

In Nebraska, we have a long history of farm broadcasters who help farmers and ranchers thrive. Today, there are still over 40 AM stations that are based in my State.

Unfortunately, there are some who have lost sight of the fundamental role broadcast radio plays in rural America. A number of automakers announced plans this year to remove AM broadcast radio access from some of their vehicles.

This would deal a blow to the millions who need AM radio access in order to receive emergency alerts in remote areas as well as to be aware of local news, weather conditions. AM radio is not just a luxury; it is the backbone of our emergency alert system. It can be a question of life or death for people during natural disasters and severe storms.

My colleagues and I are concerned about how this decision will affect the safety of Americans. And that is why we introduced a bicameral, bipartisan bill to preserve AM radio access, despite some automakers' efforts to get rid of it.

Our bill, the AM for Every Vehicle Act, would direct the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to issue a rule that would require all motor vehicles to have access to AM broadcast stations. The legislation is already having an impact. It recently spurred Ford Motor Company to reverse course and to restore access to AM radio in its upcoming car models.

But passing our bill is the only way to prevent other automakers from abandoning AM radio, and it is against the best interests of the millions of people in rural areas where wireless warnings—well, they can be difficult to impossible to receive.

The American people who travel to work and school on rural roads each day are relying on us to ensure that they don't lose access to local news, weather, emergency alerts, and public safety announcements from AM radio.

As Members of the U.S. Senate, we represent millions—millions—of people in rural communities across the country. We cannot let rural voices be set aside while we prioritize other issues.

Let's continue to appreciate rural TV and radio and advance legislation that supports the critical services that they provide.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

CHINA

MR. KENNEDY. Madam President, the United States and China should talk. The United States wants to, but the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party—the CCP—does not. And, frankly, the leadership of the CCP is acting like a sullen teenager. You can only be young once, but you can always be immature.

Talking does not show weakness. It shows strength. It shows confidence. America is confident. In refusing to talk, the Chinese Communist Party and its insecurities are loud.

Now, the United States, as you know from recent media reports, has tried to talk to China, and we have had some success. Recently, not that long ago, our National Security Advisor and our Commerce Secretary met with their Chinese counterparts. I understand they had good discussions.

I had hoped that that might be a start, but I was wrong. The CCP proved me wrong. For instance, our Defense Secretary, the weekend before last, I believe, was at the annual Singapore Security Conference. Our Defense Secretary asked to meet with Chinese defense officials, a fairly routine request.

The defense officials from China snubbed it.

Further, on May 26—you may have read about this in the media—a Chinese fighter jet flew within 400 yards of a U.S. reconnaissance plane flying above the South China Sea in international waters—in international waters. The U.S. plane had to fly through the Chinese fighter jet's wake, which is very dangerous. It was an unmistakable attempt by the Chinese Communist Party to intimidate.

Further still, just this past weekend, a Chinese naval ship came within 150 yards of a U.S. missile destroyer, yet another intentional and dangerous act. The U.S. ship was in the Taiwan Strait along with a Canadian warship. Both the U.S. ship and the Canadian ship had every right to be there. This was another unmistakable attempt by China to intimidate.

Additionally, hardly a day goes by that the CCP doesn't release a statement denigrating the American people and accusing the United States of wanting to suppress and even destroy China.

Let me be clear. The United States of America does not want to suppress China. The United States of America does not want to destroy China. All we want is for China to become and to act like a responsible member of a stable world order that follows international rules and norms. And that is all the world wants too.

All we want and all the world wants is for China to stop its aggression. All we want and all the world wants is for China to stop manipulating its currency.

All we want and all the world wants is for China to leave Taiwan alone. All we want and all the world wants is for China to end its attempt to militarize the South China Sea and the East China Sea, which are international waters.

All we want and all the world wants is for China to stop poisoning our children with fentanyl. Stop it.

All we want and all the world wants is for China to end its “debt trap” diplomacy through its Belt and Road Initiative and other loan schemes.

All we want and all the world wants is for China to cease using its economic power to bully other sovereign countries—like Australia, like Lithuania—when those countries offer an opinion

the Communist Party of China doesn't like.

All we want and all the world wants is for China to tell us the truth—the truth—about how the COVID virus started, or at least work with us and other countries so we can find out.

I could, of course, continue this list, but I won't.

So let me repeat. The United States and China should talk. The advantages are and ought to be obvious.

Why should we talk? To avoid military conflict. It is a pretty good start. To avoid miscalculation. The more silence there is between us, the more Beijing underestimates American strength.

Why should we talk? To limit the risk of accidental confrontation, to pursue bilateral detente, because our economies are interwoven, because our economies are stronger together if everyone plays by the rules.

Why should we talk? To seek peace in Ukraine; to develop a mutual plan for how we should respond to advancements in technology, like artificial intelligence, like quantum computing; to talk about space; to discuss fair trade policies for products that don't have national security implications.

Why should we talk? To prepare for the next pandemic—it is just a thought—to develop cheaper and cleaner energy, to avoid nuclear war, to avoid destroying the human race.

Look, if China doesn't want to talk, that would be a shame. But it is hard to fix somebody who doesn't want to be fixed. It would also be China's loss. It would be China's loss not to talk.

For years, China has tried to portray itself to the world as mighty, as successful, as peace-loving. And I hope someday China is all of those things.

China, for years, has tried to portray itself to the world as a gentle giant. For a while, it worked. It worked until it didn't. The world now sees a different China. The world now sees a China that mismanaged COVID, that is on the wrong side of the Ukraine war, that is destroying Hong Kong, that has militarized the South and East China Seas.

The world now sees a China that punishes its own people—the Uighurs and the good people of Tibet—that denies even the most basic civil rights to its Han Chinese majority, including the right to self-determine, including the right even to access an uncensored internet.

The world sees a China that tries to bully other sovereign countries.

The world now sees a China whose population is shrinking, whose people are aging without a safety net for its elderly, whose young, college-educated children can't find a job, whose housing market is in turmoil.

The world now sees a China whose debt is unmanageable, whose technology sector has been purposely, intentionally stunted by its own political leadership.

The world now sees a China whose capital markets are flailing, whose

state-owned entities are models of inefficiency and corruption, and whose economy is slowing.

I know that is a cold dish of truth, but that is what the world sees. If China cares about the world and if the people of China care about how the world sees China—and both do—China will reengage with the world, including the United States of America, not shrink from it.

So I end, Madam President, as I began. The United States and China need to talk. The United States and China need to talk, not just for the United States but also for China and for the world. And, frankly, China has the most to gain, given the deterioration of its reputation.

But it is entirely up to China. America, we have done our part, and the United States will continue to do its part. We want to talk. We are confident, but, lately, China's insecurities are loud.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

NOMINATION OF DILAWAR SYED

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to reiterate my strong support for Dilawar Syed to serve as Deputy Administrator of the U.S. Small Business Administration.

Mr. Syed is highly qualified and widely supported as a nominee who has the backing of numerous business groups and organizations. In many ways, he is the picture of the American dream. He is a business owner, entrepreneur, and job creator who was born in Pakistan and educated in the United States. Over the course of his career, Mr. Syed has founded and run several companies in the tech and healthcare sectors.

He also has firsthand experience dealing with challenges small businesses faced during this pandemic. During the COVID-19 crisis, Mr. Syed chaired a task force to help other businesses in the State of California survive and rebuild from the pandemic. His experience in and commitment to the small business sector are clear. That is why over the past 2 years my Democratic colleagues and I have made a concerted effort to get Mr. Syed confirmed.

As Deputy Administrator, he would largely be responsible for running the day-to-day operations of the SBA. Working with Administrator Guzman, he will play a critical role in ensuring that small businesses across our country have the support they need to continue growing.

This work is vital to Hawaii's economy. More than 99 percent of the businesses in our State are small businesses, and nearly half of all employees

in Hawaii work for a small business. A strong, fully staffed Small Business Administration is essential for these small businesses in my home State and millions more across the country.

Despite his stellar qualifications and the importance of the SBA, for nearly 2 years my Republican colleagues have blocked Mr. Syed's nomination to serve in this important role. I sit on the Small Business Committee, and we have had numerous times where we would call a markup in order to enable a vote on Mr. Syed's nomination, and the Republicans would simply not bother to show up. They just wouldn't even bother to show up.

My Republican colleagues have at different points wrongly accused Mr. Syed of being anti-Israel. They have chastised him for utilizing legal SBA pandemic relief loans and raised other baseless objections to his nomination. One wonders why the Republicans so eagerly raise objections to nominees like Mr. Syed who are obviously qualified for their nominated positions. But despite their baseless bluster, the facts are clear: Mr. Syed is well qualified to serve as Deputy Administrator of the Small Business Administration, and his confirmation will make our economy and our country stronger.

While it never should have taken this long—2 years—I am glad that tomorrow this body will vote on Mr. Syed's nomination to serve as Deputy Administrator. As I said, it has taken far too long to have someone as qualified and as committed—to have his vote occur.

I look forward to voting to confirm Mr. Syed and to working with him to strengthen small businesses in every corner of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

251ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE "GASPEE" RAID

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, every year, I come to the Senate floor around the anniversary of June 9 of 1772 to educate our pages—and anyone else listening—about an event that took place that night in Rhode Island as the United States moved towards its revolutionary conflict with Great Britain.

And the lead-up to this was that Rhode Island was a shipping and a trading State; and Newport, in particular, was an extremely wealthy and active trading community. And the British government very much wanted to tax all of that trading, and the Rhode Islanders very much wanted not to be taxed.

And so there was considerable back-and-forth between the colonists in Rhode Island and what was then the mother country. And when the obstreperousness of the Rhode Islanders reached a certain point, a new ship and a new captain were detailed to Rhode Island to do a better job of collecting taxes from the shipping traffic.

The captain was named Dudingston—Lieutenant Dudingston—of her majesty's royal Navy. And he came in with

a rather very poor attitude about Rhode Island and behaved quite badly. He seized ships without much provocation. He would grab them and send them off to be sold for salvage. He would steal cargoes out of ships.

He made himself extremely unpopular to a point that the chief justice of Rhode Island said: Excuse me, you don't get to do this. Under Rhode Island law, under our colonial charter, if you want to operate Rhode Island waters, you actually have to declare yourself and show your commission to our Governor.

And the rather undiplomatic response of Lieutenant Dudingston was, if anybody tries to interfere with my operations, I will hang them.

So things were not all that great between Lieutenant Dudingston and Rhode Island. And his ship, which is this one, was called the *Gaspee*, as in the Gaspe Peninsula up in Canada. She was an armed revenue cutter of fairly good size. And it was her job to basically pull over ships, search their cargoes, seize their cargoes, demand taxes, if necessary, seize the vessel.

One of his early seizures was a boat called the *Fortune*, which was owned by Nathanael Greene, who had not been particularly active in revolutionary matters until he had his fortune seized by Lieutenant Dudingston. And after that, he became quite active in revolutionary matters to the point of becoming, essentially, the adjutant for George Washington and then being sent by George Washington down to run the southern campaign of the revolution where the commanding British general in the Revolutionary War said: That damn Greene is more dangerous than Washington, because he was so successful running the southern campaign, much of it provoked by this Lieutenant Dudingston and his seizure of Greene's boat, the *Fortune*.

On this occasion, June 9, 1772, a boat called the *Hannah*, captained by Benjamin Lindsey, was sailing up Narragansett Bay to deliver cargo to Providence. And the *Gaspee* approached and signaled the *Hannah* to heave to, to be boarded and searched. And the *Hannah* refused. Captain Lindsey kept sailing.

So the *Gaspee* gave chase, and the two boats sailed, one after the other, with occasional gunfire from the decks of the *Gaspee* north towards Providence.

Before you get to Providence, there is a point that sticks out. And where the river flows in, there is a sand berm that sticks out into the bay. And Captain Lindsey, who knew the waters of Narragansett Bay very well, sailed over this sandy shallows off of what was called Namquit Point and kept going on his merry way up to Providence.

The *Gaspee* was a bigger vessel. It drew more water, and it ran into the sand berm in a falling tide. It was stuck. It was trapped. It was helpless.

The *Hannah* kept going up. Captain Lindsey went up to Providence. When he got to the Port of Providence, he