

was not a world without walls in which we were all part of one big, happy human family. The reality is that people live in nations, and nations have interests, and, by and large, for almost all of human history, nations have acted in the interests of their nations. Now we see what happens when one side does that and the other does not. The result has been the rise of China and Big Business—the two big winners. All of this is the consolidation of corporate power in the hands of a handful of companies and key industries and the rapid and historic rise of China at our expense.

China is a populous country. They were always going to be a superpower—they were always going to be one—but they did it faster because they did it at our expense. They didn't create these jobs; they moved them. They didn't create these industries; they took them.

We buy solar panels from China. Who invented solar panels? We did.

They lead the world now in battery production for these electric vehicles. We invented it. They make them; they have perfected them; and they now lead in the technology. I can go on and on.

They are building more coal-fired plants than any country on Earth. Today, China has more surplus refining capacity for oil than any nation on the planet.

This era has to end now. It is not about just taking on China; it is about changing the way we think. It is not 2000 anymore. It is not 1999 anymore. This is a different world.

In a series of speeches over the next few weeks, I am going to attempt to outline a coherent alternative moving forward in the hopes that we don't just sit around here all day and try to outdo each other about who is going to ban "this" and who is going to block "that" from going to China. This is about a lot more than just banning "this" and stopping "that." It is about having a coherent approach to a difficult and historic challenge. Look, it is a complicated one, and complicated problems rarely, if ever, have simple solutions.

The simplest way I can describe how I think we should move forward—and I will have to describe it, obviously, in more detail—is that we need to fundamentally realign the assumptions and the ideas behind our economic and foreign policies. We need a new system of global economics where we enter into global trade agreements not with the goal of doing what is good for the global economy but what is good for us. If a trade deal creates American jobs or strengthens a key American industry, we do that deal. If it undermines us, we don't do the deal just because it would be good for the global economy or because, in the free market lab experiment, it is the right thing to do. We don't live in a lab. We are human beings of flesh and blood. We live in the real world.

In economic theory, when a factory leaves and a job is lost, it is just a

number on a spreadsheet. Realize, when a factory leaves and a job is lost, a dad loses his job or a single mom, for example, loses her ability to support her family, and a community is gutted. So we will need to enter into the world of trade agreements. We are not talking about isolationism here, but the criteria for every agreement needs to be, Is it good for our industries and workers or is it bad? It sounds pretty simplistic. I don't know how anyone could disagree that we should not enter into trade agreements that are bad for American workers and bad for key industries.

We also, by the way, need to enter into foreign policy alliances that reward our allies and strengthen those who share our values and our principles. That also, by the way, helps to create American jobs and strengthen American industry, and if it can't be here, then have it strengthen the ability of an ally to be the source of our supplies.

But I will tell you this at the outset: It will not be easy because those who have prospered and flourished under the status quo, they still have a lot of power, and they will use it to protect that status quo. But we have no choice but to change direction because our success or our failure is going to define the 21st century.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW ACT

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I am here to speak about the Congressional Review Act that the Senate and House passed this week on a bipartisan basis and particularly about the President's decision to veto that Congressional Review Act.

Now, protecting Americans' property is what government should do—period; end of story. The American people deserve to know that the property that they invest in for their retirement is going to go to its highest, best use; that the person managing that money is going to make sure they maximize the return so that the couple, the family, the individual investing in that retirement is making the wisest decisions for their future.

Instead, President Biden's new environmental and social governance rule authorizes those who manage that money to prioritize President Biden's political agenda over the long-term financial health of the retirement fund of that fellow American. Think about that. It isn't what is best for their retirement, in their golden years when they are 65, 70, when they have to retire. It is what President Biden wishes to do now as a political agenda. He is

willing to jeopardize the retirement of the 152 million Americans who are planning for their future to fulfill his political goal.

Now, it is easy to speak about 152 million people. Let's bring it down to the young couple. They are 28 years old. They just had their first child. They are feeling responsible. They are feeling like they need to put money aside so that—my gosh, it seems so far away—when they retire, they have taken care of their financial future.

And they read the literature. If the return on my investment is 1 percent more, I have a much better life. If it is 0.5 or 1 percent less, I have not as good of a life because that is the power of compounding. Over that long period of time, that little bit of extra which continues to compound makes the difference sometimes between having to continue to work and the ability to buy the RV, take off west, and to see the Grand Canyon. That is kind of putting a human face upon this. Congress knew that.

When the President said that he was going to endorse this rule—promulgated it, if you will, put it out there—that told the asset managers, "Don't prioritize the best return on the investment; prioritize what we tell you is the better way to invest the dollars for our political goals." Congress voted on a bipartisan basis to end this ESG rule and to stand up for that American worker and that American family who are diligently saving and depend upon the best rate of return to securely retire.

Now, instead of joining Congress and supporting the workers, protecting their retirement, the President announced he will veto the effort. Oh, he doesn't say that he is going to do it to hurt their long-term retirement plans, but that is absolutely what it does. It puts window dressing around it: He is saving the planet. You name this; you name that. He is hurting their retirement plan, and he knows it, but that is of secondary importance to him.

Now, by the way, for Louisiana energy workers, this is more than a betrayal of their retirement. It weaponizes their retirement accounts not just against their future but also against their present. Those energy workers who are helping to produce the natural gas and the oil that is fueling our modern economy, that is helping to send natural gas overseas to Europe so that they can better withstand the financial and the energy pressure exerted by Russia over their economies, they are going to be hurt because this ESG rule will tell these financial institutions not to put as much capital into the development of this essential oil and natural gas for both our economy, for our European allies, and, by the way, for natural gas, in terms of helping to decrease global carbon emissions, and—did I say it—for the retirement accounts of these workers.

It is another effort by Washington, DC, Democrats to dismantle America's

energy economy, which has the byproduct—the very unfortunate byproduct, I suppose—of killing the jobs of millions of Americans.

Those investment managers helping to plan the retirement of these workers should help these workers achieve their best retirement plans. That is not necessarily the goal of the Biden administration. It is not necessarily the goal of academia or the environmental activists. But it is the savers' money; it is not Joe Biden's.

There is still time for the President to rethink his veto threat. The President says he is for supporting workers. Then show it. He says he is for those who do less well in our economy. Then show it. This ESG policy will make things worse for them. Don't veto. Allow it to go through.

Supporting American workers means supporting their jobs now and supporting their retirement savings. I urge him to sign this bill.

With that, 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. WYDEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MIFEPRISTONE

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, today, I begin an effort to provide regular updates to the Senate and the country about the devastating consequences for women in every State if Texas Judge Kacsmaryk issues a ruling banning mifepristone nationwide.

Two weeks ago, I stood on the Senate floor and laid out what has to happen if and when this decision comes down. President Biden and the Food and Drug Administration must ignore it. The Food and Drug Administration has the authority it needs to keep this medication on the market without interruption, regardless of what this ruling says.

I have already laid out the rationale for why the case is absurd, meritless, and lacks any legal standing, as well as the FDA's legal authority to ignore such a ruling.

Today, I am not going to rehash those important points. I want to discuss what I have heard over the last couple of weeks about the human cost if every woman in this country loses access to mifepristone. Republicans on the Supreme Court said that the issue of abortion ought to be returned to the States, that the country shouldn't have a "one size fits all" policy on this subject that is so essential to protecting the privacy rights of women in our country.

I am going to talk about the States for a minute or two.

My home State of Oregon has some of the strongest protections for reproductive health in the Nation. Abortion is legal. If you have health insurance, it

is required to cover this critical priority. If you don't, you can still access care. There are no waiting periods. You can get abortion medication via telemedicine and by mail, something that is crucial in large States and small States with very large rural populations, like mine. In fact, despite the dangerous Dobbs decision, access to reproductive care has been expanding in Oregon, partially to accommodate women traveling from nearby States whose own home State laws deny them this critical right to privacy.

Oregon has leaders like Governor Tina Kotek and Attorney General Ellen Rosenblum fighting to keep mifepristone legal and accessible to women in our State. I am proud to come from a State where the law reflects the fact that a woman's right to privacy is paramount and a woman's right to choose is hers and hers alone.

But if the plaintiffs and the anti-abortion activists prevail in that case in Texas, everything changes—everything changes—for the people facing important reproductive decisions every day and everywhere in the United States. We are talking about every single State—every one.

Despite strong laws on the books, women in my State of Oregon stand to lose mifepristone, a drug that is used now in more than 50 percent of abortions. So much for the idea of States' rights. All that talk about returning abortion law to the States is just going straight out the window.

I have said it before, and I will repeat it here. So often, the Republican Party often seems concerned about the States' rights only when they think a State is right. Otherwise, they seem happy to take over and tell the States what to do. Well, the people I am honored to represent, Oregonians, don't appreciate that selective application of their philosophy, but here it is.

Because of one judge, handpicked by Donald Trump, in the 16th largest city in Texas, there is serious potential that soon Americans, from one side of the country to the other and everywhere in between, will no longer be able to access the safest, most effective, and most relied on form of abortion care.

This is not leaving decisions to the States, like the U.S. Supreme Court told us would happen back in June.

Look at the Dobbs decision. That was the very foundation of the Dobbs decision. And, no shock to anybody, that is not what is being seen today. Here is what is going to ensue when the reckless decision in Texas comes down. We know that providers are already being stretched very thin. They are harassed and subject to vile threats. They are going to be thrown into a landscape of chaos and confusion.

Over the last few months, I have heard nonstop from these heroic medical professionals in my State. They worry there will be lines out the doors of women needing help. They worry about long wait times for the women

who are fortunate enough to eventually receive in-person care. They worry about the women who will never make it to a doctor's office because they live in a rural county or lack the means to make the journey that will now be necessary to receive abortion care. They worry about what will happen next. When will another judge in another State that looks nothing like Oregon make it so that these providers are not able to treat women seeking to exercise their privacy rights?

This is not some far-fetched slippery slope. It is happening now—now—right in front of our eyes.

Women have relied on mifepristone for more than 20 years. I held the first congressional hearing on this drug in 1990, when I was a Member of the other body. And finally—finally—there has been access to this drug, and it provides freedom to women to make their own private medical decisions and face far less stigma. That fundamental right is potentially about to be further gutted.

This is America. Aren't we for freedom—freedom to determine our own lives and futures, freedom to decide whether and when to have a family?

We have heard lots of horror stories of life before Roe. There are too many people with immense power in this country who tragically want to yank America back to those times. I doubt those people have given a moment's consideration to the danger women face when a pregnancy goes wrong, how their lives can be at risk.

This is about women's health and survival. This is about control over their lives, control over their bodies. It is about depriving Oregonians and women everywhere of their fundamental right to privacy.

I am here to say that, unfortunately, these anti-abortion activists aren't going to stop until abortion in every form and in every State is simply banned. The need to control women's bodies is not going to end at attacking mifepristone, which I would say, as I did earlier, has a long record—a long record—grounded not in political rhetoric but in scientific evidence for being safe and effective.

It will not end with the topic of abortion either. Rightwing extremists are coming after access to reproductive healthcare more broadly. Some lawmakers and their allies have filed legislation and lawsuits to block access to birth control—birth control.

I remember the President of the Senate helping us in this body to champion for so many years those priorities. And now we have legislation to block access to birth control, lifesaving cancer screenings, HIV prevention. The list goes on.

As these attacks go forward, we also know who is going to be hurt the most—people of modest means, people in rural areas, people of color, immigrants, LGBTQ Americans.

I said it 2 weeks ago when I was on the floor to discuss the case, I will say