

debt limit bill. Well, it is really quite simple. House Republicans want to pair any increase in the debt ceiling with spending reforms, and the President doesn't want anything that will restrain his ability to spend. He is intent on expanding the size and reach of the Federal Government, and spending reforms would get in the way.

What President Biden does not seem to realize, however, is that our Nation is on an unsustainable spending trajectory. Spending under the Biden administration has reached staggering levels. The total Federal budget for fiscal year 2023 is up approximately 40 percent from 2019, the last budget before the pandemic—40 percent. And under the President's budget, over the next decade, the Federal budget would reach a staggering \$10 trillion, a 125-percent increase from its pre-pandemic level. Think about it—a 125-percent increase in the cost of government from the pre-pandemic level. Our country and our economy cannot take that level of spending.

Between October and March, the Federal Government borrowed \$6 billion a day—a day. That is more than the entire 2023 budget for my State of South Dakota. The amount of money that the Federal Government borrows in a single day is more than the entire budget for the State of South Dakota for the entire year. Debt at that level threatens economic growth. It jeopardizes our national security and leaves us excessively dependent on other countries who hold our Nation's debt, and it sucks money away from essential government spending on things like Social Security and Medicare and our national defense.

Just paying the interest on our debt is taking a toll on our Nation's budget. According to the nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, 50 cents of every dollar our country borrows in the next 10 years will go just toward paying interest on our national debt. By 2028, we will be spending more on interest than on national defense. By 2044, we will be spending more on interest than on Medicare. And by 2050, we will be spending more on interest than on Social Security.

How in the world are we going to be able to pay for these programs and other essential government functions if we are spending that much money just meeting the interest—the interest alone—on that massive, going-on-\$32-trillion debt?

Negotiating over the debt ceiling is hardly new. Seven of the last ten debt limit increases have included some mix of policy or budgetary changes rather than a simple, clean increase. And the Democrat leader of the Senate, the same Democrat leader who is now insisting on a clean debt limit increase, is on the record during the last administration talking about using the debt ceiling as leverage to achieve Democrat priorities.

So the President and the Democrat leader's outrage that they might have

to yield to the realities of divided government and actually have to negotiate over the debt ceiling is a little hard to swallow. And it is profoundly disturbing that, with a national debt in excess of \$31 trillion and growing every day, the President and the Democrat leader can't be brought to consider even the mildest spending reforms.

House Republicans have proposed reasonable spending reforms. The nonpartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget—where the President's own Treasury Secretary used to sit on the Board, I might add—called the Republican bill “a serious package” and a “realistic and extremely welcome first step.” But if the President doesn't like the House's proposed spending reforms, he should put forward his own spending reforms.

What he should not do, however, and cannot responsibly do is continue to refuse to engage in negotiations. If he continues to reject compromise, if he continues to insist that it is his way and no other, then, come June, he will be responsible for our Nation defaulting on its debts.

The President has already spent us into an inflation crisis. Let's hope he can see his way to negotiating before he plunges us into a default crisis as well.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

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

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

#### VOTE ON GORORDO NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Gorordo nomination?

Mr. REED. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 117 Ex.]

#### YEAS—52

Baldwin	Cardin	Duckworth
Bennet	Carper	Durbin
Blumenthal	Casey	Fetterman
Booker	Collins	Hassan
Brown	Coons	Heinrich
Cantwell	Cortez Masto	Hickenlooper

Hirono	Ossoff	Stabenow
Kaine	Padilla	Tester
Kelly	Peters	Van Hollen
King	Reed	Warner
Klobuchar	Romney	Warnock
Luján	Rosen	Warren
Manchin	Sanders	Welch
Markey	Schatz	Whitehouse
Menendez	Schumer	Wyden
Merkley	Shaheen	Young
Murphy	Sinema	
Murray	Smith	

#### NAYS—45

Barrasso	Fischer	Mullin
Blackburn	Graham	Murkowski
Boozman	Grassley	Paul
Braun	Hagerty	Ricketts
Britt	Hawley	Risch
Budd	Hoeven	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cramer	Lee	Sullivan
Crapo	Lummis	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Vance
Ernst	Moran	Wicker

#### NOT VOTING—3

Feinstein	Gillibrand	Tuberville
-----------	------------	------------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 55, Glenna Lauren Wright-Gallo, of Nevada, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

Charles E. Schumer, Ben Ray Luján, Peter Welch, Tina Smith, Tammy Duckworth, Tim Kaine, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Raphael G. Warnock, Christopher Murphy, John W. Hickenlooper, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Baldwin, Edward J. Markey, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Mazie K. Hirono.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Glenna Lauren Wright-Gallo, of Nevada, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 52, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 118 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Hirono	Rosen
Bennet	Kaine	Sanders
Blumenthal	Kelly	Schatz
Booker	King	Schumer
Brown	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cantwell	Luján	Sinema
Cardin	Manchin	Smith
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	Menendez	Tester
Collins	Merkley	Van Hollen
Coons	Murkowski	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Ossoff	Welch
Fetterman	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden
Heinrich	Reed	
Hickenlooper	Romney	

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Fischer	Mullin
Blackburn	Graham	Paul
Boozman	Grassley	Ricketts
Braun	Hagerty	Risch
Britt	Hawley	Rounds
Budd	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lankford	Sullivan
Cramer	Lee	Thune
Crapo	Lummis	Tillis
Cruz	Marshall	Vance
Daines	McConnell	Wicker
Ernst	Moran	Young

NOT VOTING—3

Feinstein	Gillibrand	Tuberville
-----------	------------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). The yeas are 52; the nays are 45.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Glenna Laureen Wright-Gallo, of Nevada, to be Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:21 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Ms. Rosen).

EXECUTIVE SESSION—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

NOMINATION OF COLLEEN JOY SHOGAN

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity to come to the floor. This is like what they call in Delaware a “threefer”—three for one. And I appreciate the cooperation of the floor staff and from you to enable me to do this.

One of the things I always look for when I am hiring somebody is I ask for

recommendations and references of people they have worked for in the past. As it turns out, in the nomination of Dr. Colleen Shogan to be the Archivist of the United States, one of the people she used to work for was Senator Joe Lieberman, a good friend to all of us, Democrats and Republicans.

He was good enough to reach out to me several weeks ago, and we had just had a hearing on Dr. Shogan before us in the Homeland Security Committee. I was really impressed. He called and said: She used to work for me. And I said: No kidding? Well, I wouldn't disqualify her for that.

I am just kidding. But he went on to tell me what a remarkable human being she was, even at a younger age in her life. But as the Chief Administrator of the National Archives and Records Administration, the Archivist of the United States plays a vital role in a couple of different ways: one, especially with the preservation of the history of this country that we are all sworn to protect.

This person who has been nominated, this nominee, would serve as our Nation's recordkeeper for executive agencies and for Presidential records while also being responsible for the National Archives and Records Administration.

This role has been critical in leading the Federal Government's ongoing transition from paper to electronic records for a long time. Dr. Shogan is extremely well qualified to take on what is not a small responsibility; it is a great responsibility and important, too.

As Senior Vice President and Director of the David M. Rubenstein Center for White House History at the White House Historical Association, Dr. Shogan has already demonstrated her extensive skill set as an archivist.

She is a dedicated public servant, pulling a decade's worth of senior roles at the Library of Congress. She has developed a career in academia, Federal Government service, and nonprofit management. And one of those folks she worked with—worked for—was our former colleague, Senator Joe Lieberman.

At our hearing to consider her nomination before the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee earlier this year, Dr. Shogan reaffirmed her commitment to non-partisanship, which is very important for this role. She highlighted her service as the Vice Chair of the Women's Suffrage Centennial Commission.

Dr. Shogan also shared how she will work to address the backlog of veterans' record requests at the National Archives and Records Administration. As the last Vietnam veteran serving here in the United States Senate, that means a lot to me.

She also has vowed to make sure that the oftentimes long and arduous process that can prevent our veterans from receiving their critical services and benefits that they are entitled to, that they are addressed.

I strongly urge my colleagues to confirm Dr. Shogan as the Archivist of the United States, and I know she will serve our country well.

My talking points now say to yield the floor, but I am not, because I have been asked by the folks who help us manage the floor if I would like to go ahead and speak on two CRAs, which is the Congressional Review Act resolutions. And I would like to do that, if I may. I appreciate the tolerance and consideration of the chairman of our committee.

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT VOTES

Madam President, on the first one, this is an unlikely one. Let me just say, Delaware has a very strong ag industry. If you look at the key industries in Delaware, our No. 1 slot, people think it is banking and chemicals and stuff like that. The No. 1 is agriculture. It has been agriculture for as long as I have lived in the First State. We raise a lot of chickens, we raise a lot of other things as well.

One of the creatures that helps us best in managing the battle against pests in our State—and, as it turns out, in over 35 other States—is an unlikely creature called the long-eared bat. What I want to do today is to talk about the resolution being offered by our friends on the other side to reverse a critical habitat designation under the Endangered Species Act with respect to this listing of the northern long-eared bat as an endangered species.

Madam President, last week, I came to the floor, you may recall, to this chamber to defend science-based protections for the lesser prairie-chicken. As I said then, that species has long been considered an important indicator of the health of American grasslands and prairie.

Today, I rise in opposition to two new congressional review act resolutions which would revoke science-based rules under the Endangered Species Act. Simply put, the Endangered Species Act is our best tool to address biodiversity loss in the United States. We know biodiversity is worth preserving for many reasons, whether it be to protect human health or whether it is a moral imperative or to be good stewards of our one and only planet.

The first resolution that we are going to consider would reinstate a rule from the Trump administration which limited the ability of the National Marine Fisheries Service and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to designate critical habitat based on the best available science.

What is critical habitat, some may ask? They are areas that our Federal Agencies identify as key to the recovery of threatened and endangered species. The agencies subsequently propose these areas for protection, and the habitat becomes the focus of conservation efforts.

The Trump-era rule that the CRA resolution would reinstate was especially damaging for species that are imperiled due to climate change. The