

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN721 NAVY nominations (11) beginning MICHAEL K. BEALL, and ending ALANNA B. YOUNGBLOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN722 NAVY nominations (2) beginning FORREST N. BUSH and ending NATHAN J. RICHARDSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN723 NAVY nominations (48) beginning SCOTT B. AARON, and ending CLINTON M. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN724 NAVY nominations (32) JESSICA L. ALEXANDER, and ending CRYSTAL R. WARRENE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN725 NAVY nominations (46) beginning SUZANNE T. ALFORD, and ending ERIC R. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN726 NAVY nominations (14) beginning NICHOLAS D. CHIUIONI, and ending JULIAN G. WILSON, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN727 NAVY nominations (16) beginning MARVIN E. BARTHOLOMEW, and ending KIRTLEY N. YEISER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN728 NAVY nominations (13) beginning QUENTIN ALBEA, and ending EDWARD E. WEEKLEY, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN729 NAVY nominations (15) beginning PAUL M. ALLEN, and ending THOMAS H. WILLIAMS, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN730 NAVY nominations (9) beginning SCOTT P. ADER, and ending PHILIP R. SAULNIER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN731 NAVY nomination of Erika M. Meszaros, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN732 NAVY nominations (36) beginning MARY R. ANKER, and ending BRANDON K. WOLF, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN733 NAVY nominations (12) beginning DAVID W. ALEXANDER, and ending JOHN C. VANDYKE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN734 NAVY nominations (11) beginning CHRISTOPHER S. CASNE, and ending JUSTIN D. SPINKS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN735 NAVY nominations (28) beginning KEVIN L. BORKERT, and ending BLAKE A. WHITTLE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 30, 2023.

PN755 NAVY nominations (11) beginning THEODORE G. CAVOORES, JR., and ending CHRISTY L. ROUSSEAU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN756 NAVY nominations (7) beginning ANDREW E. CARMICHAEL, and ending DAVID N. STOCK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN757 NAVY nominations (7) beginning KRISTEN M. BETAK, and ending SUZANNE J. WOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN758 NAVY no which nominations (4) beginning SARAH E. DAVIS, and ending JEFFREY J. ROCKWOOD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN759 NAVY nominations (28) beginning BRYAN T. ALVAREZ, and ending JENNIFER J. VOGT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN760 NAVY nominations (8) beginning RODNEY M. BONNER, and ending CHARLES C. THOMPSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN761 NAVY nomination of Julie K. Moss, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN762 NAVY nominations (5) beginning LUIS E. ALDERMAN, II, and ending MELINDA S.L. ZALMA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN763 NAVY nominations (6) beginning TIMOTHY W. GLEASON, and ending CORY A. WOODS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

#### IN THE SPACE FORCE

PN764 SPACE FORCE nomination of Robin J. Glebes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN765 SPACE FORCE nominations (3) beginning LISA T. GREEN, and ending KEITH D. VAN DYCK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

PN766 SPACE FORCE nominations (36) beginning PHOENIX L. HAUSER, and ending DUSTIN L. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 6, 2023.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

#### EATS ACT OF 2023

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the recent Supreme Court ruling in favor of the California law that is called Proposition 12, affecting the pork industry, has sent shock waves through the entire agricultural industry. Particularly hard-hit by the news is my State of Iowa, which is No. 1 in pork and No. 1 in eggs; and another proposition California law affects the selling of eggs in California.

California is 15 percent of the national market for pork, so you can see what California is doing can have a big impact on the pork industry in the other 49 States.

If California can regulate pork producers out of business through costly and unrealistic regulation, which food will be next? What segment of agriculture will be negatively affected next?

Consumers should be waking up to the reality of activist policies coming from folks on the left who want to put the kibosh on animal agriculture.

California's law is based on arbitrary and prescriptive standards that lack any scientific, technical, or agricultural basis. It also jeopardizes sow safety. And for you city slickers, "sow" is the word we use for mother pigs.

The cost to implement Proposition 12 has been measured to be approximately \$3,500 per sow—a cost that farmers would need to pass on to the consumer.

This additional cost will threaten the independent pork producers in rural

Iowa and run them out of business due to burdensome regulations.

I am not only speaking for Iowa pork producers, even though we are No. 1 in pork production. This is affecting pork producers in the other 49 States. The result of this law will be significant on Iowa's independent pork producers.

We all know people will continue to eat pork chops, ham, and bacon, but this will only lead to further consolidation so that you will only have three or four companies controlling the entire supply of pork for our country.

The future of the independent pork production is at stake, and I do not want to sit idly by as pork producers across Iowa go out of business. So this Monday, our national holiday, when the Senate wasn't in session, I met with 40 pork producers in Palo Alto county. Hearing from Iowans firsthand on this issue was especially impactful.

Iowa producers who have raised hogs for more than 50 years told me that they have never been so worried. How will rural agriculture fight against the special interests and big money of the coasts is a question I was asked. How can farmers afford to remain compliant with nonsense policies written by someone who has never been on a hog farm?

There has to be a legislative solution to what California is negatively doing to pork producers in the other 49 States, so Senator MARSHALL, Senator ERNST, and I have been working on a solution. The EATS Act—E-A-T-S, that is an acronym for a piece of legislation preventing States from impeding ag trade from other States within the United States, under the constitutional power of Congress, to regulate interstate foreign commerce. Our legislation is an example of Congress regulating interstate commerce.

In the court's majority decision, it was a five-to-four decision—an odd combination of liberals and conservatives on the Supreme Court saying that California did the right thing and an odd combination of liberals and conservatives who said that California didn't have the power to do what they did under our Constitution. But in this majority opinion, Justice Neil Gorsuch wrote that Congress has the power to regulate commerce but has yet to enact legislation to displace Proposition 12.

I read Justice Gorsuch saying to the Congress of the United States—the courts are kind of saying to themselves something like this: Why should we say that California has acted unconstitutionally when Congress has the power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce and they have not done it?

So this is the reason for this bill. This bill would put an end to California's war on breakfast and override the coastal State's overreach into the heartland's breadbasket.

The Supreme Court asked Congress to act, so that is what Senators MARSHALL, ERNST, and I—and many other Senators have now joined us in this effort. We are responding to the Supreme Court's decision.

Feeding your family is not a partisan issue and neither is protecting our food supply chain. Food security, after all, is national security.

I am engaging in discussions with as many as my colleagues as I can on this very issue. I hope this will soon be a bipartisan bill.

It is common sense to protect affordable, quality food for America's families and support the 2 percent of the country that we call family farmers who feed the other 98 percent of the people in this State; and not only produce for the other 98 percent but about a third of our agriculture production is exported. Remember, bacon doesn't grow in grocery stores.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me as cosponsors of the EATS Act.

#### STUDENT DEBT

I have one more statement in regard to education that I would like to give.

Mr. President, every person taking out a loan knows it must be repaid. Still, we have seen lots of talk about canceling student debt after the debt has been assumed. But that doesn't help students who are not in college yet but going to enter college. It is closing the barn door after the horse has been stolen.

To lower the cost of college, we need to let students be able to compare the true costs between schools. They can't do that now because, right now, schools that are upfront about their costs, meaning they give the students an exact figure on what they are going to have to pay to get a college degree, these very schools are at a disadvantage to their competition that doesn't play by honest rules and honest policies about what it actually costs to go to a particular school.

So I am going to go into some detail about what is wrong with the present environment, and I am going to start with the Government Accountability Office taking a look at the financial aid letters that should show students how much they will pay. Unfortunately, according to the GAO, not a single college followed all 10 best practices that have been suggested by that Agency, the Government Accountability Office.

Now, here are some examples:

A third of the colleges confused loans and grants—how misleading. You think you are getting a grant, and you find out later it is a loan. And 91 percent of the colleges understate their true costs.

So it is quite obvious the free market doesn't work if students only find out how much they owe after they have already selected the college that they will attend.

That is why my bill that I entitled Understanding the True Cost of College Act creates a standard, easy-to-read fi-

nancial aid letter. Under my bill, students could take this letter that they get from the various colleges that they have been accepted to and see, side by side, what each school offers them. They can compare, in other words, apples with apples, not apples with oranges, as is the very case today.

Another thing that doesn't make any sense: Do you know that the current practice effectively encourages students to go into debt more than what it actually costs to get a college degree? The paperwork offering student loans tends to default to the maximum eligible loan amount, whether that maximum is needed or not, to get a college degree. So then, under this practice, students have to go out of their way to borrow less money than what is offered. But guess what. Most students actually do borrow the maximum.

So, you see, we have a Federal policy that encourages students to take out more debt than they need to get their degree, and we shouldn't have the Federal Government encourage indebtedness that is not needed. The Federal Government, in other words, should help students borrow only what they need.

So I have a bill that goes by the title of Know Before You Owe Act. This act would show students their estimated monthly loan payments after graduating. They would see it compared to the average salary for graduates of their particular college major. It would also require students to type in the amount that they want to borrow, instead of clicking a box that ends up with them taking the maximum that is allowed.

Each of these proposals puts students, then, in the driver's seat, where the student should be.

Choosing a college happens to be one of the largest purchases many Americans ever make. It should be a good investment for a bright future, not a one-way ticket to excessive debt. Students should have all the information they need when they are making that decision of what college or university to attend.

All the ideas I mentioned here are bipartisan, and I have been advocating some of these issues for years. It is not a Republican or Democrat idea to give students the information they need to make the right decision for which school to attend. That is why I was glad to see each of these two ideas that I am talking about now included in legislation called the Lowering Education Costs and Debt Act.

My colleagues in the Senate are right to focus on the start of the process, when students choose a college and take out a loan. Dealing with debt only after it is taken out does not lower the cost of a college education. Right now, a student can't pick a college on price even if they wanted to.

I hope this is the start of a discussion to help students limit their borrowing on the front end and, ultimately, to put pressure on institutions to bring down the cost of college.

Whereas President Biden's proposal to wipe out student debt would give colleges a license to pump up tuition costs, these proposals would pump the brakes on soaring tuition costs by empowering students to make smart decisions on the front end.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### ABORTION

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I have a question for this body. It is not a legislative question. It starts first with just a question. It is a question for us to be able to think about, and it is a question, quite frankly, that is essential that we think about but that we don't think about very often because it is introspective, because it is personal, because it connects both science and faith and culture and background. But it is essential to who we are as people, human beings, and it is this simple question: When does life begin?

I don't say it flippantly. It is a real question. It is a question that we have had as a nation now the entire time we have been a nation, and it has been decided by different States and by different people from the very beginning of our Nation.

When does life begin? For some people, they would say life begins at birth, when I can see that child, when they are screaming and crying and just born, red-faced.

Some people would say it is actually 10 minutes before that birth; that it is not at birth; that it is just a little bit before.

There are some people who would back it up, and they would say: No, you are really a child when you are alive and you are viable—that is somewhere around 21 weeks' gestation now—that when you are viable, that is when you are really alive.

Some people would back it up even more to say: Not at 21 weeks; maybe at 15 weeks because science would say at about 15 weeks that child in the womb has a nervous system that is developed and they can feel pain.

Some would say: No, I would back it up more than that. I would actually take it to 6 weeks because, at 6 weeks, it is the early stages of a beating heart, and we would say, when that heart beat is actually happening, that is when that child is alive.

And others would back it up even further and would say: When that child has unique DNA that is different DNA than the mom or the dad—in fact, in that mom's body, every single cell in her body has the same DNA marker except for those cells. For those cells in the woman's body, that DNA is different. They are the only cells that are different, and, as they multiply and divide, that DNA signature grows, but it stays right there with that child.

It is a real question.

Fifty-one years ago, our country had different opinions. Different States had different ideas about when life began.