

strength of our military, if you care about defending our freedoms that have defined America since the first drop of ink was written on our Constitution, then you will vote against this amendment. Please do not abandon the women who have done so much to keep our Union safe. Please do not repay our heroes for their sacrifices by telling them what they can and cannot do with their bodies they put at risk time and again to protect our country.

Please, as you sit at your fancy desks under this hallowed, historic dome, ask yourself if you are so desperate for a pat on the back from FOX News that you would be willing to vote to strip away the rights these women have spent their lives protecting. I certainly could not live with that decision—with that vote. I hope the same is true for each of my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF JULIE RIKELMAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Julie Rikelman to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit. She is a highly skilled litigator with almost 25 years of experience in private practice, as in-house counsel, and in public interest law.

After graduating from Harvard College and Harvard Law School, Ms. Rikelman clerked for Justice Dana Fabe on the Alaska Supreme Court and Judge Morton Greenberg on the Third Circuit. Ms. Rikelman then began her legal career as a Blackmun Fellow at the Center for Reproductive Rights—CRR—litigating reproductive rights cases around the country. In private practice, Ms. Rikelman has handled a wide range of civil and criminal cases, at both the trial and appellate level, including securities fraud, commercial breach of contract, State antitrust law, and election law. As an in-house attorney at NBC Universal, Ms. Rikelman litigated a variety of matters in Federal and State courts—including defamation, intellectual property, and employment discrimination. In 2011, Ms. Rikelman returned to CRR to take on a more senior role litigating cases, as well as spearheading case strategy.

Over the course of her career, Ms. Rikelman has proven to be a skilled trial attorney and an accomplished appellate practitioner, arguing multiple appeals, including two before the U.S. Supreme Court. The American Bar Association unanimously rated Ms. Rikelman “well qualified,” and she has the strong support of her home State Senators: Ms. WARREN and Mr. MARKEY. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting Ms. Rikelman’s nomination.

VOTE ON RIKELMAN NOMINATION

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

Ms. DUCKWORTH. 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 166 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—43

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

NOT VOTING—6

Barrasso	Murphy	Rubio
Fetterman	Risch	Scott (SC)

The nomination was confirmed.

(Mr. MARKEY assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. WARNOCK assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. KELLY.) The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider with respect to the Rikelman nomination be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations en bloc: Calendar No. 46 through No. 52, No. 82 through No. 107, No. 110 through No. 113, No. 130 through No. 139, No. 180 through No. 205, No. 224 through No. 234, No. 236 through No. 246; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider to be considered made

and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?

The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, this is now the sixth time that I have been on this floor asking for unanimous consent so that the U.S. Senate can do its job to ratify, to approve the nominations of flag officers’ promotions at the Department of Defense.

That is something that we have done as a matter of course in the U.S. Senate for the last 230 years. No Senator in the history of the United States has ever prevented the Senate from proceeding with these nominations of flag officers.

I certainly don’t have to tell the Presiding Officer how important these promotions are, how critical they are. And observer after observer after observer has said that it is in the national security interest of the United States, not surprisingly, for this Senate to confirm these promotions, to ratify these promotions.

We are compromising our national security when one Senator out of the whole 100 people decides that they are going to do something that no Senator has ever done in the history of the United States. No Senator has ever put a blanket hold on the promotions of flag officers, and there is a good reason for that, because if people are willing to play politics with that, they are playing politics with our national security. If they are willing to play politics with that, they are playing politics with the expectations of people who have spent an entire career defending the national security of this country, serving the public, serving in the Department of Defense, and who now have been promoted to a position of trust and responsibility.

By the way, this doesn’t just affect those people who are getting that promotion. It also affects the people who are below them who can’t get the promotion that now is no longer vacant because they are stuck in the job that they are in.

And I am shocked that somebody here would do this and pretend that this is just common: You know, this is the Senate. This is the way the Senate functions. This the way the Senate, as my colleague from Alabama has said, just does its business.

This is not how the Senate ever does its business. It is not how the Department of Defense does its business. And it, particularly, I think, should be particularly grieving to the American people because of the reasons the Senator from Alabama is doing what he is doing.

Tonight, we are here on basically the 1-year anniversary of the Supreme Court's decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade* in the Dobbs decision. If you told me when I was in law school that a majority of the Supreme Court would join the majority opinion by Justice Alito that would say, if it wasn't a right or a freedom in 1868, it is not a freedom today—if you told me that was the basis on which they were going to strip a fundamental freedom from the American people, I would have said that will never happen; it is never going to happen.

That is what is happening, and that is the result of a 50-year crusade to overturn a woman's right to choose in the United States of America. It is the first time since Reconstruction that we have given up a fundamental right here. It is first time since Reconstruction that we have been stripped of our fundamental rights and our freedoms have been diminished, that they have grown smaller in the hands of a 50-year campaign that was waged to put four people on the Supreme Court—a majority on the Supreme Court—who subscribe to the best named doctrine I have ever heard named in American political history or anybody's political history, and that is the doctrine of originalism, a doctrine that was dressed up to create a scenario or a legal set of arguments that somehow there were a group of people in this society with such mystical powers that they were capable—unlike anybody else in America, they would be capable of divining the originality intent of the Founding Fathers, putting aside the fact, tonight, that everybody in this Chamber who studied the Constitution even for 10 minutes knows that the Founders had fundamental disagreements among themselves and that the Constitution itself was a product of these fundamental differences—not their fundamental consensus but the fundamental differences. There was consensus on some issues. There was compromise on other issues.

But I dwell on that for a moment just to say, especially to people around here—maybe the age of the pages in the Senate—that you shouldn't give this theory of legal interpretation any great weight just because they dressed it up and called it something called originalism or they said somehow they could divine what the Founding Fathers said.

Fundamentally, what it came down to in the case of the Supreme Court was that because abortion wasn't a freedom, as they said, in 1868—a country where women didn't even have the right to vote in the United States yet—that it was not going to be a freedom today, and they stripped the American people of this freedom.

And there are people on this floor, people, you know, in the other party who spent 50 years trying to create a Supreme Court like this, basically since Ronald Reagan was our President. I think Ronald Reagan would be

shocked by the extreme nature of the opinion that was rendered by Justice Alito, but who knows.

What we do know is this has been a 50-year campaign that has been waged. And the second that the Supreme Court did what they have been shooting for the last 50 years, what they started to say was: Don't worry about it. It is not a big deal. This is just reverting to States' rights. This fundamental constitutional right, this fundamental constitutional freedom, it is just being reverted to the States.

What has happened since then? Twenty States have banned abortion since that decision was made or restricted access. Nine of those States have no exceptions for rape or incest, like the State of Alabama, I think, which has an exception for the life of the mother.

So there is a lot to worry about in this decision. There is a lot to worry about for our men and women in uniform.

Before Dobbs, women in the military had at least some assurance that wherever the Pentagon sent them, they would have minimal access to reproductive care, a protected constitutional right, a protected freedom. That is no longer the case.

One of the very first calls I got after Dobbs was decided was from a woman whom I know in Colorado who was an Air Force officer. She was a pilot. She told me her personal story, and then she said: I don't understand how they could have possibly made the decision they made because this is a fundamental readiness issue.

Well, they didn't have to deal with that. They didn't have to deal with that fundamental issue of readiness. They didn't have to deal with the fundamental fact of how people every single day would be dealing with the loss of this right or the loss of this freedom because nothing in their interpretive doctrine requires them to do that. It only requires them to ask: Was it a freedom in 1868? Not a freedom today.

And in response to this shocking development—and it is shocking. You know, if you are the age of the pages who are here, if you are my daughter's age—my oldest daughter is 23 years old—you are wondering how it is possible. We were having this conversation the other day. We were driving by a billboard in Colorado advertising some stuff in Colorado. Amazing thing that we could be, on the one hand, legalizing marijuana in this country and on the other hand, banning abortion. If you told me that when I was a teenager in America, I would have said: What are you smoking? That is impossible. That is impossible, and that is where we are.

What the Supreme Court did in this case is fundamentally unpopular with the American people. The American people are angry that this has happened. It didn't happen by accident. This is a war that has been waged on a woman's right to choose. It is a war that has been waged for that doctrine of originalism.

And a lot of people and a lot of institutions in America are having to make adjustments in the wake of this shocking development, and the Pentagon is one of those places.

In the wake of the Supreme Court overturning *Roe v. Wade*, the Pentagon extended two policies that already exists for servicemembers if a medical procedure is not available near their duty station. One was the travel allowance. If you are not—if you can't get that knee operated on close to your duty station, we are going to pay you to travel. That is what the rules say today.

By the way, that is not a law that Congress passed. That is the DOD making regulations, which is how this works, to ensure that people serving our country are able to get the medical care that they need. We say: You know what, you will have to travel and because you have to travel to do this, we are going to give you paid leave to do that, to go get that knee surgery.

And what the DOD said in the wake of the Dobbs decision reversing *Roe v. Wade* is that if you are doing that because you made a decision to seek reproductive healthcare, you made a decision to have an abortion, we are going to apply the same rules to you that we apply for these other surgeries. We are not going to treat you differently. We are going to treat you exactly the same. That is what we are going to do. And if you need to travel because it is not available, you can do it.

So if you live in a State like Alabama, where my colleague who is blocking every single appointment or promotion in the DOD, where he lives—where, if you are a doctor and you perform an abortion, you can go to jail for 99 years—if you are living in a State like Alabama where abortion is banned, and there are very limited exceptions, if any exception, that you can go somewhere else to do it or the DOD will actually pay for you to go, and the DOD will give you paid leave. That is true whether you are seeking women's reproductive healthcare or you are going for knee surgery. But knee surgery isn't banned in 20 States in this country.

And there was one other thing that the Department of Defense said. They said: You know what, in the case of a pregnancy, you can tell your commanding officer, you can tell your command 20 weeks after you learned of your pregnancy. You don't have to tell people right away because things might happen in the early stages of pregnancy or you might make a decision to have an abortion in that time. This was an attempt by DOD to harmonize the rules at DOD for healthcare with the changes of the Supreme Court. It would be difficult, in my mind, at least, to imagine a more modest set of changes to the rules by DOD.

I thought about what could be more modest than saying: OK. If we are going to pay people who are getting

knee surgery or pay them paid leave, then we are going to do this for everybody else—for women who need reproductive healthcare. If we are going to pay people to travel for these other things, then we are going to let people travel.

I would think most people who have disagreements about abortion in this country might say: Well, that is fair. People have the right to be able to make this decision on their own—or they should have the right to make this decision on their own—and we shouldn't discriminate against people just because we might have a disagreement about abortion.

One thing this set of rules does not do in any shape or form is pay for an abortion. The Senator from Alabama has almost admitted as much on this floor. He said it is sort of tantamount to that. It is sort of this, and Senator LEE from Utah was saying it is sort of, but they know that it is not. That is not what the rules do. That is a debate that we are going to need to have here, but that is not what is happening here. What is happening here is the rules, as I stated.

The Senator from Alabama was so enraged by this, so infuriated by this, so angered by this, that he has now put a blanket hold on 249 military promotions to unwind those rules, to change those rules, to force the DOD to retreat and for the DOD to say: OK. From here on out, here is what we are going to do. We will pay for your travel for every single operation that you can't get at your duty station except if you are a woman who is seeking reproductive healthcare. If you are a woman who is going to have an abortion, we are going to discriminate against you. We are going to treat you differently than anybody else for every other purpose.

And we are going to give you paid leave because we understand that it is inconvenient to have to go somewhere else from your duty station. By the way, you haven't asked to be at that duty station. We are going to give you paid leave except if you are going because of reproductive healthcare, in which case, we are going to discriminate against women and say, uniquely: You do not get paid leave. And, I guess, you have to inform your commanding officer—somebody does—that you are pregnant sooner than the 20 weeks.

That is the world that the Senator from Alabama is trying to pursue here on this floor by holding every single military promotion, every flag officer promotion in the United States of America when Putin is invading Ukraine and China is sailing their shiny new navy all over the South China Sea. And I know he knows. He can't think it is a good idea.

He has come out here and said: Don't worry about it. There are acting people who are doing those jobs. Don't worry about it. The generals don't actually make decisions. It is the enlisted people who are doing all the work. Don't

worry about it. Somehow this is going to help with the recruiting quagmire that he has pointed out.

I don't think, by the way, it is going to help with the recruiting quagmire that he has talked about out here; that women who are thinking about joining the military are going to know that their life, their lives, are in the hands of politicians in Washington, DC. Their very lives are in their hands. Their destiny is in their hands. And DOD can send them to a place where abortion is banned and doctors go to jail for 99 years if they perform an abortion or they might be lucky enough to serve in a place like Colorado where we codified Roe v. Wade anyway. We are the first State in America to do it.

And I don't have to tell the Presiding Officer, who, by the way, served and has been on the Armed Services Committee, how important these jobs are we are talking about: the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Air Force General C.Q. Brown; the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff; the Chief of the National Security Agency; the next military representative to NATO. You think that is an important job?

Soon this hold is going to include the next Commandant of the Marine Corps, the Army Chief of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations, putting our national security at risk.

Mr. President, I asked unanimous consent at the outset of tonight's proceedings if we could have unanimous consent on a number of these promotions.

I ask unanimous consent that those names and ranks and positions be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY NOMINATIONS

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #46—Col. Leigh A. Swanson to be Brigadier General

IN THE ARMY

Exec. Cal. #47—Maj. Gen. Sean A. Gainey to be Lieutenant General; Exec. Cal. #48—Maj. Gen. Heidi J. Hoyle to be Lieutenant General; Exec. Cal. #49—Brig. Gen. Laurence S. Linton to be Major General; Exec. Cal. #50—Brig. Gen. Stacy M. Babcock to be Major General and Col. Peggy R. McManus to be Brigadier General

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #51—Maj. Gen. Andrew J. Gebara to be Lieutenant General

IN THE ARMY

Exec. Cal. #52—Maj. Gen. Robert M. Collins to be Lieutenant General

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #82—to be Brigadier General: Col. David J. Berkland; Col. Amy S. Bumgarner; Col. Ivory D. Carter; Col. Raja J. Chari; Col. Jason E. Carrothers; Col. John B. Creel; Col. Nicholas B. Evans; Col. Bridget V. Gigliotti; Col. Christopher B. Hammond; Col. Leslie F. Hauck, III; Col. Kurt C. Helphinstine; Col. Abraham L. Jackson; Col. Benjamin R. Jonsson; Col. Joy M. Kaczor; Col. Christopher J. Leonard; Col. Christopher E. Menuey; Col. David S. Miller; Col. Jeffrey A. Philips; Col. Erik N. Quigley; Col. Michael

S. Rowe; Col. Derek M. Salmi; Col. Kayle M. Stevens; Col. Jose E. Sumangil; Col. Terence G. Taylor; Col. Jason D. Voorheis; Col. Michael O. Walters; Col. Adrienne L. Williams

Exec. Cal. #83—Col. Corey A. Simmons to be Brigadier General

IN THE NAVY

Exec. Cal. #84—Rear Adm. George M. Wikoff to be Vice Admiral

Exec. Cal. #85—Rear Adm. Frederick W. Kacher to be Vice Admiral

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #86—to be Brigadier General: Col. Sean M. Carpenter; Col. Mary K. Haddad; Col. James L. Hartle; Col. Aaron J. Heick; Col. Joseph D. Janik; Col. Michael T. McGinley; Col. Kevin J. Merrill; Col. Tara E. Nolan; Col. Roderick C. Owens; Col. Mark D. Richey; Col. Norman B. Shaw, Jr.

Exec. Cal. #87—to be Brigadier General: Col. Kristin A. Hillery; Col. Michelle L. Wagner

Exec. Cal. #88—to be Major General: Brig. Gen. Elizabeth E. Arledge; Brig. Gen. Robert M. Blake; Brig. Gen. Vanessa J. Dornhoefer; Brig. Gen. Christopher A. Freeman; Brig. Gen. David P. Garfield; Brig. Gen. Mitchell A. Hanson; Brig. Gen. Jody A. Merritt; Brig. Gen. Adrian K. White; Brig. Gen. William W. Whittenberger, Jr.; Brig. Gen. Christopher F. Yancy

IN THE ARMY

Exec. Cal. #89—Col. Carlos M. Caceres to be Brigadier General

IN THE NAVY

Exec. Cal. #90—Rear Adm. Shoshana S. Chatfield—to be Vice Admiral

IN THE ARMY

Exec. Cal. #91—Col. William F. Wilkerson to be Brigadier General

Exec. Cal. #92—Col. Evelyn E. Laptook to be Brigadier General

Exec. Cal. #93—Brig. Gen. Ronald R. Ragin to be Major General

Exec. Cal. #94—to be Brigadier General: Col. Brandon C. Anderson; Col. Beth A. Behn; Col. Matthew W. Braman; Col. Kenneth J. Burgess; Col. Thomas E. Burke; Col. Chad C. Chalfont; Col. Kendall J. Clarke; Col. Patrick M. Costello; Col. Rory A. Crooks; Col. Troy M. Denomy; Col. Sara E. Dudley; Col. Joseph E. Escandon; Col. Alric L. Francis; Col. George C. Hackler; Col. William C. Hannan, Jr.; Col. Peter G. Hart; Col. Gregory L. Holden; Col. Paul D. Howard; Col. James G. Kent; Col. Curtis W. King; Col. John P. Lloyd; Col. Shannon M. Lucas; Col. Landis C. Maddox; Col. Kareem P. Montague; Col. John B. Mountford; Col. David C. Phillips; Col. Kenneth N. Reed; Col. John W. Sannes; Col. Andrew O. Saslav; Col. Charlone E. Stallworth; Col. Jennifer S. Walkawicz; Col. Camilla A. White; Col. Scott D. Wilkinson; Col. Jeremy S. Wilson; Col. Scott C. Woodward; Col. Joseph W. Wortham, II; Col. David J. Zinn

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Exec. Cal. #95—to be Brigadier General: Col. David R. Everly; Col. Kelvin W. Gallman; Col. Adolfo Garcia, Jr.; Col. Matthew T. Good; Col. Trevor Hall; Col. Richard D. Joyce; Col. Omar J. Randall; Col. Robert S. Weiler

IN THE NAVY

Exec. Cal. #96—to be Rear Admiral (lower half): Capt. Walter D. Brafford; Capt. Robert J. Hawkins

Exec. Cal. #97—to be Rear Admiral (lower half): Capt. Amy N. Bauernschmidt; Capt. Michael B. Devore; Capt. Thomas A. Donovan; Capt. Frederic C. Goldhammer; Capt. Ian L. Johnson; Capt. Neil A. Koprowski; Capt. Paul J. Lanzilotta; Capt. Joshua Lasky; Capt. Donald W. Marks; Capt. Craig

T. Mattingly; Capt. Andrew T. Miller; Capt. Lincoln M. Reifsteck; Capt. Frank A. Rhodes, IV; Capt. Thomas E. Shultz; Capt. Todd E. Whalen; Capt. Forrest O. Young

Exec. Cal. #98—to be Rear Admiral (lower half): Capt. Brian J. Anderson; Capt. Julie M. Treanor

Exec. Cal. #99—to be Rear Admiral: Rear Adm. (lh) Casey J. Moton; Rear Adm. (lh) Stephen R. Tedford

Exec. Cal. #100—Rear Adm. (lh) Rick Freedman to be Rear Admiral:

Exec. Cal. #101—Rear Adm. (lh) Kenneth W. Epps to be Rear Admiral:

Exec. Cal. #102—to be Rear Admiral: Rear Adm. (lh) Stephen D. Barnett; Rear Adm. (lh) Michael W. Baze; Rear Adm. (lh) Richard T. Brophy, Jr.; Rear Adm. (lh) Joseph F. Cahill, III; Rear Adm. (lh) Brian L. Davies; Rear Adm. (lh) Michael P. Donnelly; Rear Adm. (lh) Daniel P. Martin; Rear Adm. (lh) Richard E. Seif, Jr.; Rear Adm. (lh) Paul C. Spedero, Jr.; Rear Adm. (lh) Derek A. Trinquet; Rear Adm. (lh) Dennis Velez; Rear Adm. (lh) Darryl L. Walker; Rear Adm. (lh) Jeremy B. Williams

Exec. Cal. #103—Capt. Frank G. Schlereth, III to be Rear Admiral (lower half):

Exec. Cal. #104—to be Rear Admiral (lower half): Capt. Joshua C. Himes; Capt. Kurtis A. Mole

Exec. Cal. #105—to be Rear Admiral (lower half): Capt. Thomas J. Dickinson; Capt. Kevin R. Smith; Capt. Todd S. Weeks; Capt. Dianna Wolfson

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #106—to be Major General: Brig. Gen. Thomas W. Harrell; Brig. Gen. Jeannine M. Ryder

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Exec. Cal. #107—Lt. Gen. James W. Bierman, Jr. to be Lieutenant General

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #110—to be Major General: Brig. Gen. Curtis R. Bass; Brig. Gen. Kenyon K. Bell; Brig. Gen. Charles D. Bolton; Brig. Gen. Larry R. Broadwell, Jr.; Brig. Gen. Scott A. Cain; Brig. Gen. Sean M. Choquette; Brig. Gen. Roy W. Collins; Brig. Gen. John R. Edwards; Brig. Gen. Jason T. Hinds; Brig. Gen. Justin R. Hoffman; Brig. Gen. Stacy J. Huser; Brig. Gen. Matteo G. Martemucci; Brig. Gen. David A. Mineau; Brig. Gen. Paul D. Moga; Brig. Gen. Ty W. Neuman; Brig. Gen. Christopher J. Niemi; Brig. Gen. Brandon D. Parker; Brig. Gen. Michael T. Rawls; Brig. Gen. Patrick S. Ryder; Brig. Gen. David G. Shoemaker; Brig. Gen. Rebecca J. Sonkiss; Brig. Gen. Claude K. Tudor, Jr.; Brig. Gen. Dale R. White

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Exec. Cal. #111—Maj. Gen. Bradford J. Gering to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #112—Maj. Gen. Gregory L. Masiello to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #113—Rear Adm. James P. Downey to be Vice Admiral

IN THE ARMY

Exec. Cal. #130—Maj. Gen. John W. Brennan, Jr. to be Lieutenant General

IN THE NAVY

Exec. Cal. #131—Vice Adm. Karl O. Thomas to be Vice Admiral

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Exec. Cal. #132—Lt. Gen. Michael S. Cederholm to be Lieutenant General

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #133—Brig. Gen. Derin S. Durham to be Major General

IN THE ARMY

Exec. Cal. #134—to be Brigadier General Col. Brandi B. Peasley; Col. John D. Rhodes Col. Earl C. Sparks, IV

Exec. Cal. #135—Brig. Gen. William Green, Jr. to be Major General

Exec. Cal. #136—Maj. Gen. Mark T. Simerly to be Lieutenant General

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Exec. Cal. #137—Maj. Gen. Ryan P. Heritage to be Lieutenant General

IN THE NAVY

Exec. Cal. #138—Vice Adm. Craig A. Clapperton to be Vice Admiral

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #139—Col. Brian R. Moore to be Brigadier General

IN THE NAVY

Exec. Cal. #180—Vice Adm. Daniel W. Dwyer to be Vice Admiral

Exec. Cal. #181—Rear Adm. Daniel L. Cheever to be Vice Admiral

Exec. Cal. #182—Rear Adm. (lh) Darin K. Via to be Rear Admiral

Exec. Cal. #183—Rear Adm. (lh) Darin K. Via to be Rear Admiral (lower half)

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #184—Lt. Gen. Scott L. Pleus to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #185—Brig. Gen. Dale R. White to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #186—Maj. Gen. David A. Harris, Jr. to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #187—Maj. Gen. David R. Iverson to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #188—Lt. Gen. Kevin B. Schneider to be General

Exec. Cal. #189—Maj. Gen. Laura L. Lenderman to be Lieutenant General

IN THE ARMY

Exec. Cal. #190—Maj. Gen. David M. Hodne to be Lieutenant General

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Exec. Cal. #191—Maj. Gen. Roger B. Turner, Jr. to be Lieutenant General

IN THE NAVY

Exec. Cal. #192—Rear Adm. Yvette M. Davids to be Vice Admiral

Exec. Cal. #193—Rear Adm. Brendan R. McLane to be Vice Admiral

Exec. Cal. #194—Rear Adm. John E. Gumbleton to be Vice Admiral

Exec. Cal. #195—Rear Adm. Christopher S. Gray to be Vice Admiral

Exec. Cal. #196—Vice Adm. Charles B. Cooper, II to be Vice Admiral

Exec. Cal. #197—Rear Adm. James E. Pitts to be Vice Admiral

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #198—Gen. Kenneth S. Wilsbach to be General

Exec. Cal. #199—Maj. Gen. Linda S. Hurry to be Lieutenant General

IN THE ARMY

Exec. Cal. #200—Brig. Gen. Miguel A. Mendez to be Major General

Exec. Cal. #201—Col. Marlene K. Markotan to be Brigadier General

IN THE NAVY

Exec. Cal. #202—Vice Adm. William J. Houston to be Admiral

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #203—Col. David M. Castaneda to be Brigadier General

IN THE NAVY

Exec. Cal. #204—Rear Adm. Robert M. Gaucher to be Vice Admiral

Exec. Cal. #205—Rear Adm. Douglas G. Perry to be Vice Admiral

IN THE ARMY

Exec. Cal. #224—Maj. Gen. Karl H. Gingrich to be Lieutenant General

IN THE NAVY

Exec. Cal. #225—to be Rear Admiral Rear Adm. (lh) Kenneth R. Blackmon; Rear Adm.

(lh) Marc S. Lederer; Rear Adm. (lh) Robert C. Nowakowski;

Exec. Cal. #226—to be Rear Admiral (Lower Half) Capt. Jeffrey A. Jurgemeyer; Capt. Richard S. Lofgren; Capt. Michael S. Mattis; Capt. Richard W. Meyer; Capt. Bryon T. Smith; Capt. Michael R. Vanpoots

Exec. Cal. #227—Capt. John E. Byington to be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Exec. Cal. #228—Capt. John A. Robinson, III to be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Exec. Cal. #229—Capt. David E. Ludwa to be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Exec. Cal. #230—Capt. Peter K. Muschinske to be Rear Admiral (lower half)

Exec. Cal. #231—Capt. Marc F. Williams to be Rear Admiral (lower half)

IN THE ARMY

Exec. Cal. #232—Lt. Gen. Andrew M. Rohling to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #233—Maj. Gen. John B. Richardson, IV to be Lieutenant General

IN THE NAVY

Exec. Cal. #234—Vice Adm. Jeffrey W. Hughes to be Vice Admiral

IN THE AIR FORCE

Exec. Cal. #236—Lt. Gen. Gregory M. Guillot to be General

Exec. Cal. #237—Maj. Gen. Heath A. Collins to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #238—Lt. Gen. Jeffrey A. Kruse to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #239—Maj. Gen. Michael G. Koscheski to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #240—Lt. Gen. Donna D. Shipton to be Lieutenant General

IN THE ARMY

Exec. Cal. #241—Maj. Gen. Anthony R. Hale to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #242—Lt. Gen. Laura A. Potter to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #243—Maj. Gen. William J. Hartman to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #244—Lt. Gen. John S. Kolasheski to be Lieutenant General

Exec. Cal. #245—Col. Matthew N. Gebhard to be Brigadier General

Exec. Cal. #246—Col. Katherine M. Braun to be Brigadier General.

Mr. BENNET. Former Defense Secretary Gates, who, by the way, for those who don't know, was appointed by George W. Bush, said that the Senator from Alabama has made the military "a pawn." That is a guy who served in a Republican administration. We have had Secretaries of Defense from both sides of the aisle who said the Senator from Alabama is hurting our national defense, hurting our national security, is playing politics with our Department of Defense.

What is his justification again? Well, it is no different than what I already said. He uses different words. He says that the DOD has made—the Department of Defense—by making these rules, into an abortion travel agency. Those are his words: abortion travel agency. Well, that is not true.

We have already talked about the travel allowance and the absence without leave and more time to notify. I am sure there are some people—a handful of people in America—who couldn't see the wisdom in that, who would disagree with that. But I will bet you that the vast majority of people in this country, including people who have a different view on a woman's right to choose than I have, would say that women ought to

have the right, in the Department of Defense, to get travel paid for just like anybody else and to get paid leave and to be able to have 20 weeks to be able to tell their commanding officer that they are pregnant.

This is an effort to punish women who are seeking reproductive healthcare and forcing them, for reasons I don't understand, to tell their commanding officer the minute that they are pregnant.

This is reminiscent to me of the States after *Dobbs*—after the Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*—that started to look at bills to try to prevent women from traveling from States that had banned abortion to States that had made abortion legal.

It is kind of a shocking place for us to be in to hear people—a party—embrace freedom and talk about freedom all the time and still live in a place where we are talking about trying to ban Americans from traveling from one State to another or not allowing the Department of Defense to pay money or to use paid leave for women's reproductive healthcare the way they do for anything else.

I mean, I do believe strongly—I believe strongly in a woman's right to choose, and I believe it should be a decision that is made between a woman and her doctor. Most Americans agree with that. I know that there is profound moral disagreement on this question, and I respect that. But I think it is fair to say that the Senator from Alabama's position on this to not allow paid leave, to not allow paid travel, to not allow women to get 20 weeks before they have to tell their commanding officers that they are pregnant—the vast majority of Americans, I think, would agree that those rules are appropriate.

By the way, one of the other reasons the Senator from Alabama has objected to this is that he has said that if the Senate wanted those rules, it should have passed those rules. Well, the Senate doesn't write the rules like that. We didn't pass the rules that exist today that pay for people to be able to go get surgery or get paid leave in the military. Those are rules that the Department of Defense makes, having been delegated that authority by the Congress.

But, man, he is in a totally different place on this. He says that he is going to keep this hold until the Pentagon follows the law or Congress changes the law; that is the way we do it here in the Senate. That is a reference to what I was just talking about in terms of the rules.

By the way, this is not how we do this in the Senate. It is just not. It is not. And the evidence is that no one in the history of this body has ever done this—ever in the history of the country. Nobody has done this. Nobody has done it. And I would say that not only has nobody done it, nobody has done it and taken a political position that is so far outside the mainstream of conventional American politics.

I think the American people should be asking their Senators where they stand on this. There are only 100 people here. It is not hard to find our telephone numbers or our addresses. They should be asking them: Do you agree that we should be holding up every single flag officer's promotion because one Senator thinks that we shouldn't have paid leave or paid travel for women who need reproductive healthcare?

He says he is going to relent only when that is true. He is only going to relent when there is a DOD policy that pays for every other surgery that somebody could get, that has paid family leave for any other procedure that you could get, but bans that for abortion. That is an extreme position. That is an extreme position.

It is an extreme position to say that we are going to not allow people to have 20 weeks to make this decision.

There are no exceptions in Alabama for rape or incest. That may be part of the reason why he has the perspective he does. It is a State where, if you are a doctor and you perform an abortion, you could go to jail for 99 years. But that is not what the majority of Americans believe on this issue. It is not. It is not. I don't even think the majority of Alabamians believe that. But the majority of Americans certainly don't. The majority of Americans believe in a woman's right to choose. The majority of Americans believe that these questions are best decided between a woman and her doctor or her family and her faith if she has one.

That is what my State believes. We were the first State that decriminalized abortion before *Roe* was even decided and were the first State to codify a woman's right to choose. That is, I think, what freedom actually looks like.

Our State, Colorado, is the first State to codify *Roe* since the Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*. And other folks were saying: You don't need to worry about the States. Now one of the largest States in America—a large State where something like 65 percent of the people support a woman's right to choose—the Governor of that State, the State of Florida, has banned abortion after 6 weeks. He signed that law at 11 at night when nobody would be around to see the way he was trampling on the freedom of his constituents.

Most Americans, if they knew this debate was happening, would be shocked, I think, to hear that what we are trying to do here is prevent women from getting paid leave; that we are trying to prevent women from having paid travel; that we are trying to prevent women from having 20 weeks to tell their commanding officer. That is what the Senator from Alabama is saying, that until that happens—until we are preventing women from those things, until we are discriminating against women who are seeking reproductive healthcare—he is going to continue to hold all these nominations. Forever?

I don't know how anybody can take that position and say they stand for freedom, but that is the position the Senator from Alabama has taken. I hope he will reconsider what he is doing because of the damage it is causing our national security at a moment when, as I said, Putin has invaded Ukraine and China is pressing, you know, its advantages in various places around the world.

We need the Senator to lift these holds, and I am going to keep coming to the floor until he does.

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.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session to be in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT S. JACKSON, JR.

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, with my colleagues Senator JIM RISCH and Representative MIKE SIMPSON, we honor an outstanding Idahoan and great American, Robert S. Jackson, Jr., for his service to our country, fellow veterans, and community.

Robert "Bob" Jackson is an Idaho native who spent many years in the U.S. Navy, serving throughout the world on various aircraft carriers that traveled to Vietnam, Libya, Lebanon, and locations for Desert Shield/Storm. His numerous awards throughout his career include Sailor of the Year three times, Navy Commendation Medal, Navy Achievement Medal, Silver Wreath with six stars, and Meritorious Unit Commendation.

Following his retirement in 1992, he found ways to assist local veterans, particularly with his administrative and organizational skills. He is well-respected in the State veterans community and has helped a number of projects advance smoothly with his input and expertise. His list of efforts is long and includes leadership positions with the Veterans of Foreign Wars, VFW, State Convention posts, and MC responsibilities. He is also a proud father of four daughters and one