

individuals.” Not just in Washington but in our world. “His dedication to supporting others—his endless supply of energy and empathy . . . is remarkable.”

I will ratify this one: “He was here for the right reasons—he wanted to serve. He saw each day as [a chance] to solve problems.”

Another said, “Jonathan was always willing to provide some ‘chain momentum’ by chiming-in on an email thread in order to ensure we moved toward the desired outcome.”

I regret I have rarely provided chain momentum.

Another former colleague said that Jonathan is the rarest of specimens in DC: “authentic, empathetic, smart, funny, and a great softball player. The proverbial 5-tool player.”

Another trusted colleague said, “Jonathan has a keen ability to know what a person needs before they themselves know it. Whether that be guidance, laughter, cheering up, strategy, or a ‘full cone,’”—a “full cone of silence,” apparently, “to listen.”

And I would say that Jonathan fights harder for others than he does for himself. That is the very definition of servant leadership.

As we were talking through family and colleague memories, I was reminded that you have never seen Jonathan more focused and determined than when asked by his niece to present about government to a fifth grade class. He went supersonic. He had a whole series of conversations with her to discuss his vision. This is a fifth grade class, I will remind you. He brushed up on specific policy knowledge, and he put together an interactive PowerPoint for 10-year-olds and held several practice runs with staff to ensure his delivery was the best possible for his niece.

While I may make light of it, that sort of intensity, that sort of heartfelt dedication to family, is one of his most charming qualities.

Trinity is one of his most beloved colleagues, our deputy chief. Whenever a niece or nephew of Trinity’s would visit our office, Jonathan would inevitably offer some fun or unexpected behind-the-scenes experience in the Capitol Complex.

And he was not just serious and heartfelt but also fun, dedicated to team-building through things like paintball competitions or trips to the DC car show—apparently without the Senator.

He also had some quirks. Jonathan is fond of asking about what the dew point is rather than the temperature in order to assess the proper attire for an event, something with which I was unfamiliar.

Although incredibly unsafe and unwise, he prefers, frequently, to use a scooter, whenever possible, and never missed a chance to connect with the most infamous of Delawareans, one James Francis Paoli, a denizen of the Starboard in Dewey.

Jonathan, gradually, through Jim’s tutelage, has become not just tolerant of but a true fan of Orange Crush at Friday morning breakfast.

Jonathan was, in some ways, a superhero of this place. He used his chief of staff powers for good, whether it was an urgent passport matter to save a family vacation or someone who needed access to lifesaving medical care. He always made time to do the little things that make a big impact for staff and constituents and sometimes the big things that can literally change the course of a life.

He enjoyed sharing everything, from embassy events to, literally, tours of the Capitol Dome conducted in person.

As I mentioned before, his mother was a trained therapist, and, from that, Jonathan gained really important tools. One well known to the practitioners of the dark arts of organizational development is the Myers-Briggs test. Jonathan is a Myers-Briggs expert. He uses it as his decoder ring to better understand his colleagues and, even on occasion, me.

Jonathan is an INFP. I am an ENFP. To those of you who have endured the rigors of Myers-Briggs testing, you know that is enough in common that we are both “diplomats,” individuals known for their empathy, passionate idealism, and diplomatic skills, which I hope will serve him well in New York.

Jonathan knew that I get energy by talking to people—extrovert—and that I make decisions about issues by talking to people. As his family and friends will tell you, Jonathan is someone who doesn’t, who prefers text messages and rarely, if ever, answers a ringing phone. In fact, you would often find him with noise-canceling headphones on in his office, a very polite but very real “do not disturb” signal. We often say he isn’t always there when you call, but he is always on time.

Jonathan also has exceptionally good taste in whiskey, something we have enjoyed together on a few occasions, and I, hopefully, look forward to enjoying again tonight.

We went through many different periods, many different chapters here in the Senate, in my home State, and in our lives. We comforted each other on the loss of our parents. We consoled each other when a bill failed. And we celebrated together when legislation made it to the President’s desk.

In the very long period that was the pandemic, when so many of the offices of the Senate and so much of the work, the business that happens here, the steady parade of constituents, and the constant noise in the halls dimmed, quieted, Jonathan and a small group gathered day after day after day, dedicated to be that 224-A team that carried us through the pandemic. And I will never forget some of those long but very good days together.

Some say being a Senate chief of staff is the highest calling of any public servant here. Being a chief, frankly, is a very demanding, often thankless

job that requires 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, attending to the demands of constituents, the needs of staff, and, yes, the whims of Members and the challenges that they so often create, sometimes daily.

Jonathan has given so much to our team, to our office, to his colleagues, and to me. He is and has been the ideal chief of staff.

I have been incredibly lucky, Jonathan, to have your guidance and support for 13 years together and to work through, together, times that were interesting, grave, genuinely scary, sometimes fun, sometimes hysterical, and certainly historic.

We have had times of concern and alarm, of hope and optimism, and overall of accomplishment. It has been a long and sometimes strange trip together, but, Jonathan, you should be confident in the team you built, the culture you have cultivated, the LD whom you have helped mentor and bring along to succeed you, and the remarkable legacy of accomplishment you are leaving behind.

The heartfelt idealism, the overbrimming optimism, the determination to make a difference that first brought you to this our Nation’s Capital—you leave this place with those qualities undimmed, that capability strengthened, and that forward trajectory made more sure.

As Juliet says to Romeo, in Shakespeare—I think it is act II, scene II—“Parting is such sweet sorrow.” It is an ancient but modern way to remind us that good-byes are painful.

But this is not good-bye. This is good luck. This is: Know that you go with my thanks and the blessings of my office and my family and my State for your next chapter of public service.

Our Ambassador in New York, Linda Thomas-Greenfield, and the entire team at our U.N. Ambassador’s office will be blessed to have you, and I am excited for your new adventure to serve alongside another great public servant.

My office, my State, our Senate, and our Nation are immeasurably better because of your kindness, your generosity, and your dedication to public service, and I cannot thank you enough.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, yesterday, the Republican leader of the Senate came to the floor to give a speech relative to the issue of crime in America, and he was fairly specific as he outlined examples of violent crimes that were taking place across the Nation. He, of course, included in his litany the city of Chicago, talking about the car thefts that were occurring in that city and other felonious assaults in New York City and the like.

He concluded his remarks—the Republican Senate leader did—by saying:

American families deserve to feel safe in their homes and in their neighborhoods and

certainly in the Nation's Capital. It shouldn't take another assault, carjacking, or homicide to convince local leftwing leaders to start actually doing their jobs.

I come to the floor to discuss doing your job and reducing crime in America. I come here once again to discuss the Senate's need to quickly confirm two pending U.S. attorney nominees: Rebecca Lutzko, to the Northern District of Ohio, and April Perry, to the Northern District of Illinois.

I have come to the floor three times in the past 2 weeks to request unanimous consent for the Senate to take up and confirm these pending U.S. attorney nominees who are being stopped by one junior Senator from Ohio.

Keep in mind that both of these nominees, for the State of Ohio and for the State of Illinois, have gone through extensive vetting and extensive efforts to determine whether or not they were prepared and qualified for the job—and it is a big job. They would be the leading U.S. criminal prosecutors in their area and have responsibilities that we know are substantial.

Each time I have come to the floor to ask to give the opportunity to these two young people to lead the U.S. Attorney's Office, Senator VANCE of Ohio has come up with a different explanation of why he is blocking their confirmation. It appears that he is not certain in his own mind as to the issue on a daily basis.

As I stated last week, for almost 50 years, the Senate has confirmed U.S. attorney nominees, from both political parties, by either a voice vote or unanimous consent after they have been reported by the Judiciary Committee.

Just look back to the previous Trump administration. In the 115th and 116th Congress, 85 of President Trump's U.S. nominees moved through the Judiciary Committee, and Senate Democrats allowed all 85—every single one of them—to be confirmed by a voice vote or by unanimous consent.

Why would we automatically give to a President of the United States their U.S. attorneys, their representatives of the Department of Justice and the Nation? Because we understand the critical role that U.S. attorneys play in our justice system.

Just take a look at the law, title 28 of the U.S. Code, section 547. It states that "each United States attorney, within his district, shall prosecute for all offenses against the United States of America."

Leader MCCONNELL regularly comes to the floor to assert that Republicans are really tougher on crime than Democrats. The obstacles that Senate Republicans have created to confirming Federal prosecutors, and especially Senator VANCE's actions over the last 2 weeks, show what an empty argument that is.

Senate Republicans are literally moving the goalposts in the Senate and blocking the confirmation of law enforcement officers who lead our Nation's efforts to prosecute violent

crime and protect our communities from drug traffickers, gun violence, terrorism, and so many other crimes.

Is it important in the State of Ohio, where the junior Senator hails from, as it is important in Illinois, to deal with fentanyl deaths? It most certainly is. We understand that thousands of Americans are dying each year because of this deadly narcotic.

Who is fighting them? Leading the fight is our Federal Government and the Department of Justice. We are dealing with an international drug cartel hailing out of Mexico. We are dealing with an effort to take over drug and narcotics control of the United States, Europe, and beyond. Certainly, we need more than local law enforcement to deal with it.

So whom do we put on the case? The Department of Justice. Why is that important? It is important because we need to have the men and women serving in that Department of Justice who are doing this job every single day.

Earlier this year, the Senator from Ohio explained why he is doing this, why he is stopping the appointment of well-qualified and vetted criminal prosecutors in the Department of Justice. Here is what he said:

I will hold all Department of Justice nominations . . . we will grind the Justice Department to a halt.

"Grind the Justice Department to a halt"—really? Is that what you want to leave as your legacy in the U.S. Senate, that somehow you managed to diminish the Department of Justice's effort to keep America safe, to keep neighborhoods safe, to stop the spread of narcotics? Is that something you brag about back home? I don't think so.

The average American hopes and prays that someone in Washington is working late at night, lights on, trying to make sure that there is less crime in America. They trust us to do our jobs, and one of them is to make sure the Department of Justice has the men and women they need to be led properly and to be effective.

The junior Senator from Ohio campaigned for this job in Congress, in the U.S. Senate, on the fact that he was tough on crime. He said:

Americans deserve safety. They won't get it if politicians . . . keep attacking police officers instead of violent criminals.

I would think he would recognize that U.S. attorneys are too important to be used as political footballs to make some headline or make some tweet, or whatever it happens to be. I would think he would recognize that he is blocking highly qualified nominees who have significant experience as Federal prosecutors and who have qualifications and leadership abilities to serve with distinction.

According to the junior Senator from Ohio, the Justice Department has been "weaponized"—a favorite word of the right—simply because former President Trump has been indicted for multiple felonies. So this is retribution. In

order to punish the Department of Justice for any part of it—prosecuting or indicting the former President—the Senator from Ohio wants to stop prosecutors—criminal prosecutors—from going to work in Chicago and Cleveland.

What is he going to do about the pending case in New York? There has to be a way for him to stop the Department of Justice, the work by the State of New York, the work by their attorney general. The former President is being sued—I can use the term "prosecuted," but sued—in court for his business dealings in New York, and he has a case pending in Georgia. What is the junior Senator in Ohio going to do to punish Georgia for having the temerity of indicting the former President as well?

There is simply no basis in reason, fact, or law for what he is doing. The Justice Department under the Biden administration has made a point of demonstrating its independence, focusing on investigating and prosecuting criminal activity, regardless of an individual's political affiliation.

Attorney General Merrick Garland has even appointed special counsels to handle the investigations of the current President and the former President to ensure their independence.

Last week, Senator VANCE came to the Senate floor and stated:

[M]y objection is not specific to the qualifications of the particular individuals that have been nominated.

He explicitly said this in reference to both these nominees. So he is not questioning whether they are qualified for the job; he is just angry because the former President has been indicted by the Department of Justice.

In response, I offered the junior Senator from Ohio the opportunity to end his obstruction and to keep his promise to support law enforcement by allowing us to schedule confirmation votes on four pending U.S. attorneys—exactly what he said in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD he wanted. He agreed to it. He released his objection to all four nominees on the condition that we hold rollcall votes on them. He did this publicly in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and privately. He had said that while he couldn't speak for his colleagues in the Senate who may object to some on the floor, he would no longer object.

Last week, we held votes on two of those U.S. attorney nominees. But then Senator VANCE changed his mind again. Overnight, he decided he actually does object to even holding a confirmation vote on the two nominees—Rebecca Lutzko to be the U.S. attorney in Cleveland, OH, and April Perry to be the U.S. attorney in Chicago, IL.

Over the last few weeks, Senator VANCE offered explanation after explanation on why he is doing exactly what he promised not to do when he ran for office. He promised he would "fight the criminals—not the cops." He has introduced a resolution in the Senate that calls on "all levels of government to

ensure that law enforcement officers receive the support and resources needed to keep all communities in the United States safe.”

Now he has the chance to support law enforcement. Instead, he comes to the Senate floor three times to undermine the U.S. Attorney’s Office—even one in his own State that he represents here in the Senate. These are officers responsible for prosecuting drug cartels, sex traffickers, and other violent criminals.

Senator VANCE himself has said that Americans will not be safe if politicians keep attacking our law enforcement officers. I fear he is proving that as right.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 314 and 315; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want to address a few points that my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Illinois, made. I will restate a few of the things I have said.

First of all, he made much about my hold policy being focused on Donald Trump. And, of course, I do think it is preposterous—banana republic stuff—that the President of the United States is trying to throw his opponent in jail in the middle of a Presidential election.

But this isn’t just about Donald Trump. This is about a pro-life father of seven who was harassed and arrested in front of his children like a common criminal. This is about parents who are investigated by the FBI for peacefully exercising their First Amendment rights at school board meetings. This is about a Department of Justice that seems far more interested in politics than in justice.

So long as that is true, Senator, I will certainly continue to implement my hold policy.

I want to say a second thing, which is that all I am asking for—all I am asking for—is that my distinguished colleague from Illinois or any other Senator invoke cloture, force a cloture vote, and then force a vote on the Senate floor. I understand that is not easy for a Senate that votes one to four times per day, but the American people—most of them have much harder jobs than we do. I think sticking our thumbs in the air or down to the ground is not too much to ask for people who—as my distinguished colleague said, we asked for this job. We ran for this job. We work pretty hard for this job. I think expecting us to vote on cloture and vote on these nominees on the record is not too much to ask.

Third point that I will make: I have come to really appreciate and look forward to these exchanges with my colleague from Illinois. I will say this, that I think his criticism and I think his concern come from a very legitimate place. He has made this argument a number of times, the argument that there is something unprecedented about what I am doing.

What is it—85 nominees were approved during the Trump administration through unanimous consent or whatever the number is—I don’t know; I am going off of memory here—and now we have somehow stopped it, we have changed it.

Well, certainly I have changed it. I have changed it because the Department of Justice has changed. When Donald Trump was President, he was not trying to throw Joe Biden in prison. Joe Biden is President, and he is threatening to throw not just Donald Trump but a whole host of political opponents in prison. That is unprecedented. That is a new thing. Therefore, the way we respond to it must be unprecedented as well.

I acknowledge something the Senator from Illinois is pointing out here. In years past, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have made an argument that most of my fellow conservatives don’t agree with but I do agree with. It is that for the Department of Justice or any local law enforcement to work—whether it is State, Federal, or county, city—it needs to have legitimacy; it needs to have the trust of the people.

I have talked to a number of people just in the last few months who have told me that they have witnessed things in their community, but they wouldn’t call the Department of Justice because they don’t trust the Department of Justice.

I know Senator DURBIN and others might say: Well, look, you are a conservative Republican from Ohio. Of course you talk to the sorts of people who are skeptical of the Department of Justice.

But I would ask him to extend the same courtesy to my voters that I would extend to all voters across this country whether they like me or not.

When people don’t believe that law enforcement can be trusted, public safety will suffer. Our Democratic colleagues have made this argument in the past, speaking about other prosecutors and other communities, and I actually think they are right. Whether you agree with the reasons why a given community is mistrustful of law enforcement, mistrust of law enforcement destroys one of the foundations of the Republic. You cannot have application of law if the people don’t trust the people who are doing the application. That is what is different about the situation we find ourselves in.

I don’t like that the Department of Justice has become what it has become. I don’t like—again, set aside President Trump. I am pro-Trump. A

number of my colleagues are anti-Trump. Set aside the concerns about the Presidential election. What about parents who are protesting at their school board meetings for their kids? Should they be investigated by the FBI? Since they are being investigated by the FBI, doesn’t that suggest that something is broken at the leadership of the Department of Justice? I think the answer is yes, and I think that answer threatens the foundation of law enforcement and equal justice under the law in this country.

I will continue the hold policy so long as a broken Department of Justice cares more about politics than it does justice. Because of that, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Can you imagine what the family in Chicago who is concerned about narcotics and fentanyl deaths in their neighborhood thinks about this argument that somehow there is a grievance and people are mad about some of the things done by the Department of Justice?

Trust me, under the previous administration as well as this administration, as an attorney and a Senator, I can find things to object to. But to deny to the city of Cleveland and the Northern District of Ohio a U.S. attorney to lead their office to stop sex trafficking—that is a political statement this Senator believes is appropriate, that he is going to stop a nomination for someone to move into the U.S. Attorney’s Office in Chicago and lead the effort to stop the narcotics in our community or the trafficking of thousands and thousands and thousands of guns each year from neighboring States, and he is going to hold up that person because he objects to the way they treated former President Trump? For goodness’ sake, that is what is wrong with this country, and that is what is wrong with this Senate.

When one Senator can stop the appointment of a well-qualified individual with no questions asked about her ability to handle the job, either in Cleveland or in Chicago, and to do that because he has a political grievance—I hope I never get to that point, and I hope other Members of the Senate will think twice.

We need to function as a government that is effective and provides safety for the people we are sent here to represent. Having this snit over some political grievance and holding up the effective appointment of prosecutors to do their job is inappropriate.

I will continue to come to the floor and plead the case for safety in the neighborhoods.

Before anyone else decides to come to the floor in the future on the Republican side and criticize crime in the city of Chicago, for goodness’ sake, try to explain to the Senator from Ohio that there is a connection between criminal prosecution and crime.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I want to talk briefly to the Senate today about two issues. With respect to the first issue, I suppose I am talking to my people back in Louisiana as much as I am talking to my colleagues in the U.S. Senate.

This is New Orleans. This is the Mississippi River, which, as you know, runs through New Orleans. Much of southeast Louisiana, including but not limited to the city of New Orleans, gets its drinking water from the Mississippi River. Of course, the Mississippi River is freshwater, and the Mississippi River is long, wide, and mighty.

The Mississippi River's source is the northern part of our State. It drains a number of other rivers. This is the southern portion of the Mississippi River. In New Orleans, it kind of meanders around and shifts to the east before it hits south again into the Gulf of Mexico, which is, of course, saltwater.

You probably never thought about this, Mr. President. Perhaps you have. Most people haven't. Why doesn't saltwater—the Mississippi River runs into the gulf, which is saltwater, and the gulf is a big area. Why doesn't saltwater from the Gulf of Mexico flow up the Mississippi River? That would be a good question.

The reason is pretty simple. As I said, the Mississippi River is long, big, wide, and mighty, and it drains a good portion of the United States. When the Mississippi River is at normal levels, it flows very, very quickly and fast, and it keeps the saltwater down here in the Gulf of Mexico at bay.

But sometimes the Mississippi River gets low, and it flows less swiftly, and that is the situation right now. When that happens—it has happened I think five times in the last three centuries—sometimes saltwater actually comes up from the gulf into the Mississippi River, which is a problem for my people in southeast Louisiana, including but not limited to New Orleans, because they rely on the Mississippi River for their drinking water because it is freshwater.

This red line represents the saltwater intrusion. Saltwater is creeping up the Mississippi River just like a thermometer. We know, based on historical evidence, that it is not likely to go all the way up the Mississippi River, but that doesn't solve our problem in Louisiana because we depend on the Mississippi River for drinking water. If it gets far enough up the Mississippi River—"it" meaning the saltwater—then we have a real problem in southeast Louisiana.

As I say, in the last 25 years, this has happened four times—in 1999, 2002, 2022, and it is happening this year as we speak. I think the time that it happened before was in 1888, if I recall correctly.

I am an optimist who worries. I am worried about this because about 1 million of my 4.6 million people in my

State depend on this river for drinking water, and we are in the middle of watching the saltwater come up the river, and we don't think it is going to stop coming up the river until sometime around, I don't know, the end of October maybe. We could be wrong.

But I want the Senate and I want my people to understand that their local, their State, and their Federal governments are dealing with this problem.

First, I want to thank President Biden. President Biden declared a disaster declaration, which allows us to get the assistance of FEMA, and I am very, very grateful for that.

No. 2, our Corps of Engineers is involved. They are very able people. Our Corps of Engineers, below the city of New Orleans, has built an underwater dam. That is what it looks like. It is like a dam. They call it a sill. I call it a dam or a levee. It is under the water. It is down below New Orleans.

Well, why in the world would the Corps of Engineers do that? Because saltwater is heavier than freshwater and when the saltwater comes up the Mississippi River, it is not coming at the top; it is coming at the bottom.

And the Corps of Engineers in a place called Myrtle Grove below New Orleans—by the way, Myrtle Grove is also known for its great fishing, wonderful fishing, and really good people. But at the area in the river next to Myrtle Grove, the corps is coming in, and they built an underwater dam.

Now, that is not going to stop all the saltwater. It is just going to slow it down and stop some of it. So some of the saltwater, despite this dam, is still flowing north, headed toward New Orleans. The corps is talking about, if necessary, adding an additional 25 feet to the underwater dam.

Right now, the underwater dam is about 55 feet. We add another 25 feet. The river at that level or at this point is about 90 feet. And they are leaving a hole in the dam, in case you were wondering, for ships to come through.

No. 3, the Corps of Engineers and FEMA are both prepared, if necessary, to deliver us freshwater, if we need it, by barge. And if you ever wonder about the might of the Federal Government and particularly our Corps of Engineers—again, I can't thank them enough—they can deliver up to 36 million gallons of freshwater a day. So thank you, Corps of Engineers, and I want my people back home to know that, so they won't be worried.

Also, looking on the bright side—put that back up for me will you, Henson—by the way, Mr. President, with me today are two of my colleagues from my office, Mr. Henson Webre and Mr. Christian Amy. I want to thank them for their help.

Again, this is New Orleans. Here is the saltwater creeping up. Not everybody in New Orleans and in the New Orleans area and Southeast Louisiana gets their water from the Mississippi River. Some people have well water. So that is a plus.

Some facilities in New Orleans have also started installing what is called reverse osmosis filtration machines to take the saltwater out of the freshwater. And we in government stand ready and willing to advise facilities of the right to do that.

The other thing we are talking about doing—we are trying to not do this except as a last resort because it is so expensive—as you see here, the red is the saltwater; the blue is the freshwater. Folks who live down here by the saltwater and can't get water out of the Mississippi because it is too salty, we are thinking about building pipelines this direction, going north sort of along the river to get freshwater from a point in the river further up north and take it through those pipelines down south where we need it.

Now, that is expensive. It is being looked at by local governments, being looked at by the State government. We are in discussions with the Federal Government about it. It will be a last resort because it is so expensive, and I hope that the saltwater intrusion can stop. We can stop it.

Frankly, what is causing this is we are having a drought, and there is not enough water in the Mississippi River. If we could get a little rain up north, that will add to the volume of the river, and it will flow more quickly, and it will push that saltwater out.

The final thing, I want my people to understand what we are doing. This is Southeast Louisiana. It is sort of the toe of the boot. Further up here in Louisiana, we have built a minidam. We call it the Old River Control structure on the Mississippi River, and we divert some of the water out of the Mississippi River into another river in Louisiana called the Atchafalaya River.

In fact, we do that pursuant to a statute passed by Congress which says that 70 percent of the water at this point, which is way up here, has to be diverted—or kept in the Mississippi River, but 30 percent is diverted further west to the Atchafalaya River.

Why do we do that? Because the corps decided years and years and years ago, that river at that point is so strong and so mighty and moving so quickly and so swiftly and that if we did not divert some of that water, the Mississippi would change course and, instead of flowing through Baton Rouge and New Orleans, it would change course and flow this way to the gulf. So years ago, the corps said, We need to take some water out.

The corps is thinking about opening that dam up, if necessary, at the Old River Control structure and putting some of that water back into the Mississippi River that it is diverting right now to increase the flow of the river, which will, of course, push the saltwater back out.

So I appreciate, Mr. President, the Senate's patience in allowing me to explain this. As I say, I want to thank President Biden for his declaration. I