

entire State of Florida is covered. But then out here, you get into wildfire-adjacent areas where the wildfire risk is already causing problems in the home insurance markets.

In the face of these risks, all across the country, up against truly distinguished witnesses, real grownups who know what they are talking about, whose warnings are already coming true, Republicans frequently put up fossil fuel front group mouthpieces, paid not to understand the facts. Sadly, it is a sign that fossil fuel mischief persists. So in our 11th hearing, we showed how the fossil fuel industry has known for almost seven decades about these dangers they deny.

As early as the 1950s, industry scientists left records of their warnings about climate change. They were measuring and predicting it. Industry scientists were measuring and predicting it, and they knew their fossil fuel products were causing it.

In 1977, Exxon Senior Scientist James Black told Exxon's management committee—I am quoting him here.

There is general scientific agreement that the most likely manner in which mankind is influencing the global climate is through carbon dioxide release from the burning of fossil fuels.

Nineteen seventy-seven, that is what Exxon's scientists told Exxon's management. Well, other scientists noticed it, too. And Congress began pursuing legislation that would have addressed climate dangers. Big Oil responded with billions of dollars in fossil fuel funded disinformation, lobbying, and dark money election spending. They are still at it, as the more preposterous witnesses attested by their presence. It wasn't always so. During my first years here in the Senate, climate legislation was bipartisan. John McCain ran for President on a serious climate platform.

But in January 2010, the Citizens United decision set loose a barrage of political spending by the fossil fuel industry. Worse, the Court allowed that spending to be secret, to hide the identity of the spender. The fossil fuel industry was ready with unlimited dark money and—with the secret threats and promises that the ability to spend unlimited dark money allows you to make.

And between the spending and the threats and the promises, the fossil fuel industry snuffed out bipartisanism on climate like that. From January of 2010, the date of Citizens United forward, no Republican has gotten on a serious climate bill in the Senate.

Collectively, fossil fuel interest through trade organizations and through their dark money front groups have spent billions of dollars that we know of so far on ads, on lobbying, on campaign contributions, and on super PACs.

Super PACs, by the way, didn't exist before Citizens United. That monstrosity is a creation of Citizens United and dark money. The delay in climate

action that those billions of dollars bought has directly caused the economic perils that our hearings have spotlighted. Organizations like the Cato Institute, the Heritage Foundation, the American Enterprise Institute, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, by 2021 had received over half a billion dollars from fossil fuel and other dark money interests.

This is the web of various fossil fuel-funded front groups, with the bulk of the funding unidentified. That is the dark money blob in the middle of this web.

Here are some of the key groups into which political money flowed to support climate denial and climate skepticism. Political money flowed through anonymizing intermediaries into Republican super PACs. Lobbyists from industries and trade associations crawled around this building. They spent a fortune.

But for all the billions that they spent, this political and propaganda effort was a bargain—a corrupting bargain but a bargain. The International Monetary Fund calculates, using a peer-reviewed procedure, that we subsidize fossil fuels by \$760 billion—billion—annually in the United States alone. Seven hundred and sixty billion dollars is the subsidy the IMF points out that the fossil fuel industry floats on in this country.

So let's say the fossil fuel industry spent \$7.6 billion on political influence and secret corruption schemes every year. They would be pocketing a subsidy dollar for every political-influence penny that they spent if they protected their \$760 billion subsidy. It is the best money they could possibly spend. It is more rewarding than drilling for oil.

But while corrupting Congress may have been a bargain for them, the price of a corrupted Congress was very high for everyone else. We lost an essential decade from the Citizens United decision in January of 2010 and our passage of the IRA—the first serious piece of climate legislation passed by Congress.

More than \$10 trillion of our national debt stems from the 2008 financial crisis—a warned-of economic shock—and the COVID pandemic—another warned-of shock. Those trillions of “shock debt” amount to 40 percent of our total national debt. Climate disruption shocks are looming, predicted, clearly predicted, just like climate change and its consequences were predicted, clearly predicted. Now, as we have seen, the climate change consequences are here. The shocks are still looming.

I will close by saying that the threat from climate change to the Federal budget is probably the least of our climate worries as we think about the damage we are doing to the natural systems that have made Earth habitable for humankind; as we think about new diseases and dangers and destruction; as we think about wars and suffering as resources shift and global scarcity replaces global abundance; as we think about the lost species, the

lost places of beauty, the lost natural harmonies, the lost human traditions, the trout stream you can't teach your granddaughter to fish at because the trout aren't there. By some measures, the money is the least of it.

But here in Mammon Hall, we seem to care most about the money. So our Budget Committee hearings have made clear that warnings abound of what droughts, floods, wildfires, and heated, rising seas will do economically to American families and businesses and to our Federal budget.

The long-predicted damage has already begun. It has gone beyond science predictions. It is now within the fiduciary horizons of businesses that are having to report to shareholders on climate risks because it has become so real and so immediate that their fiduciary obligations demand that reporting. That is why the fossil fuel industry cooked up this whole phony anti-ESG show that they have put on to try to push back against the fiduciary obligations that so many corporations are feeling obliged to meet.

These looming, systemic, economy-wide threats are real. Nothing says that it is going to be either the coastal crash or the wildfire crash or the carbon bubble crash. Nothing says that all three can't happen.

If we are to be serious about debt and about deficits and about federal spending, we better damn well be serious about climate change. It is, as my trusty old graphic says, time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, first, I want to commend my colleague from Rhode Island. No one has been more accurate and more farseeing about climate change than SHELDON WHITEHOUSE.

When he first came to the Senate, it was a technical issue that scientists debated. Now it is an issue we are confronting because of his efforts, and it is also an issue we are confronting because we see it.

We are in the midst of a crisis. He foresaw it. He has dedicated himself to addressing it. I am just very proud to be his colleague in this Senate.

UKRAINE

Mr. President, tonight, I rise to discuss the state of the war in Ukraine and the vital importance of our support for the Ukrainian people.

While we could all breathe a sigh of relief that the House GOP didn't shut the government down last week, we need to move quickly to restore the military and humanitarian assistance that the House stripped out of the 47-day stopgap funding bill. At a minimum, we need to provide the full amount of Ukraine assistance requested by the administration. It is not just that we have a moral obligation to assist Ukraine; it is in our national security interest to do so.

I can't begin to understand the political infighting and intrigue that are occurring within the Republican majority in the House, and I certainly can't explain why GOP leaders allowed a small cadre of their caucus to effectively veto assistance to Ukraine. What I do know is that Ukrainians are at a crucial point in their fight against Russia, and they need our help.

Ukraine will soon enter another difficult winter, and we know Russia will target its energy and civilian infrastructure without regard for innocent civilians.

In a letter to congressional leaders last Friday, Michael McCord, the Comptroller for the Department of Defense, wrote that "the [Department of Defense] has exhausted nearly all available security assistance funding for Ukraine."

Under Secretary McCord added:

Without additional funding now, we would have to delay or curtail assistance to meet Ukraine's urgent requirements, including for air defense and ammunition that are critical and urgent now as Russia prepares to conduct a winter offensive and continues its bombardment of Ukrainian cities.

We cannot let that happen.

Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2023.

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER JEFFRIES: I write to express the Department of Defense's deep concern with the absence of security assistance funding for Ukraine in the continuing resolution (CR) being considered in the House, H.R. 5525, or any similar continuing resolution that might be proposed. The Department of Defense (DoD) is anxious to avoid a lapse in appropriations, but it is important that a CR protect our security interests and uphold our commitments and our values.

As you know, the Department has been providing vital security assistance to Ukraine since Russia's unprovoked invasion in February 2022, thanks to the bipartisan support of Congress. It is just as vital today that we continue that support.

Today, DoD has exhausted nearly all available security assistance funding for Ukraine. We are already out of funding for the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative, one of the two security assistance tools we have.

The other funding tool we need are those funds provided to replenish our military's inventories for the weapons and supplies we've provided to support Ukraine in their fight via drawdown. We have only \$1.6 billion remaining of the \$25.9 billion Congress has provided. We have already been forced to slow down the replenishment of our own forces to hedge against an uncertain funding future. Failure to replenish our military services on a timely basis could harm our military's readiness.

Without additional funding now, we would have to delay or curtail assistance to meet Ukraine's urgent requirements, including for air defense and ammunition that are critical and urgent now as Russia prepares to conduct a winter offensive and continues its bombardment of Ukrainian cities. For exam-

ple, a lack of USAI funding now will delay contracting actions that could negatively impact the Department's ability to purchase essential additional 155mm artillery and critical munitions essential for the success of Ukraine's Armed Forces.

This ammunition is critical to sustaining Ukraine's Armed Forces, including for their ongoing counteroffensive. An inability to ensure timely procurement and deliveries could undermine essential Ukrainian operations to retake additional territory or defend against potential future Russian offensives.

It would also affect our ability to support Ukraine's land forces, including obstacle breaching equipment, sustainment of previously provided small Unmanned Aerial Systems, systems to detect, analyze, and locate adversary signals, and demolitions equipment. It would affect training, maintenance and sustainment of the equipment we have previously provided, exportability efforts, spare parts, and other activities to ensure the Ukrainian Armed Forces receive a full capability.

A funding cutoff would also send a negative signal to our defense industrial base, which we have asked to step up munitions production across the country, resulting in increased defense capacity and higher employment. We cannot afford to throw that progress away. In fact, we are counting on it to implement our National Defense Strategy. It is important to note that from workers supporting Stinger and AMRAAM manufacturing in Arizona to factories producing components for Patriot interceptors and GMLRS in Arkansas, this funding is strengthening the American economy and creating hundreds of new American jobs.

Some have suggested that the Department could still execute the mission and support Ukraine's needs if we were given permission to transfer funds from inside a short-term CR from our own needs to fund more security assistance. I want to be clear, the Department does not support that approach, which will create unacceptable risk to us. Under a CR, the Department will be operating at a level approximately \$25 billion below our budget request for FY2024, which was and is consistent with the Fiscal Responsibility Act funding levels.

The bottom line is we cannot sustain adequate levels of Ukraine assistance with transfer authority alone.

Delays to additional funding would also be perceived by Ukraine as a sign of wavering U.S. support and likely as a betrayal of our previous commitments. Allies and partners are also unlikely to sustain their increased level of support without clear, continuing U.S. leadership. As you know, Secretary Austin successfully engages over 50 nations every month to press for sustained support. It is crucial that the U.S. continues to lead this global coalition, and we need the resources to underwrite our leadership role.

The Department appreciates your leadership on this vital matter, and I am sending an identical letter to the Speaker of the House as well as the Senate Majority and Minority Leaders.

MICHAEL MCCORD.

Mr. REED. I must point out that our support is the leading edge of worldwide support. Our NATO allies have stepped forward, and countries around the globe understand that this battle between democracy and freedom and autocracy and inhumanity must be won.

President Zelenskyy came to this very building 2 weeks ago to ask for our support. He received overwhelming

bipartisan promises from Members of both the Senate and the House. Of course, I was proud to pledge my support, and I know nearly all of my Senate colleagues were also.

It is shameful that on the heels of that visit, after looking President Zelenskyy in the eye and promising to stand with him, our House colleagues decided to strip all Ukraine funding from their continuing resolution. That decision contradicts the will of the majority of Congress and the American people, and it breaks faith with the people of Ukraine, who are in a battle to preserve their nation and their lives. And their battle is our battle. Their battle against unprovoked aggression by Putin against a democratic neighbor is a battle that we must ensure they can win because he won't stop there.

We can't allow the obstinacy of a few Members of the House of Representatives to force a cruel deal on those who least deserve it—the Ukrainian people.

As I said, this conflict matters not just to Ukraine but to our own security here at home. It is clear that if Putin succeeds in Ukraine, he will not stop. He made this clear years ago when he talked about that his mission in life, his sole, overwhelming preoccupation, was to recreate the Russian Empire—the Balkans, parts of Poland, Moldova, Georgia. He is very clear.

It is ironic in history how dictators can be so clear about what they want to do but ignored by people who should stand up to them. Hitler was very explicit in "Mein Kampf" on what his goal was. Yet world leaders appeased him. Will we appease Putin and cut off aid to the Ukrainians? If we do, it will be our problem.

He will seek to destabilize other countries in the region, including our NATO allies. If that happens, under article 5 of NATO, we have a legal and moral obligation to go to their aid. That means the blood that will be shed is not Ukrainian blood but the blood of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, guardians, and coastguardsmen. The cost of that, in my view, is priceless.

Our job in some respects is to ensure by our actions here that we continue lowering the probability that American men and women in our service will suffer and die in action. If we renege on our commitment to Ukraine, that probability will go up, not down, and we will regret it immensely.

We have seen colleagues on the other side speak out, but they have to speak out more vigorously.

Leader MCCONNELL said recently:

With Ukraine bravely defending its sovereignty and eroding Russia's capacity to threaten NATO, it is not the time to ease up. . . . Helping Ukraine retake its territory means weakening one of America's biggest strategic adversaries without firing a shot.

Leader MCCONNELL is right about that, and I admire his forceful and courageous support of the Ukrainian people.

Remember, also, China is watching how the democratic nations of the

world respond to Russia. In considering a potential invasion of Taiwan, President Xi is scrutinizing Putin's playbook and the international response, and he has seen things that are potentially encouraging, particularly if the international community simply gives up and allows Ukraine to fall.

The conclusion he likely will draw is that, if I engage and I am persistent enough for long enough, then the political whims in the United States and across the globe will fall behind and they will give up and I will succeed.

The credibility of the U.S. deterrent is only as strong as our actions. Our would-be partners around the world are also watching closely at what we are doing. Will we have their backs if they are attacked? We must show that we are a steadfast ally, not hamstrung by the whims of fringe politicians. Again, our adversaries would see themselves empowered as our alliances dissolve because there is no confidence or a lack of confidence in the United States.

This is especially true when we consider how the Ukrainians have proven, time and time again, that, given the right support, they are entirely capable of defeating the assaults launched against them, and there are a number of reasons for this.

First and foremost is the incredible courage and fighting skill of the Ukrainian people as well as the inspirational leadership of President Volodymyr Zelenskyy. I had the opportunity, like so many of my colleagues, to travel to Kyiv earlier this year and was deeply moved by the Ukrainians' bravery and commitment to defending their homeland.

Second is the remarkable statesmanship of President Biden. His administration has forged a unified response, leading the worldwide condemnation of Putin and providing enormous military, economic, and humanitarian support for Ukraine. I doubt if anyone in this Senate, in the weeks before the invasion of Ukraine, would have predicted that NATO would rally as it has to support the Ukrainians; that allies across the globe would dig into their stocks of munitions and transfer them to the Ukrainians; that the whole world would be, in some respects, moved by the actions of our country in standing up and inspiring others to join with us.

We also benefited from 8 years of training of Ukrainian forces, starting in 2014. In fact, I had the first opportunity to meet General Cavoli, our Supreme Allied Commander, when he was a brigadier general in Lviv training Ukrainian soldiers. That training was manifested as they repulsed the Russian assault. It was squad leaders and company commanders and young battalion commanders who had been trained by us and our allies who were able to outfight, outmaneuver, and outthink their Russian adversaries, and they continue to do that.

Finally, Putin's assault has faltered from the inept performance of his own

forces. The war has exposed a poorly led and poorly trained Russian Army with corrupt leadership at every level, poor tactics and communication and inept logistics. But people learn from adversity. The Russians are learning, and they are beginning to understand the limitations of their forces. So they are putting them in trenches; they are fortifying the battlefield; they are minimizing any maneuver that they must do because that is a complicated military operation. Then they are throwing in thousands and thousands of poorly trained but still well-armed soldiers.

So we can't assume that their poor performance will last forever. That is another reason we have to continue our support and give our Ukrainian allies all the help they need.

Now, Putin assumed, I believe, that his actions, his quick assault on Kyiv, would drive a wedge within the international community; that we would dither; that we would debate; that we would do nothing. Well, he was badly mistaken. As I indicated before, with the leadership of President Biden and Secretary Blinken and others, NATO has shown a remarkable unity and resolve. And we can't overstate the scale of this importance; that countries that before were unenthusiastic, let me say, about military operations, suddenly began to provide equipment, support, training, raised their budgets, and do so to assist the people of Ukraine.

Also, something that goes unstated by so many is that our European allies are also giving tremendous aid to civilian populations that have been displaced and aid to the budget of Ukraine. If you look on a per capita basis of the GDP—I should say the basis of percentage of the GDP—we are not the most generous benefactor of Ukraine; it is the Baltic nations. So this is an unusual worldwide commitment of sacrifice, of resources, in which we are the leader, but many other nations are giving as much, if not more.

Now, Putin, I think, believes he can wait us all out. He can wait for the supplies to be exhausted by the Ukrainians. Oh, and by the way, if we take away our resources, those supplies will be quickly exhausted. But we cannot validate this viewpoint as the Ukrainians have fought too hard and suffered too much to be left alone on the battlefield, to be abandoned.

And just as the Ukrainians have learned and adapted on the battlefield, the effort to aid and equip their security forces has evolved as we have gone forward. Throughout the war, the Biden administration has calibrated our assistance to Ukraine, calibrated in a very difficult situation. We have allies that were somewhat reluctant to move weapons systems in. We have allies that are signatories to the treaty against the use of cluster munitions, which we had to take into account. We have to negotiate between multiple parties that don't have precisely the

same viewpoint as we have, but yet we have been able to consistently support, train, equip, and provide the resources necessary for the Ukrainian forces to begin their counteroffensive, which they did weeks ago; to continue their fight through this winter and position them, we hope, for a decisive action as soon as possible.

We have committed tremendous amounts of security assistance, including advanced air defense systems equipment, and we remain keen that we look ahead to provide the most modern weapons systems that the Ukrainians can use. Many people forget the training that is necessary to use sophisticated weapons systems. Many people forget that the key to maneuver operations is a rather sophisticated coordination between ground forces, heavy armored forces, artillery support, air support when available. All of these things are not something that one just does naturally. It takes training. It takes repeated attempts. Fortunately, for us, the Ukrainians are so dedicated to their country that they are committing their all to use our equipment effectively.

I will also note that the supplemental funding that we have brought has allowed us to invest more money and create more jobs right here in the United States as U.S. defense industry partners ramp up production to meet Ukraine's needs and to backfill our own munitions supplies.

Indeed, what we have found is, really, a new type of warfare. We had become accustomed for decades to have complete air superiority when we fought, to have precision weapons that were so accurate that the battles we fought were weeks: Desert Storm, Iraqi Freedom, the first phase of the battlefield in Afghanistan. So we didn't think we needed a large-scale munitions production. The type of warfare we are seeing now, which very well might be the type of warfare we encounter in the future, requires an industrial base that can provide adequate ammunition, an adequate supply of equipment. We have started that process. One aspect is multiyear contracts now for munitions so that there is a demand that producers understand and will fulfill.

Now, some have said our response has been too slow and that we should have given more weaponry or better weaponry, et cetera. Well, those people who have criticized the President about their claims of slowness should be outraged at the House, which is demanding we stop it all. They should raise their voices now, strongly, emphatically, to tell the House: We must have Ukrainian aid approved, and we must do it quickly.

Throughout the war in Ukraine, President Biden has led the United States and the international community with admirable resolve. Congress must send a strong message to Putin that Americans continue to stand in solidarity with the people of Ukraine

and that we are committed to supporting them as they fight bravely to defend their homeland.

The simple truth is that their battle is our battle. If they lose, Americans lose, and the likelihood that our young men and women will be called upon to enter the fray increases dramatically. We must support our Ukrainian allies. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. 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. SCHUMER. Madam 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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 309.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Jennifer L. Hall, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 309, Jennifer L. Hall, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the District of Delaware.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Mazie Hirono, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Alex Padilla, Patty Murray, Sheldon Whitehouse, Debbie Stabenow, Tina Smith, Benjamin L. Cardin, Chris Van Hollen, Tim Kaine, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Peter Welch.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 297.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Julia Kathleen Munley, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 297, Julia Kathleen Munley, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Tim Kaine, Christopher Murphy, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Sheldon Whitehouse, Debbie Stabenow, Margaret Wood Hassan, Gary C. Peters, Peter Welch, Jeanne Shaheen, Chris Van Hollen, Mark Kelly, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tammy Duckworth.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 53.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Karla Ann Gilbride, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term of four years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 53, Karla Ann Gilbride, of Maryland, to be General Counsel of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for a term of four years.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, October 4, be waived.

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I just filed on three nominations, and that will take us through Tuesday afternoon, October 17.

We will also return to the consideration of the minibuses, which includes MILCON-VA, Transportation-HUD, and Agriculture. We are working in good faith, together with our colleagues, to get the minibuses done as soon as possible.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and 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.

REMEMBERING KAREN MCGINNIS

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise today to pay tribute to a true public servant and an icon of the Tri-Cities community. Last month, my good friend Karen McGinnis passed away. For 20 years, Karen served as the founding director of a critically important worker training facility, the Volpentest Hazardous Materials Management and Emergency Response, HAMMER, Federal Training Center, at the Hanford site in my home State of Washington.

Born in Nevada and raised in Oregon, Karen made her way to my alma mater, Washington State University, where she received her master's degree in agricultural economics in 1980. She went on to work at the Hanford site for almost her entire career, serving various Hanford contractors for 40 years,