

is my wife Iris and my daughters Jessica and Alison, Alison's wife Biz, and—he kept quiet during the swearing in; I was very relieved—my 4-year-old grandson, Noah. They are part of my greater family, and they are my biggest supporters, motivators, and the unsung heroes of my life. And though he is no longer with us, I know my dad is looking down smiling today. We miss him every single day, but I know he is right here with us in spirit.

Now, Madam President, now is the time to set our sights on the future. As we begin the 118th Congress, this Senate Democratic majority enters the new year in a stronger position than anyone ever expected. We have a lot of challenges ahead, but this majority is ready to meet them. We will be relentless, flexible, and work with the other side to get things done. It won't be easy moving forward under a divided government, but after everything we have accomplished with an evenly split Senate and a narrowly divided House, there is no reason we can't keep the streak going moving forward.

Let's not forget, as I mentioned, that five of our six major bills last year were done on a bipartisan basis. So let me say it again. After everything we have accomplished in an evenly divided Senate and a narrowly divided House, there is no reason both sides can't keep working together for the good of our beloved country.

That doesn't mean we will agree all the time or even much of the time. It doesn't mean we will ignore our differences or compromise on our values. We won't do that. But party differences do not absolve either side of the need to work together when the good of the country is on the line. If both sides are willing to give it a good-faith effort, I am optimistic that we can be successful, far more successful than many might think.

After all, Madam President, if you said 2 years ago that a 50-50 Senate would finish as one of the most successful since the Great Society, the naysayers would have said that is crazy talk. They would have said a 50-50 Senate is doomed to languish in gridlock.

But let's take a look at everything we accomplished over the last 2 years and be proud of it. With no margin for error, this majority enacted the historic Inflation Reduction Act and confirmed the most diverse collection of judges—97 in total—in American history.

With bipartisan support, we enacted a historic infrastructure bill. After decades of trying, both sides passed the first gun safety bill in over 30 years. We approved the CHIPS and Science Act, passed the PACT Act, and stood with our friends in Ukraine. And just a few weeks ago, both sides worked together to enact marriage equality and the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act—all of this done in an equally divided Senate, all of this done with a narrowly divided House.

So I hope we can continue to get things done, even with a narrowly controlled Republican House. For whom ever ends up becoming Speaker of the House, I hope they will find a way to work with us in a productive way this Congress. Senate Democrats are ready to reach across the aisle and across the Capitol to accomplish big things that will benefit all Americans.

So, to close, Madam President, after everything we have accomplished over the last 2 years, America is stronger, healthier, and better prepared for the future thanks to the Senate working together, and we must continue. If Republicans are willing to work with us in the new year, they will be met with an open hand. If they are willing to come to the table, we will sit right down and do the difficult work of legislating for the people. And if they are willing to set their sights on making our country better together, there is no reason why the successes of the last 2 years need to end today.

There is much that we should be proud of from the 117th Congress. There is much we can be hopeful for in the 118th. Let us, therefore, begin the work anew, mindful of the challenges to come but determined, without ceasing, to reward the trust the American people have placed in us.

I yield the floor.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican leader is recognized.

#### REMEMBERING MIKE MANSFIELD

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, last November, my Republican colleagues reelected me to another 2-year term serving our conference as leader.

The greatest honor of my career is representing the Commonwealth of Kentucky in this Chamber and fighting for my fellow Kentuckians, but the second greatest honor is the trust that my fellow Republican Senators have placed in me to lead our diverse conference and help them achieve their goals.

As I begin my ninth Congress serving my colleagues in this role, I find myself looking back over some of the remarkable statesmen who have come before. Designated party floor leaders have been a feature of the Senate for more than 100 years, and no two have done the job exactly alike.

Some notable leaders have built influence through bookish mastery of procedure—for example, Massachusetts Republican Henry Cabot Lodge and West Virginia Democrat Robert Byrd.

Other leaders are remembered less for parliamentary wizardry than for tackle football. Joseph Taylor Robinson of Arkansas delivered much of the New Deal through the Senate for F.D.R., with a lively repertoire that included cutting deals, red-faced rants, pounding his desk, and almost ending up in fisticuffs here on the floor.

When Robinson died of a heart attack, Roosevelt's pick to fill the vacancy was Kentucky Senator Alben Barkley. Even with that endorsement, Barkley only won his first election as leader by one vote, in part because Senate Democrats worried the President's handpicked man might actually have mixed loyalties. But Barkley won his colleagues' trust. In 1944, when he dramatically resigned during a showdown with the White House over tax policy, his conference reinstated him on a unanimous vote the very next day.

Then there was our late friend and colleague Bob Dole of Kansas, a sharp competitor who excelled both at partisan combat and bipartisan compromise—plus, as we all know, had a wicked sense of humor.

The Texas Democrat Lyndon Johnson was a towering interpersonal force and master of relationships. The Ohio Republican Robert Taft had been more introverted and cerebral. He was a master of policy. But each was a strong force and a powerful thorn in the side of the opposite-party administrations.

Then there have been leaders who rose to the job through lower key, behind-the-scenes styles, and that, Madam President, is how Senator Michael Joseph Mansfield of Montana became the longest serving Senate leader in American history until today. The highest ranking Federal official Montana has ever produced wasn't actually born under the "Big Sky." When Mike Mansfield's mother died early, this young son of Irish immigrants was put on a train from New York City to family in Great Falls, MT.

Though Mansfield would later be famous as a Senate leader who didn't bully his colleagues, apparently, young Mike first tried a different approach. A brief trial run as a self-appointed schoolyard bully ended when a bigger boy supplied some humility right to his nose. At age 14, standing all of 5 feet 4 inches, he successfully used doctored documents to join the Navy. Soon after, he migrated to the Army, instead, and, soon after that, the Marines, which took Mansfield to the Philippines and the coast of China.

After that, back in Montana, Mansfield worked in copper mines as a mucker. This was touchy work, in a dangerous underground environment, with dynamite everywhere and few exit routes. Eventually, Mike left the grueling work to pursue school, but not before the mines had taught him enduring lessons about caution and about prudence.

First came college, then graduate studies, continuing a fascination with Asia. But Mike soon exchanged the faculty lounge for elected office. He lost his first race to represent Montana's First District in 1940, but he won both the primary and the general in 1942, after the incumbent Republican Jeanette Rankin had cast the only vote against war with Japan after Pearl Harbor.

The war gave Congress's newest Asia expert immediate relevance. Speaker

Sam Rayburn made sure he landed on the Foreign Affairs Committee. NBC invited Congressman Mansfield to deliver a broadcast lecture on events in Asia. Soon, the Roosevelt White House named him the President's personal envoy to wartime China. A decade later, five terms in, Representative Mansfield was a trusted foreign policy hand and a proven fighter for Montana.

He traveled to Asia multiple times. He served as a U.N. delegate. President Truman offered to nominate Mansfield to a State Department job, but Mansfield was eyeing a different kind of promotion. In 1952, he beat Montana's incumbent Republican Senator by a few thousand votes and began a Senate tenure that would span nearly a quarter of a century.

From his freshman seat on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mansfield spent the 1950s as the Senate's most frequent traveler to the increasingly pivotal region of Indochina—what we would soon be calling Vietnam.

Even during the Republican Eisenhower administration, the Montana Democrat had great influence. He was an early voice calling for more and faster shipments of military aid to the anti-communist cause.

And at least one historian argues that without Mansfield's personal intervention, the United States might well have pulled the plug on supporting Diem and conceded Vietnam to the communists as early as the mid-1950s, avoiding the entire war.

It took Mansfield's colleagues little time to identify another use for these diplomatic talents closer to home. After the previous Democratic whip, Earle Clements of Kentucky, narrowly lost reelection in 1956, Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson needed a new No. 2. He eventually turned to the respected first-termer from Montana.

Mansfield later remembered how it happened. He said:

Lyndon insisted I had to take it because I was the least objectionable to most of the Democratic Senators . . . it was not a flattering argument, but after several meetings, I finally lost my resolve against becoming Whip.

Now, L.B.J. was not looking to devolve any real power to his lieutenant. The record suggests that Johnson's famous pit bull staffer Bobby Baker did more threatening, horse-trading, and whipping of Senators than did Mansfield. Mostly, the Senator kept investing in his twin passions: Montana and Asia. But his colleagues grew in appreciation for the traits that Mansfield offered the caucus that L.B.J. did not: a calm presence, a collaborative style, a listening ear.

When Mansfield's colleagues Kennedy and Johnson won the 1960 election, both J.F.K. and L.B.J. wanted Mansfield for leader. But there was drama right from the start. Johnson insisted that Senate Democrats begin the new Congress by voting on a resolution to let him chair the Democratic caucus,

as if he had never left. Well, the debate was unexpectedly fierce. The "no" vote was surprisingly large. Even though the resolution carried, the episode was a clear rebuke. L.B.J.'s former colleagues wanted to turn the page. So Mike Mansfield would be leader not just in name but in reality.

So the shift from a boisterous, high-drama leader to a lower key, more businesslike floor manager rippled through the institution. Johnson had deliberately run a melodramatic and unpredictable Senate. Mansfield set out to make things more predictable and formal.

Instead of surprise late-night sessions and unpredictable recesses, Senators got a set schedule. Instead of micromanaging, the majority leader was actually laissez faire. President Kennedy's Cabinet quickly learned they could meet with the majority leader all they like, but he wouldn't get ahead of his Members. He would listen politely and refer them to the appropriate chairman.

When snafus stalled the Senate floor, Mansfield's first problem-solving tactic was to try simply doing nothing. One biographer marvels at Mansfield's "awesome, monumental, fearsome, incredible patience." He would sit "stiffly erect at his desk on the Senate floor . . . hour after hour, and sometimes day after day."

Leader Mansfield prioritized treating Members equally. Apparently, he never even took a position in the races that determined his own whip. In one small but telling touch, Mansfield made sure the Senate's only two women Members, Margaret Chase Smith and Maureen Neuberger, got a pair of plum offices that shared a private restroom.

In the Mansfield Senate, proceedings became more orderly and less theatrical. Crucial work migrated out of hallway confrontations and hideaway handshakes and into hearing rooms and committee offices. The Senate was less defined by top-down dramatics than by bills and priorities actually percolating upward, a diligent, low-key leadership style from a serious, diligent, low-key person. As one historian puts it, this "insistence on being last rather than first, the servant and not the suzerain of the Senate, fitted his personality just like a comfortable suit."

Now, not all Senators welcomed the change; especially during the Kennedy years, when some of his party's bold priorities stalled under filibusters, some of Mansfield's own Members openly criticized him and his comparatively hands-off approach.

Mansfield, however, stood firm. He prepared a defiant speech, doubling down on his faith in an orderly process and collegial Senate. Remarkably, literally minutes before this big speech was to be announced, President Kennedy was shot and died. Mansfield's remarks ended up slid into the RECORD with little fanfare.

Of course, thereafter, a variety of factors made the Johnson Presidency a

fruitful time for major legislation—from the Civil Rights Act to the Voting Rights Act, to Medicare and the rest of the Great Society. And Mansfield's Senators remained productive.

Later, the Nixon administration and Democrats in Congress passed a thick stack of bipartisan policies. Some critics of Mansfield argue that the majority leader was not the direct driving force behind these accomplishments, that he contented himself with the modest task of keeping the Senate machinery oiled, while other people with stronger and clearer visions championed particular outcomes.

However, it is worth noting Mansfield himself would have seen that statement actually as a badge of honor. And really, the caricature of a totally hands-off, almost agnostic leader is simply not accurate. Mansfield was, in fact, a canny strategist who knew how to rally his conference. He knew when to go to battle and when to coordinate with his counterpart Everett Dirksen. In short, he knew how to work the Senate.

Even when a supermajority of Senators stood ready to pass the Civil Rights Act in early 1964, it took Mansfield's personal field generalship to actually get it accomplished.

On the front end, his crafty moves kept the bill from dying an early death in Senator Eastland's hostile Judiciary Committee; on the back end, they stopped the final filibuster; and in between, thwarted all the creative stall tactics without blowing up the institution.

But it is certainly true that, overall, Mansfield did not view—and did not treat—the Senate as a mere means to policy ends he favored. Yes, the former history teacher was a Democrat; he did want particular results; and he often got them. But he seems to have felt the most valuable end was the institution of the Senate itself—its processes and debates, its traditions and its structures, and all 100 of its Members.

He saw his job as facilitating the Senate as a whole working its will—and not just working his will.

Again, this unusually neutral style came with costs. For example, L.B.J. was convinced Mansfield could have jammed through the Civil Rights Act earlier if he had played harder ball with the Southerners.

Earlier, J.F.K. had grown exasperated with his friend's patient handling of Dirksen while Republicans slow-walked Kennedy's Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. But take note: In both cases, the priorities did eventually pass. And they probably became law with broader and deeper support because Mansfield allowed Members more time, more space, and face-saving.

With regard to Asia, even when Mansfield's historic run in the Senate finally ended, his service on the international stage did not. Shortly after he departed this Chamber, President Carter nominated him to be our Ambassador to Japan. His performance was so

strong that President Reagan asked him to stay on. He served in that role for 11 years—from the longest serving Senate leader to the longest serving Japanese Ambassador.

Mansfield's decades of work in Asia could fill a separate speech. But it is worth noting one time where his approach to the job of leader directly shaped his work in the region.

I mentioned how some historians see Mansfield's aggressive emphasis on Vietnam during the Eisenhower period a key tipping point toward eventual war. But as early as 1962, Mansfield's learned perspective had him deeply worried about the direction of our involvement in Vietnam. Where he had spent the fifties lobbying for more and faster aid, he spent the sixties sounding alarms.

But while there were some public statements, Mansfield remained measured and discreet and reserved his sharpest warnings for a long string of private memorandums that he sent down to the White House.

Some historians feel Mansfield should have engineered a more public, more dramatic break with the Johnson administration if he was so certain we were marching into a quagmire.

Some Democratic Senators were publicly assailing Johnson's Vietnam policies. But Majority Leader Mansfield decided against making a high-profile public break with a President of his own party on foreign policy.

Clearly, Mike Mansfield was a complex and fascinating Senate leader for reasons far beyond his longevity. This scholarly Montanan was not an exciting idealist who transformed our national discourse, nor was he a policy entrepreneur who brought to the leader's role his own sweeping wish list of Federal programs.

Mansfield made a huge impact through a different road: by viewing the role of leader as serving others—well, that and the fact that he always enjoyed big, stable majorities on his side, often well in excess of 60 votes, helped as well.

In the Mansfield model, serving his caucus meant listening to his Members, supporting them in their goals, and helping facilitate the victories his party wanted out of the spotlight.

And he also sought to serve the Senate as a whole. He got things done without blowing up bedrock. He mostly defended the Senate's idiosyncrasies, traditions, and pace rather than try to tear them down. He erred on the side of empowering his colleagues rather than trying to dominate them; prudence over performativity; suggestion over dictatorship; and a winning record on his party's key priorities without attacking the institution to do it—a quintessentially Senate record from one of the quintessential Senate characters in our history. What a path, from mucking in the Butte copper mines to serving 16 years as Senate leader and advising nine consecutive Presidents as a seasoned statesman.

And what a testament to our great country that such a path was possible. It has been my honor to remember my distinguished predecessor this afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SINEMA). The Senator from Texas.

#### 118TH CONGRESS

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, this week we start a brandnew year, a new Congress, and turn the page on a new chapter here in Washington, DC.

After 2 years with a single party—the Democratic Party—controlling all levers of government, the American people voted for a change for divided government.

Sometimes you will hear that divided government is actually the best time to do hard things, and I think that is true. And I hope we will rise to the challenge with the divided government that the voters in the midterm elections gave us. But, of course, now Republicans hold the majority—albeit slim—in the House of Representatives, where they will serve as a much-needed check on some of the governing strategy of our friends across the aisle.

With a Republican House, Democrats will no longer be able to use budget reconciliation to circumvent the normal legislative process and, with it, the reckless spending that has helped to fuel inflation over the last 2 years. Instead, they will have to work in earnest. They will have to work with Republicans to find common ground and move legislation using the regular order.

That is what the American people want. That is the verdict of the voters in the midterm elections. I am hopeful that we will embrace this new era of divided government to provide the opportunity to govern in a more responsible way.

The start of a new Congress is always bittersweet because you are saying good-bye to old friends, but you are also saying welcome to new friends.

While we have had to say farewell to some truly top-notch colleagues who have retired at the end of the year, we are happy to welcome those new colleagues to the Senate.

The Republican Conference officially welcomes five new Members in our ranks today: KATIE BRITT from Alabama, TED BUDD from North Carolina, MARKWAYNE MULLIN from Oklahoma, ERIC SCHMITT from Missouri, and JD VANCE from Ohio. They have now gone from Senators-elect to full-fledged U.S. Senators. And I know how excited they are to get to work.

Each of these new Senators has run the gauntlet of a primary and general election campaign and has come to Washington with a fresh perspective and a long list of ideas about how to improve the lives of their constituents in their States.

I have gotten to know each of these new colleagues over the past few

months, and I am eager to work with them here in the Senate.

On the other side of the Capitol, there are new faces joining the Texas delegation. Given the explosive population growth in the State of Texas—now we have just reached the 30 million mark of people calling Texas home—we have added two new House seats this cycle, bringing the total House of Representatives to 38 from the State of Texas.

Today, we officially welcome five new Texas Republicans to the House, and I am, likewise, eager to work with each of them.

During my time in this Chamber, I have consistently fought to protect the right of Texans and create more opportunities for every family to achieve the American dream. Despite the partisanship that has often gripped this Chamber last Congress, we have managed to actually accomplish quite a bit on behalf of the American people.

We have funded the CHIPS for America Act, which made an investment in our national security and economic competitiveness. We gave States and local government the flexibility to use excess COVID-19 relief funds on important infrastructure and disaster relief projects. And in the wake of the devastating shooting in Uvalde, we have passed bipartisan legislation to strengthen mental health resources, improve school safety, and strengthen the background check system without impacting Second Amendment rights. And it is already producing well by saving lives, I believe. We will hear more about that as time goes by.

We sent more support to local law enforcement for mental health courts and crisis intervention teams, as well as critical deescalation training.

We made major strides in combating the scourge of human trafficking and other heinous crimes and helped improve our support for crime victim survivors.

These are just a few examples of bills that I introduced or cosponsored that are now the law of the land.

While I am proud of everything that we have been able to accomplish on a bipartisan basis last Congress, we regrettably failed to address some of the biggest problems facing our country, starting with the border.

Since President Biden took office, the southern border has been overwhelmed by unprecedented levels of migration. In the last 12 months alone, Border Patrol has encountered more than 2½ million migrants along the U.S.-Mexico border.

It used to be considered a crisis when the Border Patrol encountered more than 100,000 migrants in a single month, but over the last year, we have averaged more than double that every single month.

It is a gross understatement to say that frontline officers and agents are overwhelmed. They can't keep up in terms of staffing, so Border Patrol has to leave the front lines to process asylum seekers, unaccompanied minors,