

leadership. President Biden has simply been MIA.

First, the President said he would not negotiate unless Speaker MCCARTHY and House Republicans passed their own bill. So they did. Our Republican colleagues in the House passed a responsible bill. It is the only legislation currently in existence that can pass even one Chamber of Congress, let alone both.

Let that sink in.

This is where we are. Senate Democrats and Leader SCHUMER can give all the angry speeches they want, but they have no bill. Leader SCHUMER has no plan that can earn 60 votes here in the Senate. He has no solution that can even pass his Chamber, let alone the House. Speaker MCCARTHY and House Republicans are the only people in Washington who have actually passed legislation to avoid default.

The Senate majority offers plenty of angry noises but zero plan. The only solution is Presidential leadership. President Biden has been sleepwalking toward this crisis.

It is time to wake up—time to wake up.

The President has two options. He can endorse the responsible bill the House Republicans have already passed and instruct Senate Republicans not to block it in this Chamber or he can finally sit down with Speaker MCCARTHY and reach an agreement. The Speaker of the House has been sitting at the grownup's table for months waiting for President Biden to act like a leader.

Whatever President Biden and Speaker McCarthy can both agree to will pass the Senate easily. Any bill that doesn't meet that description appears to have no chance.

So I am glad President Biden has begun backing down and finally advised the Speaker to begin negotiating. I accept his invitation to join the meeting myself, but I will continue to lend my support to the Speaker.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT VOTES

Mr. President, on another matter, today the Senate has two opportunities to roll back this administration's overreach and redtape.

The first resolution is from our colleague Senator MARSHALL. It builds on bipartisan efforts to remedy a hugely painful side effect of the Endangered Species Act that is holding American farms, ranches, and other small businesses hostage to an animal called the lesser prairie-chicken—the lesser prairie-chicken. Americans in Kansas and Oklahoma were already striking a careful balance between prosperity and conservation without Washington meddling. A voluntary partnership between local landowners and officials had already secured 15 million acres of potential habitat.

Since 2013, the population of this particular bird is actually up. But the Biden administration wants to plow ahead anyway, throw the book at these Americans, and threaten nearly \$14 billion in agricultural production.

The second resolution tackles an issue that is top of the mind for many Senators: winning the economic competition with the Chinese Communist Party.

Last June, President Biden issued an emergency proclamation to let unfairly traded Chinese solar panels enter U.S. markets without additional tariffs that should have applied. In other words, the Democrats went soft on China for the sake of their Green New Deal daydreams. At the time, President Biden's own Commerce Department was investigating Chinese producers for circumventing solar panel tariffs by rerouting products through other countries.

American workers and manufacturers were counting on the results of that investigation to reestablish a fair and level playing field. In December, a preliminary report did find the Chinese companies had cheated, but the administration threw in the towel and gave China a win.

Today, the Senate can join the House and take bipartisan action to freeze the President's so-called emergency proclamation and make his administration hold China's unfair trade practices actually to account. I hope each of my colleagues will join me in supporting both of these commonsense resolutions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the National Institutes of Health here in the Washington, DC, area is the leading health research Agency in the world—in the world. And we are very proud of that fact.

One of the leaders of the NIH, through Presidents of both political parties, was Dr. Francis Collins, who still is part of the Biden administration. But as head of NIH, he really brought the research capacity of that Agency to a historic high.

I visited him about 6 years ago and said: What can I do as a Member of the Senate to help you when it comes to medical research?

He said: Well, the researchers that we count on to come through with the breakthroughs in medical research are never sure what Congress is going to do. Are you going to fund us this year as much money as last year or are you going to cut our budgets? Some of the researchers give up even on promising projects because they are uncertain about the future. He said: The best thing you can do, Senator, is to get 5 percent real growth in the spending at the National Institutes of Health year in and year out.

I said: Dr. Collins, I will take you up on that.

I came back here to the Senate and discovered that the person I needed to win to my point of view on this was Republican Senator Roy Blunt from Missouri. He chaired the Appropriations subcommittee, which funded that Agency. So I went to Roy, and I said:

Here is what Dr. Collins said. We all respect him. For a man who discovered the human genome, we should respect him. He thinks 5 percent real growth can make a difference.

Roy Blunt, Republican, said: I need to have Lamar Alexander and another Republican Senator on my side, and you need to make sure PATTY MURRAY is on your side. I said: I am sure she is, but I will double check.

So we put together a team of four of us—two Democrats, two Republicans—and we did it—5 percent real growth in the budget of NIH—about 6 years ago.

The response was positive across the Nation. Researchers said: If this is going to be the future, we are going to stick with our research to see what we can find to help people alleviate suffering.

So our team put together an effort that raised the annual budget of the National Institutes of Health from \$30 billion to \$40 billion. It was a bipartisan effort and a good effort. Luckily, some of the research that they had undertaken was of practical value to families across America during the coronavirus epidemic. So we felt pretty good about it.

MEDICAL RESEARCH

Let me switch to another topic. One of the most insidious diagnoses that a person can get is to learn that they have brain cancer, glioblastoma. There are 40,000 Americans each year who are diagnosed with brain cancer. It usually gives them 2 years to live when they receive that diagnosis—14,000 Americans each year.

Ironically—coincidentally—it seems to have touched this body more than most. It was glioblastoma that took the life of Teddy Kennedy and John McCain and one of our great friends in the Democratic cloakroom, Tim Mitchell. I don't know why. I don't know if that is just a coincidence, but it certainly drove home to all of us what a serious diagnosis this is—glioblastoma, brain cancer.

I am going to delve into territory here where my education has not prepared me. I am a liberal arts major and have a law degree. I will be talking a little about science, but, luckily, I will be reading it to make sure I get it right.

One of the real obstacles to treating brain cancer is what is known as the blood-brain barrier. You can give—inject—a medicine into an ordinary person, and it will flow through their veins, but it won't get into the brain. So the treatment of many brain cancers is very basic—surgery—to try to remove the tumor with surgery. But the problem is, of course, surgery can't capture every errant cancer cell that might be flowing through the brain, and eventually, the brain cancer overcomes even surgical attempts. So there has always been a barrier, the blood-brain barrier.

The treatment has been dealing with and trying to find a way to get into the brain with chemotherapy. The good

news is that this morning, it was announced that Northwestern University—which I am proud to represent in the city of Chicago—has made some breakthroughs. If you will bear with me for a moment, I want to make sure I state this properly:

For the first time, previously unusable chemotherapy drugs reached brain tumors in humans after a cutting-edge procedure at Northwestern University team [in Chicago].

Doctors achieved the breakthrough with an innovative mix of ultrasound and microbubbles that opened the blood-brain barrier to allow the drugs to pass through.

Dr. Adam Sonabend, one of the co-lead investigators, said:

This is a starting point to open the doors for . . . 95% of drugs that are usually not [even] considered for treating brain diseases.

The Northwestern team released a report on the use of the procedure to treat 17 patients with glioblastoma, the most common and malignant form of brain cancer that has been viewed as incurable. The treatment led to a four- to sixfold increase in drug concentrations in the patients' brains, the researchers [said].

Dr. Sonabend goes on to explain the situation: The blood-brain barrier that blocks many drugs used to treat cancer also blocks the dye that they were using to see if they could finally go through with this procedure. Dr. Sonabend said when he injected the dye while using the new ultrasound procedure, the dye appeared first in the patient's blood vessels, but then it passed the blood-brain barrier and spread into the brain. The patient's brain lit up on the x ray that was taken during this procedure to show the effectiveness of this approach.

Dr. Roger Stupp, chief of neurooncology at Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine also helped to lead the project. He said that "This is the first trial that has taken it to the next level with chemotherapy drugs" that you ordinarily could not use for brain tumors.

Dr. Sonabend said:

"In glioblastoma patients, cancer cells scattered through the brain surrounding the tumor inevitably linger after surgery. They have been impossible to get to . . ."

Now we have an avenue that might be promising to start dealing in more effective ways, not only with brain cancer but also with Parkinson's and Alzheimer's.

It is amazing to me. It literally made my day to read that story, that these researchers funded by the National Institutes of Health here in Washington may have finally come through with the ultimate breakthrough that will allow us to treat brain cancer more effectively. Can you imagine the hope this creates in the hearts and minds of so many families who have a victim of brain cancer in their family?

Now why do I raise this on the floor other than to tell you, I think, a fascinating and important story? I do it because it is a political issue. We just heard the Republican leader of the Senate come forward and tell us that he supports the proposal by the House Republicans on budget cuts.

Do you know what the House Republican budget does to medical research at the NIH?

Let me read it to you. They propose ending the bipartisan commitment to the National Institutes of Health by cutting more than \$10 billion in 2024. That is 25 percent of the budget for medical research and more than \$100 billion over the next 10 years. That will shutter hundreds of labs across the country, lead to fewer drugs being developed for cancer, diabetes, serious mental illness, and other devastating conditions. It will decimate American biotechnology innovation and economic growth. Sadly, it will allow China to become the global leader in biomedical R&D.

So when we talk about the budget here and budget cuts and they say: We are just going to cut \$10 billion, we have got to step back and say: Well, what does that do for medical research in America? Take a step backwards. The hard bipartisan work that brought us to \$40 billion is wiped away overnight. Researchers like those at Northwestern may lose heart and worry whether or not there is enough money to continue their research projects and innovation.

What will we lose in terms of quality of life? We will lose the opportunity to come up with the cures that people count on.

That is why this means so much to me. It is a small part of the cuts that have been proposed by the Republicans in the House, but it is the part that troubles me the most. We have got to keep our commitment to medical research for the good of this Nation and for the families that count on us to make certain we come up with new cures.

We are blessed in America to have the best researchers on Earth. I would take them over any other country, and most Americans would. But are we going to stand by them, or are we going to make the deep cuts in areas like medical research as part of this political debate?

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. President, you were there yesterday when the Senate Judiciary Committee met. I chair that committee, and we had a strong turnout of Democrats and Republicans to consider an issue which everyone has read about and heard about over the last several weeks, and that is, the ethical standards applied at the Highest Court in the land, the United States Supreme Court, across the street.

We all read the news stories that led to this hearing and the questions raised about one particular Justice—but not him alone—in terms of gifts that they received and whether it influences their decisionmaking on the Court. That is basic and fundamental. If you think the fix is in on the Court, you don't have much respect for their operation.

So the question is, what is going on in the Supreme Court? And as it turns

out, as you well know, we have ethical standards and codes of conduct all across the Federal Government that apply to the Members of the Senate and the House and executive branch and to all of the courts below the Supreme Court in terms of financial disclosure and basic rules on what you can do and what you can't do.

For example, there is a basic standard that is used for gifts—gifts for Members of the Senate and House—that puts a limit of \$50 on the value of any gift. I have returned gifts given to me that I think exceeded that value, and I am sure the Presiding Officer has as well. That is our standard. But there is no ethics code of conduct, as best we can understand, when it comes to the Supreme Court, the Highest Court in the land. So, it turns out the Highest Court in the land has some of the lowest ethical standards.

Why? Well, when this came to light in the news articles relating to Justice Thomas, I wrote to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Roberts, and invited him to come to the hearing yesterday to tell his side of the story. What is the Supreme Court doing when it comes to ethical standards? They don't play by the same rules as all the other courts in the America. What are their standards?

Well, the Chief Justice declined my invitation and sent along some documents to indicate what he thinks are the rules of the road for ethics in the Supreme Court now. They were interesting; but, unfortunately, they reveal that the standards of the Highest Court in the land are not equal to the standards of all the other Federal courts.

So we had a hearing yesterday on the subject. We invited witnesses from the Republican side and the Democratic side to comment on the current state of affairs. If the Chief Justice could not appear or would not appear, we went forward with the investigation, which is our responsibility under the law.

Now asking a Justice of the Supreme Court to come and testify before a congressional committee is not unusual. Ninety-two appearances have been made by Justices of the Supreme Court since 1960 before the committees of Congress. But yesterday, neither the Chief Justice nor any other Justice on the Supreme Court appeared before us.

So what we found was a surprise to me. I thought there would be some bipartisanship in this, because in the not-too-distant past, two Senators on the committee had crafted an ethics bill on the disclosure of stock holdings, sent not only to the President to sign, but it was embraced as well by the Supreme Court—a bipartisan, thoughtful measure, for sure.

But yesterday, I am afraid things were very partisan. First, there was a question as to whether or not this was an attempt to attack the conservative members of the Supreme Court by raising ethical questions. I tried to make a point, several times, that the first letter that I sent to the Chief Justice—