

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, years ago, we realized the government's failure to keep up with the amount of classified information is outdated; it is insufficient; and it is costly.

It is important to improve our broken classification system to reduce costs, eliminate years of backlog, and create a more efficient system. But I now recognize there is another reason to do this beyond just the efficiency of good government. We now know, also, it is making our country more vulnerable.

The disclosure of classified information threatens our country's security, diminishes the safety of our military, and damages our relationships with our allies.

We are so overwhelmed protecting outdated documents that we have failed to meet the basic purpose of our classification system: protect classified information from bad actors.

In the past year, our Nation experienced a number of harmful incidents relating to how classified information has been handled. Last year, we learned that classified information was improperly in the possession of the President, the former President, and the former Vice President.

Last month, our Nation became aware of a number of documents allegedly leaked by a 21-year-old Air National Guardsman trying to impress his video game buddies.

Regarding the latest leaks and the constant reporting streaming from them, I am mystified that such a person could have such broad access to some of our Nation's most sensitive information.

The alleged leaker had a known history of threatening violence and a record that did not permit him to obtain a gun. How could he be trusted with a top security clearance?

To protect the security of the United States, it is necessary for Congress to understand how these episodes happened, ascertain the damage that has been inflicted, and work to reduce the likelihood of them ever happening again.

We must also overhaul how records are handled and who has access to them. I want to highlight the enormous amount of classified information that is already in the government's possession. In this digital era, the Federal Government is classifying more information than our current analog declassification efforts can meet.

We are increasingly finding that information which should no longer be classified, including historical records subject to mandatory declassification, remain classified because the system is just simply overwhelmed.

This comes at a cost of good governance: American taxpayers spend \$18 billion a year—\$18 billion a year—on this broken system, and it prevents transparency, costly and not good government, citizens without information.

When there are no compelling national security reasons to justify

records remaining classified, public trust in government is undermined.

Senator WYDEN, the Senator from Oregon, and I have attempted to address this growing problem by introducing the Declassification Reform Act in the previous two Congresses.

Following the recommendations of the Public Interest Declassification Board, we sought to designate the Director of National Intelligence as the official responsible to oversee an intelligence community-wide reform so that we don't fall further and further and further behind.

The intelligence community recognizes the urgency of reforming the classification system. However, it remains a question of who is in charge of this process. An executive agent is necessary. The Declassification Reform Act establishes a working fund for Agencies to utilize.

Our legislation doesn't resolve every problem associated with how government classifies and declassifies information. Too much information is classified, and administrations from both parties have allowed political considerations to interfere in the declassification process. But when records no longer require classification, neither disagreements about national security nor politics are to blame. It is an out-of-date system that is in need of leadership—leadership to reform it.

A modernized declassification system will help eliminate years of backlog and create more efficiency and greater transparency.

Modernizing our system would also apply to the process of tracking records that are supposed to remain classified so that we can better keep them secure, which is now the top priority for why we must immediately address this issue.

We live in a very dangerous world. And information that is classified and should be classified should not be shared with others. And yet we saw that happen just last month. Sensitive information that must remain classified must be protected from carelessness or maliciousness. Yet the records that no longer need to remain classified should be made available in a timely fashion.

I serve on the Senate Intelligence Committee. I look forward to introducing legislation with Senator WARNER as chairman, Senator CORNYN and Senator WYDEN, other members of that committee, to introduce legislation in the coming days to further address this issue.

I also welcome the opportunity to work with my colleagues, both on the committee and in this Chamber, to advance this debate and reach solutions to improve an out-of-date declassification system and better protect our national security, the challenges we face in this country and around the world. Now is not the time for us to look the other way. We can do better, and we need to head down that path quickly.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

SOLAR TARIFFS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the CRA that we will be voting on soon. This vote presents a pretty simple choice: Do you stand with American manufacturers and American workers or do you stand with China and do you stand with our continuing to lose our industrial base?

I fought my whole career for fair trade. One of my first and proudest votes was against the North American Free Trade Agreement, as a Member of the House. We saw what that agreement did to Vermont, did to Ohio, and did to Kansas—and Senator MORAN just spoke. We saw what NAFTA did.

These trade fights are not a new fight. Some years ago—about 20 years ago—when I was a Member of the House, I wrote a book called "Myths of Free Trade." The book wasn't exactly a bestseller. I can live with that. But telling the truth on trade has not been popular in this town—by Presidents of both parties, majorities in Congress, and corporate leaders and CEOs who were lobbying Congress.

Essentially, these trade agreements sold out American workers. These trade agreements were signed or, at least, negotiated by American Presidents and voted for by far too many Members of Congress, lobbied by the most powerful interest groups in Washington.

I remember that during NAFTA—there were two things during NAFTA, particularly. One was that someone said that there were more corporate jets at National Airport than they had ever seen, because CEOs were all flying in to push for NAFTA—to get us to vote for NAFTA—because it was more money in their pockets because it was fewer dollars in workers' pockets. The other thing I remember was one of the—this was a two-party thing. Democrats were pretty bad. Republicans were actually slightly worse. But both parties were guilty, and Presidents from both parties—from Trump and all the way back to Clinton, since I came here.

One of the Democratic leaders on this issue in the House said to me: You know, I hate these congressional recesses because when our Members go home and go to county fairs and start meeting with people, they decide that they don't think NAFTA is such a great idea.

So every time we went home, this guy, who was a Member of Congress who was pushing for NAFTA, had more work to do because the more the public heard from workers—the more that Congressman heard from workers and

from the public—the less they liked this agreement. Workers from Ohio and around the country watched the people who are supposed to represent them and stand up for them sell out to corporations again and again.

Let me tell you a real quick story. I grew up in Mansfield, OH, an industrial city at the time that was roughly halfway between Cleveland and Columbus. I worked on a family farm nearby through most of my teen years. But I remember walking the halls at a school called Johnny Appleseed Junior High. In Johnny Appleseed Junior High, I walked the halls with the sons and daughters of electrical workers at Westinghouse, autoworkers at General Motors, rubberworkers at Mansfield Tire, and machinists at Tappan Stove; and with the sons and daughters of trades people, laborers, electricians, insulators, sheet metal workers, plumbers, pipefitters, and operating engineers.

Those kids had a chance in life. Those kids had a pretty good solid middle-class life because their parents carried a union card. They had that advantage. We were a country where management would sit down with workers, and they would negotiate. Management would do well, not the kind of \$10 million-a-year CEO salaries as today, but they would do well. But workers would do well and be able to buy a car and a decent home and send their kids to Mansfield OSU or North Central Technical College or whatever.

By the time I got to Mansfield High School, you could see those jobs starting to be lost. By the time, years later, when I represented Mansfield in the legislature, so many of those jobs were gone because those companies were using words like—first, they moved south for cheap labor. Then they moved to Mexico. Then they moved to China.

Those companies were moving their production overseas in the name of “efficiency.” Efficiency is always business school speak for lower wages: We want more efficiency. Actually, we really want lower wages, but we can’t say that in public.

Corporations searched the globe for cheap labor. First, they shut down production in Mansfield, OH, and Toledo and Dayton. Then they moved to Alabama and Mississippi. Wages were low, and the unions were not particularly active there because the governments in those States kept them out, and the businesses kept them out. Then those wages weren’t cheap enough, and that is when they started going overseas.

They lobbied for tax breaks and bad trade deals always in search of lower wages. And, you know, Wall Street would reward them over and over.

Norfolk Southern I pay attention to because of their irresponsibility and greed and what they did to a community in my State. Every time they lay off workers—Norfolk Southern laid off a third of its workforce in the past 2 years. Every time they lay off workers,

their quarterly earnings report gets a little better, and their profits get a little better.

What does Wall Street do? Wall Street rewards them with a higher stock price. Then what happens is those CEOs and top executives are able to cash in, in a bigger and bigger way, with stock buybacks and other ways.

So look at where we have ended up because of this corporate-dominated, corporate-ridden trade policy. An Ohioan invented the light bulb. Today, 99 percent of LED bulbs are made in China. On the west coast, an American invented the semiconductor. Today, 90 percent of them are made overseas. We cannot and will not make that mistake again with the technologies that power our economy over the next century.

We have heard a lot of talk in the Senate over the past year about supporting manufacturing and innovation so we can better compete with China. Senator CORNYN is on the floor. He and Senator CASEY are working on a really important bill on corporate outsourcing that I hope we pass, and it will absolutely matter. It is why, in the end, we passed the CHIPS Act, to bring semiconductor production back home where it belongs.

We passed a bipartisan infrastructure bill. I worked with Senator Portman, the other Senator from Ohio, on that and on a number of other bills that rebuild our bridges and roads.

We passed the Inflation Reduction Act to make sure we lead the world in new renewable energy technologies, like solar.

But, now, suspending those solar tariffs is antithetical to the good work we did. We take four steps forward and, today, move three steps backward. That is not the progress we need.

President Biden has talked about how we are essentially—and I have been talking to him about this, and he has been repeating it—that we are burying the term “Rust Belt” in my part of the country. You can’t say you want American manufacturing to lead the world and then allow Chinese companies, subsidized always by their government, to skirt the rules and dump solar panels in the United States.

We have in my State—I believe it is still—the largest solar manufacturing company in America. First Solar employs 2,000 workers in Northwest Ohio. These workers are ready to lead the world in this industry. They just need a level playing field.

We know China cheats. The Chinese Government, as they have for generations—unfortunately, American politicians helped them do it, and American corporations helped them do it, and we build up the Chinese military that now we are concerned with.

China illegally subsidizes industry, from steel to solar. They have been doing it for years. They are always coming up with new ways to cheat. It is sort of a Whac-A-Mole problem, where we stop this cheating, and then it goes somewhere else. We stop that, and it goes somewhere else.

We put tariffs on their illegally dumped products, and they move some aspect of production to other nearby countries to get around those rules. They move to Cambodia, Malaysia, Taiwan, Vietnam, and wherever they can find to cheat and to ignore the rules.

Blame them—and I certainly do—but we have allowed it. We have allowed it because American politicians, Presidents of both parties, and far too many people in this Chamber—I would certainly say the Presiding Officer is an exception to that—far too many people in this body have gone along with it as corporate America has lobbied and lobbied and lobbied aggressively.

This isn’t just a guess. The administration’s own Commerce Department conducted an independent investigation. They released preliminary results in December. And surprise, surprise, they found that, yes, four leading Chinese solar cell manufacturers are dodging U.S. tariffs by routing some of their operations through Southeast Asia.

We can’t let them keep doing it.

That is what this vote today is about. It has real consequences for our leadership in my State in manufacturing and for American leadership in one of the leading energy industries of the future.

To my colleagues who say we must allow these Chinese imports for the time being in order to fight climate change, I disagree. Nobody in this body is more concerned and more active in terms of understanding environmental issues. As a senior in high school, I started the first Earth Day in Richland County in 1970. My commitment is absolute.

But when people say this is about climate change, surely, it isn’t. It is about ceding our leadership to other countries, and it will not result in long-term success.

American workers must know we have their backs. They need to know they aren’t a little side issue: We are for workers, except when we are doing this; we are for workers, except when we are doing that.

If you believe in the dignity of work, if you put workers at the center of our economic policy, it makes things better. We have seen how dangerous it is when we cede American leadership to other countries in key industries like semiconductors. Now we play catch up.

American workers have proven they can make these solar panels. It is not a hypothetical. Americans are manufacturing solar panels that can power our economy right now, today. They need a level playing field.

How are businesses going to expand and scale up production if they are constantly dealing with a flood—I mean a flood, one after another after another wave—of illegally subsidized imports? It comes down, as the Presiding Officer knows, to whose side are you on? Do you stand with workers in Ohio or stand with the Chinese Communist Party? Do you stand with the American solar industry or do you stand

with the solar industry in a country that cheats time after time?

It is that simple. If you love this country, you fight for the people who make it work.

I ask my colleagues to join me in standing up for workers in Ohio and around the country.

TRIBUTE TO ANNA GOKALDAS

Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and honor a longtime member of my staff, Anna Gokaldas.

Anna has been with our office almost a decade—working on veterans affairs, foreign policy, and defense—making a difference for so many Ohioans and so many of our veterans.

Anna's last day with our office is a couple of days from now. She moves on for a new opportunity at Millennium Challenge, where she will be working on something she cares so passionately about: to reduce poverty around the world.

They are lucky to have her. Her dedication to public service and public good is unwavering.

One of her greatest successes happened last summer when we passed the PACT Act, comprehensive expansion of benefits for veterans who faced toxic exposure in our country's history. Because of Anna and the veterans and advocates she worked with, the PACT Act is law today, named after an Ohioan, Heath Robinson. Thousands of veterans have access to the healthcare they deserve.

Because of her work and because this place did it right, this bill passed in August. I remember the President signing it. By January, several hundred thousand veterans—tens of thousands in my State of Ohio—were already getting additional care from the VA because they had one of these 23 illnesses from exposure to these football-field-size burn pits in Iraq and in Afghanistan, especially.

That exposure can cause any of these 23 illnesses. If you are diagnosed with one of those illnesses, you immediately get care from the Dayton VA or in Cleveland or in Cincinnati or in Chillicothe or at the Columbus or Mansfield CBOC.

It is one example of why Anna is so effective. Veterans brought this issue to her and my staff. She took their concerns seriously. She approached every conversation with care. She went to work. We worked with Members of both parties to find a solution, especially Senator TESTER and Senator MORAN. Anna never gave up. We got it done.

Among staff, Anna is known for problem-solving skills and her ability to connect with Ohio veterans.

When the VA recommended closing the Chillicothe VA, Anna fought to ensure it stayed open so veterans in Southwest Ohio could continue to receive care. Anna helped plan roundtables and coordinated with the VA. She got me to spend a lot of time in Chillicothe, talking to Jessica Fee, the head of the union there and others. Together, we got it done.

Every year, Anna guided our office through the NDAA process—the bill that funds national defense—with special attention to military bases in Mansfield, Youngstown, Toledo, and Springfield, and special attention to the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Dayton.

She has long fought for better mental health services and suicide prevention. She made veterans' issues—that is an area that is, very often, an overlooked priority for the Senate. And one of the reasons that I sit on the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Ag Committee is because these two committees are the least partisan committees in the Senate. You can always reach across the aisle in those two committees—with Senator THUNE on agricultural issues, with Senator TILLIS on veterans' issues, and others. We get things done, and you know how important that is.

On the foreign policy side, Anna always stood up for human rights and democracy and justice around the world. She fought for global health, leading our office's efforts on tuberculosis, which still kills more than a million people a year around the world. We know how to deal with it. We made progress, just not enough.

Anna's legacy in our office extends far past her countless legislative wins, making all of this work better.

She has pushed every member of our staff to do their best work for the people with whom we serve. Her determination, dedication, and commitment to public service have made a difference for so many.

On behalf of everyone in my office and the committee and all those who have had the honor of working alongside of Anna Gokaldas, we will miss you, and we thank you for your service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as we all have observed in recent years, we have witnessed a deeply concerning string of attacks, verbal and otherwise, against Federal judges. I am not talking about fiery speeches or statements by activists and organizations that happen to disagree with a particular ruling. That is their right under the First Amendment to the Constitution. What I am talking about are physical threats, including those from elected officials who want to control another branch of government and because they don't like the decisions that the judiciary is handing down in a given case.

A few years ago, five of our Democratic colleagues filed a friend of the Court brief in the Supreme Court on a case involving gun rights. These Senators made a not-so-subtle threat to the Justices that unless the Court ruled in a certain way, the entire institution could be, quote, "restructured." Some might call that coercion or intimidation.

Last year, one of our Democratic colleagues took another jab, calling the

Supreme Court's conservative majority "stolen," "illegitimate," and "far right."

But without a doubt, one of the most shocking and reckless examples of what I am talking about occurred 4 years ago with New York's senior Senator, now the majority leader of the United States Senate. As the Supreme Court considered an abortion case, the Democratic leader went to the steps of the Supreme Court and threatened two Supreme Court Justices by name if they did not rule a certain way. He said:

I want to tell you, Gorsuch; I want to tell you, Kavanaugh: You have released the whirlwind, and you will pay the price. You won't know what hit you if you go forward with these awful decisions.

Now, it might be more understandable if these words were said by some person on the street who didn't have the sort of education and background and responsibilities of the majority leader of the United States Senate, but coming from the leader of this institution, those words were shocking and reckless and even dangerous.

I hope it doesn't come as a surprise to the majority leader that when he talks, people listen. That is true for Senators in this Chamber. I know sometimes we think nobody is listening to what we say, but when we say something like that, people do listen. I have no doubt that some heard Senator SCHUMER issue unveiled threats against Supreme Court Justices, and they viewed that as permission to take action on their part—for example, the individual who was prepared to assassinate Justice Kavanaugh. No doubt this person of unstable mental mind heard some of the rhetoric and was moved to action. Thank goodness for the law enforcement officials who were able to interdict him.

Last summer, as the Supreme Court considered another case involving abortion rights, an organization released the home addresses of the Supreme Court Justices, some of whom still have young, school-age children at home. They encouraged protesters to show up at the Justices' homes to harass and intimidate them, which just so happens to be a Federal crime. It was a disgusting breach of privacy and a massive security risk for these members of the Court and their families.

It was sadly met with nothing more than a shrug by some of our Democratic colleagues. The Senate majority leader said he is comfortable with protests happening outside of the Justices' homes, even though it is a Federal crime.

The White House confirmed that President Biden believes this is a constitutional right, to protest, even though it is a Federal crime. President Biden and Attorney General Garland have not seen fit to bring any charges against these protesters for their attempts to intimidate members of the Supreme Court at their homes at all times of the day and night. In fact,