Trump, that they voted for, and most of that was a huge tax cut for the wealthy and well connected.

Now, they were willing to pay the bills—raised the debt ceiling three times during the Trump years—because it was about giving their buddies, the wealthy and well connected, a big tax cut. The truth of the matter is, if there hadn't been that tax cut, if we had truly required wealthy tax cheats to pay their fair share of taxes, if we had done those two things, we wouldn't even have to raise the debt ceiling right now. We wouldn't have to do that. There wouldn't be a need.

So they do this shell game here. So it is tax cuts for the wealthy, don't let their wealthy buddies have to pay their fair share of taxes, and then turn around and argue that they are going to crash the economy, not pay our bills, unless we cut Social Security and Medicare and add a 30-percent sales tax and a whole range of other things.

This is not our priority. We certainly, as Democrats, do not believe that this should be the priority of the American people.

By the way, when we talk about it, I forgot to mention that the other half of the story is that while they were doing this, in the last 2 years, the deficit fell by \$1.4 trillion under President Biden—\$1.4 trillion—while we have invested in people, rebuilding the country, bringing jobs home, invested in those things that will create opportunity for everybody to succeed. While we have been investing in people—not the powerful, not focused on profits but people—while we have been doing that, we have also been focused on bringing the deficit down.

So I hope our colleagues on the other side of the building and the other side of the aisle will take a step back here from the brink and understand the dangerous situation they are putting us in with not being willing to pay the bills, with crashing the economy, all for a radical, radical MAGA agenda that will hurt the majority of the American people.

They want to debate that agenda separately from crashing the economy. Let's pay our bills, and if they want to debate that and they want to pass bills and send them over to us, that is the legislative process. They can do that, and we will have that debate. And we will send them bills that make sure wealthy tax cheats pay their fair share, just like we did in the Inflation Reduction Act with a 15-percent minimum corporate tax. And we will continue to put people first, not just the wealthy and the powerful in this country.

It is a very different vision. It is a very different view of how you grow the economy. It is a very different view of whom we are fighting for, whom we are working for.

I am glad to be on this side. I am glad to be on this side with the majority of the people. And I would argue what we have done the last 2 years, putting people first, investing in people and bringing jobs home and rebuilding the economy and investing in science and bringing down costs and continuing to focus on that, as well as the deficit, has worked. This is not just rhetoric. It actually has worked. It actually has worked.

So I hope our Republican colleagues, particularly in the House, will join us in those things that will actually move America forward.

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

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

HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, tomorrow, January 27, is the 77th anniversary of the liberation of Auschwitz, which is located in German-occupied Poland. January 27 has been designated by the United Nations as Holocaust Remembrance Day.

At Auschwitz-Birkenau were the most notorious of the atrocities committed during World War II in concentration, labor, and death camps run by the Nazis in Germany during World War II. Six million Jews were murdered during World War II and 5 million others—Romans, Afros, Germans, gay men and women, people with disabilities, and others—who were just disliked by the Nazi regime. Eleven million people perished as a result of these atrocities.

Our responsibility? To remember, to never forget what happened during World War II—what was committed—and to do everything in our power to make sure that these types of atrocities never happen again. We owe that to support the survivors so that their heroism is not forgotten, and we need to support Holocaust education.

I want to thank my colleagues in the appropriations process. We have made funds available to help the survivors of the Holocaust and to provide for Holocaust education.

“Never again” is what we need to achieve. We have not achieved it to date. We can look back at the atrocities committed in Rwanda or we could take a look at what is happening today with the Uighurs or with the Rohingyas or with the Yazidis—we see atrocities being committed around the world—or we could take a look at what is happening in Ukraine, perpetrated by Russia—the atrocities and war crimes that are being committed by the Russians.

So, on this day of remembrance, it is important for us to understand where we are and to take steps to protect us against atrocities.

I serve on the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum Board as the Senate representative. That is an institution that is dedicated to compiling information about the Holocaust, making it available through education and other opportunities for people to understand what happened, and to have a mission to prevent atrocities in the future.

I also serve as the Senate Chair of the U.S. Helsinki Commission. The U.S. Helsinki Commission is best known for its commitment to advance human rights globally. I am proud of the work that we have done in Holocaust education and in fighting the rise of anti-Semitism.

I also serve as the Special Representative of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's Parliamentary Assembly on Anti-Semitism, Racism and Intolerance.

I mention all of that because I want to share with you the concerns, the warning bells, that have gone off as to the rise of hate in our own community and around the world that should be of concern to all of us.

In 2021, there was the highest number of instances of anti-Semitism in the United States in its history. We broke the record in 2021. According to the ADL, there was a 60-percent increase in 2021 over 2020 in anti-Semitic activities. The U.S. Department of Homeland Security has issued a warning about the heightened potential for violent domestic attacks. These anti-Semitic activities are deadly. I need not remind us all of the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, in 2018, where 11 people were murdered by anti-Semitic activity. There are 25 percent of Jews who live in America who fear violence caused by anti-Semitism.

I have had a chance to visit a lot of countries as a Member of the U.S. Senate and as a former Member of the House. I try to visit synagogues when I travel abroad, and it is understood that there will be security in front of the synagogue buildings when I attend the services, but I always felt comfortable in the United States that that would not be necessary. It is now necessary for synagogues to have security here in the United States and for mosques and other areas that are vulnerable to violence caused by hate.

We are also at risk today in our own democratic institutions. Anti-Semitism and hate is fueled by conspiracy

theories, the replacement theory, which is based upon the old-age, anti-Semitic trope. That leads directly to violence. It is also a threat to our democratic institutions. Conspiracy theories about election deniers led up to the January 6 attack on this sacred building. We fight for the peaceful—we believe in the peaceful transfer of power, and we saw violence trying to prevent the peaceful transfer of power, which is critically important to our democratic institutions.

Mr. Putin's campaign, in part, is based upon anti-Semitism. He says he wants to denazify Ukraine. Ukraine has a Jewish President, I would like to remind my colleagues. We all have a responsibility to fight anti-Semitism and any form of hate in our community.

In 2004, I participated in the Berlin Conference, which was the first major international conference in recent times to coordinate strategies to fight anti-Semitism. What came out of that conference was that leaders have a responsibility to lead. Our words mean something. When there is violence in our community, we need to speak out against it. If any minority group is unsafe, we are all unsafe. We need to form coalitions to fight all forms of intolerance in our community.

On November 29 of last year, I convened a roundtable discussion.

I want to thank Senator ROSEN and Senator BLUMENTHAL for joining me and Congressman VEASEY from the House of Representatives.

We brought together representatives from the Department of Homeland Security, from the Department of Justice, from the White House, and from the Department of State. We had representatives from the Anti-Defamation League and from the American Jewish Committee.

I want to compliment the Second Gentleman, Doug Emhoff, for holding a similar discussion in the White House.

What came out of those discussions is that we need a whole-of-government approach in order to stop the tide—the rise—of hate and violence in our community. So I was so pleased that President Biden, on December 12, established an interagency group, led by the Domestic Policy Council, to increase and better coordinate U.S. Government efforts to counter anti-Semitism, Islamophobia, and related forms of fear and discrimination.

We need a coordinated strategy. We all need to be part of that coordinated strategy. This is not 1 day a year; it is every day—365 days a year. We all need to be engaged. We all have a responsibility to join together in a coordinated strategy so that “never again” means never again.

So, on this day of remembrance, as we acknowledge the liberation of the Auschwitz death camps, let us also rededicate ourselves to doing everything in our power so we really can say “never again.”

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 63

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today to ask unanimous consent to discharge and pass the American Vehicle Security Act, a bill I introduced with Senator BRAUN yesterday.

Let me explain what we are trying to do and what we have done by passing the IRA. China has cornered the EV supply chain market: 80 percent of the world's battery materials processing comes from China; 60 percent of the world's cathode production comes from China; 80 percent of the world's anode production comes from China; and 75 percent of the world's lithium ion battery's cell production comes from China.

Now, for the first time in the history of this great country of ours, in the transportation mode that gave inspiration to the whole world—whether it be cars, trains, and planes—did not depend on foreign supply chains for their motivation. It did not, in any way at all, depend on it.

Now we are moving rapidly into the EV markets—and I think recklessly—as we were going into that before we were able to supply and be held captive by China, literally. So anything the IRA bill did was saying this: If you are going to get the \$7,500 credit—which I had a hard time understanding why the automotive industry needed it so desperately, because people were willing to wait a year to get the product. And we had supply chains with chips, and we fixed that; we had supply chains still with this—and they are telling me: Well, we can't do that. We just can't get there. And I said: You know what? They told us that we couldn't get there on the vaccine for COVID; it would take 5 years. We got there in 9 months. You can do it if you intend to do it, and if you want to do it, you will do it.

So what we did, we said: Fine, \$3,750 credit you will be able to earn for the discount on that vehicle if the critical minerals are sourced from North America or our free trading agreement countries so we don't have the risk of being held hostage. These are countries that we deal with and we have relationships, and it is a free trade back and forth. China, we don't; Russia, we don't. We see what happens to the world when that happens.

So this was the purpose of it. And the other 3,750 is if you manufacture the battery in North America because of our NAFTA agreement in the USMC that we have had for an awful long time. It doesn't disrupt the flow back and forth.

That way, we are guaranteed that we are going to have a manufacturing base

and continue the long heritage and the long, basically, support that we have that we can have control of our own destiny in our transportation mode. That is all. That is all this bill was doing.

The bill has been characterized so many different ways, but it is truly an energy security manufacturing bill. And I can assure you, just coming back and talking to the Europeans, they are extremely challenged and upset that, basically, America—the United States—with one leap, jumped over everybody into first place and is so far ahead of doing something and bringing manufacturing back, being self-sufficient, and self-dependent.

That is what this does. And we fixed that. We fixed all of that. And then the Treasury, failing to issue guidance, it puts more requirements. And what they are doing is, they issued guidance by law. The bill said, by December 31. They are in violation. So they don't have the guidance ready, and they had plenty of time to do it. But they are now continuing to let the \$7,500 credit go without any concerns at all about the critical mineral requirements.

It is just not what the legislation is about. It is not what we all voted for. Every Democrat voted for this. And now, all of a sudden, we are saying we are not going to pay attention to the rules. Regulations don't mean anything. Just go ahead and let them do what they want to do.

Well, I am sorry, that is not the way it is. And that is not the way it should be.

So being the birthplace of Henry Ford, who put mass production back in and put the automobile in everyone's affordability range and, basically, transitioned who we are as a country and how we move around—we are an automotive powerhouse. We have always been an automotive powerhouse. And the sooner that we are able to source our own supplies that we need for our mode of transportation, we will maintain that power.

That is what the IRA has done. That is the intent of the IRA. I have asked the IRS to follow the law, follow the rule, follow the legislative intent, and, basically, the bill that we passed. And they are defying that. And this bill would correct that. That is all we are asking.

With that, I yield to my friend from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise today—JOE has gone over this, I think, very clearly; I support him in just sticking with the letter of the law. He said China produces 75 percent of the world's lithium-ion batteries; we, only 7 percent. China controls 80 percent of the facilities that convert critical minerals into usable battery parts.

Making things in America is not just about promoting our own manufacturing—which we need to do better generally—it is also about not funding

the human rights abuses by the Chinese Communist Party.

And to give them even more of a leg up, when you see what they have done trying to fit into the world economic chain, where they still steal intellectual property, they do things that take them out of the norm that we are all familiar with.

This is just simply to fix something that was recently passed in a reconciliation bill. I didn't vote for the reconciliation package because of disagreements with it in general. I do that on a lot of things, even when I like components of what is in something if it doesn't have that fiscal responsibility to go along with it.

So whether you agree with me or Senator MANCHIN about trying to do things here in America whenever we can and not to end up supporting our main geopolitical enemy in the process, I think you have to be careful.

Senator MANCHIN mentioned, also, we just recently did it and it is clear, and the IRS was sleeping at the wheel. This should not have come down to where we are right here, even having to argue about it. It is the letter of the law.

I have got, in my own home State, Stellantis and Samsung making a big investment in Kokomo, IN, for this very issue of getting our own foot into this kind of business. What is it going to do? What is the message going to be sending to them?

Allison Transmission is conducting R&D efforts on electrifying their own components. I think it sends a bad message if we are given the letter of the law, going to make exemptions, even when it might not be expedient for other concerns.

I think this is a type of investment that we need to make sure stays here. We recently put it in law to do so. It may delay a little bit, not give the speed at which some want to move. But when you look at everything we have talked about—the fact that it gives more to the Chinese economy when you look at what they are doing on the world stage—it is going to send a bad message to people in our own country about making the investments. And, clearly, in my own State, there is a vested interest.

So I am with Senator MANCHIN on this. We ought to stick with what we just passed, not let the IRS get by with being delinquent on what they should have done in the first place.

With that, I yield back to the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, maybe I can help a little bit with clearing it up. Everyone thinks that all of a sudden, that at the end of the year, the first of the year, that the automobile industry in the United States, in order to get any credit at all, had to have 100 percent of the sourcing done from North America or free trade country agreements, such as Australia, Chile—different people that have a tremen-

dous amount of resources—but those are going to China now for processing.

The first year is 40 percent. All we are saying is we ought to at least be able to source 40 percent the first year from the favored trading countries we have and ourselves to get us into this. And then it goes up 10 percent every year. Most reasonable, most reasonable. Why the IRS did not do that their job, I can't tell you, unless their intent was never to try to comply with what we passed. They have known all along what this bill was, unless they just basically drug their feet intentionally and not only this—let me just tell you the other thing I couldn't really believe. They would pick and choose. They didn't basically just say: Well, I am sorry. We don't have rules and regulations. So it can't go into effect. Or we are going to leave it like it was at \$7,500. No, no, no, they chose. They like what we did with putting a cap on what your salary could be in order to get to \$7,500. They used that. That wasn't there before. They used that part of it.

They like the cap of where we said what price of a vehicle would qualify: for a sedan, \$55,000 and under; for a truck, \$85,000.

They would pick and choose—cherry-pick. But they said: We are just going to continue to give the \$7,500 if they apply to different categories—nothing about sourcing material, nothing about us jump-starting to be basically self-sufficient in the manufacturing of batteries in the United States of America, but also sourcing, so we would never run short and be held hostage by China or someone else.

I am old enough and you are old enough and most of us in this room are old enough to remember 1974, when we stood in line to get gas to go work. I am not going to stand in line to wait for a battery to come from China for me to go to work. That is what this is all about.

Mr. MANCHIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 63, a bill to adjust the effective date of application of certain amendments made with respect to the credit for new clean vehicles; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration, and the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. STABENOW. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. First of all, let me say that I take a backseat to no one on wanting to get out of China. There is no question about that. I authored the "Buy America" provisions with Senator BRAUN that are in the infrastructure bill. We have a "Made in America" offer. We are bringing jobs home. We are making sure that we are putting Michigan and American businesses and workers first—absolutely.

I also agree and Senator MANCHIN has—he and I have worked together on the clean energy manufacturing tax credits, 48C, which is critical; the advanced battery production tax credits; the things Senator BRAUN talked about that are bringing jobs to Indiana from the Inflation Reduction Act; and the credits that we have done for batteries and solar and wind and manufacturing and so on. They were all in that bill, which I was proud to help author and to support those efforts.

I support when Senator MANCHIN has said to those in other countries that if you want to benefit from our tax structure, move your plants to America. I said that myself. I am all for that.

This particular credit is confusing. It was not well vetted. It is not supported by anyone in the industry who believes that they have the capacity immediately, right this minute, to meet the complicated formulas. They would love to. We would love it if we didn't have to worry about lithium from China. They are working feverishly. In fact, there is a free-trade agreement with Chile coming before this body. They have lithium deposits that would be very, very helpful to us. I strongly support being able to make them part of the free-trade agreements in the legislation so that we can get the lithium from there, as well as other parts of the world.

But we are not there yet.

This does not create any path for success for American automobile workers, for American automobile companies, for suppliers, for consumers who are interested in being able to purchase electric vehicles and benefit from a credit, which, by the way, every other country has, including China. They have their own consumer credit.

So this is a situation where we disagree on how this was put together, how it is written, how the effect of it is in terms of the dates and so on.

But I have to say, on behalf of Treasury, which was given thousands of regulations they have to write by December 31, that it is not unreasonable that they took the time to listen and be thoughtful about how they did it, and they announced that they would be bringing these rules forward in March. That is not an unreasonable thing. It affects a huge industry, a foundational industry.

Henry Ford is from Michigan. We are proud to have Henry Ford from Michigan. By the way, he and Thomas Edison first tried to create an electric vehicle. That was the first choice until we decided, as Congress, to invest in oil and gas subsidies that took them in a different direction.

The bottom line: It is not unreasonable, what Treasury is doing, the path they are on. They have been given, I believe, an incredibly complicated task to try to figure out how this consumer credit will work for consumers and for the companies and workers. I don't disagree with the goals talked about. I don't disagree with anything that has

been said, except that it doesn't relate to what is happening in this credit, which doesn't work on a practical level. I am for whatever support and flexibility that we can provide to achieve what are the stated goals.

So on behalf of American automobile companies, all the auto workers and American consumers, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Would the Senator yield for a minute?

Ms. STABENOW. Yes.

Mr. MANCHIN. The only thing I would say to that is this: The subsidies we were giving for EVs had expired under the old piece of legislation for American manufacturers. They all hit their 200,000 cap, right?

Ms. STABENOW. Not all.

Mr. MANCHIN. General Motors hit it. Ford hit it.

Ms. STABENOW. Ford didn't hit it.

Mr. MANCHIN. I thought they hit it.

Ms. STABENOW. They haven't hit it, no.

Mr. MANCHIN. I am understanding that they did. OK, we will work on that. It was very close that they did.

That was over for them. They have no more. It was over. It was over. They were done. If we didn't do anything, they were done. The only people who had access to our market, if we had not done this bill, was all European manufacturers. All the manufacturers in the United States already hit their caps. So I am saying it was over. We gave them new life into this.

All we are saying is, Can't we at least get manufacturing in the United States where we are not depending on foreign supply chains, especially China? That is the difference. I mean, they knew the bill. They didn't like the bill. They built their whole model around—you would think that car manufacturing in America is going to go broke if they don't get the \$7,500 credit from the U.S. Treasury.

And there are people waiting a year.

I said: Let me tell you something. If you are waiting a year to get a product because you like it and it is good and you make it better than any place in the world, I don't think that is what you are making the decision on, because they have already lost it. China could have flooded the market. We stopped all of that from happening.

We just have a difference. We just have a difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. First of all, China cannot flood the market because we are not going to be able to meet these criteria in terms of being able to get the credit. They have their own credit, and there is no reason they are not going to be able to flood the U.S. market. I have a difference of opinion about what this actually means.

This is what I would say. We have had three parts of the stool on supporting moving forward on a new electric transportation model. One is

charging stations that we did in the infrastructure bill. It is really important to have charging stations. No. 2 is helping to create production through the battery and clean energy tax credits and so on. Third is helping to bring costs down at the beginning until volume comes up.

Now, the reason people are waiting for cars is because of the lack of chips. I mean, they are waiting because of that, and we addressed that as well.

The truth is, what was put in place on this piece was complicated. It doesn't work for several years for American companies. It doesn't stop China. It doesn't stop anybody else from coming into our market. They can come into our market. It stops our companies from fully benefiting from a piece of this with consumers. That is very important.

Thank you very much. I object.

S. RES. 13

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, the resolution designating January as National Stalking Awareness month will be voted on and pass the Senate. I thank my colleague and friend Senator AMY KLOBUCHAR for her work and dedication to this subject. Approximately 1 in 6 women and 1 in 17 men in the U.S. have experienced stalking at some point in their lives.

This bipartisan resolution sends a clear message: We will not stand for this egregious conduct. Millions of our fellow Americans have been victims of stalking. Oftentimes, their stories involve years-long episodes, drastic changes to their lives to secure their safety and, sadly, other criminal activity by stalkers. This month is a time for us all to reflect on the pervasiveness of stalking and the serious hardships and dangers faced by victims.

As stated in the resolution, I also want to thank the advocates who are on the frontlines of this issue and stand ready to assist victims and provide them with the resources and support they need and deserve.

The work of advocates raising awareness, of law enforcement and courts taking preventive and punitive action and of serviceworkers in providing help to victims are all worthy of our thanks.

Our work doesn't stop here. I am once again recommitting to the fight against stalking, trafficking, and other conduct that targets our most vulnerable populations.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess subject to the call of the Chair.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:54 p.m., recessed subject to the call of the Chair and reassembled at 1:36 p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PETERS).

NATIONAL STALKING AWARENESS MONTH—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

S. RES. 13

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise in support of the resolution that I lead with Senator GRASSLEY to designate January 2023 as a focus on stalking awareness.

This year's resolution has eight bipartisan cosponsors. This resolution builds on Congress's recent efforts to curb domestic violence. We already passed the reauthorization of the Violence Against Women Act, which back in 2013 included the bipartisan STALKERS Act to improve Federal anti-stalking laws. Last year, once again, we reauthorized the Violence Against Women Act. But there is so much more work that needs to be done.

You know, not so long ago, stalking was not seen as the harmful crime we know it to be today. It was only in the 1990s that the first anti-stalking legislation was passed in the United States. Without a consistent definition of "stalking" or resources for those in crisis, too often victims struggle to find the support they need to name and identify the harm they were experiencing.

Through the tireless work of law enforcement officers, prosecutors, and service providers, we have seen progress. In the three decades since the first anti-stalking legislation was passed, every State in the country has passed anti-stalking laws. My home State passed it in 1993—3 years before Congress made stalking a crime.

But we know our work is not done. Approximately one in every three women in the United States has experienced stalking. Each year, more than 13 million people report that they are victims of stalking. According to one study, young adults between the ages of 18 and 24 experienced stalking more than any other age group.

As a former prosecutor, I know the emotional toll this crime takes. I know what the victims suffer from. Nearly 70 percent of those who are stalked by an intimate partner are physically abused by their stalkers, and three in four women who were killed by an intimate partner were stalked by their killers in the year leading up to their deaths.

By passing this resolution today, we can show how deeply we appreciate the work of law enforcement, that we are there for the victims, and we will do all we can to provide the services, safety, and stability they need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote scheduled for 1:45 begin immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON S. RES. 13

The question is on adoption of the resolution.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. I ask for the yeas and nays.