

as if they were my own. And although I didn't listen to the entirety—I am not prepared to do that because I only got the back end—I just wanted to commend the senior Senator from Massachusetts for her moral clarity about the conduct of the war in Israel and the fact that it is a strategic and moral failure, and that the Prime Minister of Israel must be held to account for the fact that so many people are suffering so unnecessarily.

#### REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

Mr. President, overturning *Roe v. Wade*, as outrageous and devastating as it was, was never going to be the end for Republicans. They knew that, and we knew that because they weren't exactly keeping it a secret.

Except there was a set of sort of center-right and even center-left Republicans and pundits who swore privately that it wouldn't open the floodgates to an even greater assault on women's reproductive freedoms. They scoffed at even the possibility of the very kinds of outcomes that we are seeing playing out across the country today—like last week, when the Alabama Supreme Court effectively banned IVF and left people who are trying to start a family with nowhere to turn.

It turns out people were right to be worried, and one of the worst infirmities in this town is that somehow—somehow—you are considered savvy, thoughtful, a centrist, an institutionalist if you never, ever freak out.

"Everything is going to be fine."

Everything is always going to be fine. He is not going to try to overturn the results of this election. They are not going to go through with overturning *Roe v. Wade*. Every savvy person at every cocktail hour that I don't attend is always telling us to chill out.

But now it is happening. They went through with it. They repealed *Roe*, and all of the worst-case scenarios from all of the organizations that pushed for reproductive freedom were deemed right.

I still remember the great Senator from the State of Colorado who made as an emphasis in his reelection campaign women's reproductive freedom. Do you know what everybody called him on the Republican side? Not Mark Udall—Mark Uterus. They thought that was hilarious. Look at this weird focus on women's reproductive freedoms. And he sat there and said: But look, if the Supreme Court changes hands, then *Roe* is in peril.

Everyone was told to chill out. They made fun of this U.S. Senator for predicting the future.

People were right to be worried. Extreme Republicans are going after women and reproductive freedoms through every way that they can—in Congress, in statehouses, in the Supreme Court, and in State courts.

Gutting *Roe* was never going to be enough; it was a gateway to all-out war. Right now, millions of women in America are paying the price. They are terrified of what they can and cannot

do and what may or may not land them in prison. It is not a crime to start a family, but now it is. It is not a crime to dispose of a nonviable embryo in a lab, but Republicans have made sure that it is a crime.

Do you know how hard it is to do IVF? Everybody who is at least my age knows somebody who had a struggle getting pregnant, and that thing is emotionally and physically and financially exhausting. I have never thought of IVF through a partisan lens. I honestly hadn't. It didn't occur to me that they were going to go after people actually trying to get pregnant.

This is not about babies and life and families. This is about punishing women. This is about taking away their autonomy. This is their objective.

You know, 5 years ago, you might have come to me, and if I had made this kind of speech, you would have been like: Whoa, that is a little much, buddy. They are not going to do that.

They did that. They are still doing that. Republicans in Congress were quick to dismiss it. They even got a memo from their campaign committee to distance themselves from the very policies that they enabled for literally decades. They will try to on the one hand say they are for IVF but on the floor block legislation to enable IVF, and support fetal personhood legislation and block bills to protect IVF federally. They did it yesterday. So no one is fooled.

I know—and the Senator from Connecticut and I have been talking about this—sometimes it is very difficult to see through the fog on policy. On this one, it is not unclear who did what and what they are in the middle of doing. There is nothing pro-life about ripping away the only options available for someone trying to have a kid. There is nothing pro-life about jeopardizing a woman's life by forcing her to carry a nonviable pregnancy to term. That is not a principled belief; that is insanity. It is actively harming an innocent person.

In the wake of last week's decision, fertility clinics in Alabama are abruptly pulling the plug on IVF treatments because they are afraid of being prosecuted. That is leaving people wondering if they will be able to have a kid or not.

Not only can they not go through the process in Alabama, they can't even move their embryos because they are afraid of getting in legal trouble. They can't even move their embryos, right? Like, this was supposed to be—in the most optimistic scenario as well, laboratories of democracy, States can do whatever they want. You can't even take your own embryos and move them to another place where IVF is legal. Say you are a couple in Birmingham close to completing the IVF process. Suddenly, you can't continue it in your home State, and you don't have the ability to finish it somewhere else either. Overnight, these patients are left without options, with no notice and no recourse.

The human implications of the Alabama Supreme Court decision are as obvious as they are devastating, but it is also important to be crystal clear about how we got here politically, because this decision is not an anomaly. It is not a fringe view held by a few whacky judges in a single State. It is the direct result of a decades-long, organized, national effort by Republican hardliners to dismantle reproductive freedoms that were, until recently, the law of the land. They have shown zero restraint in going after people's rights, and there is no reason to believe that they are going to stop anytime soon. They will not. They did this, and they want more, and they have a plan. This is on them. This record is theirs to own.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. President, before I close, I want to briefly address the ongoing appropriations process. I am glad that we are avoiding a needless and harmful shutdown as we work to finalize the spending bills, including one from the subcommittee I chair overseeing transportation, housing, and urban development.

Our subcommittee, along with our House counterparts, worked on a bipartisan basis to deliver a bill that both adheres to top-line funding levels and provides resources for vital programs that millions of Americans rely on every day. That includes supporting affordable housing, helping to alleviate homelessness, improving roads and highways in communities big and small so that people can get around, and hiring air traffic controllers and rail safety inspectors to make sure our flights and our trains are safe and on time.

It is not a perfect bill. Everyone did not get what they wanted. But I can tell you that Democrats and Republicans worked in good faith and made the most of the funds we had available. I am glad we are near the finish line on our bill and really hope we can find bipartisan agreement on all of the bills so that we can finally fully fund the government. This funding cannot wait any longer.

I yield the floor.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Connecticut.

**MR. MURPHY.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, Senators Stabenow and Wyden be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each prior to the scheduled vote.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### BORDER SECURITY

**MR. MURPHY.** So here is a snapshot of what happened. Republicans said that fixing the border was their top priority. They appointed a hardline conservative, my friend Senator JAMES LANKFORD, to come up with a bipartisan bill to fix the border. They said that if Lankford can get the deal, they would support it.

We got that deal. If it had passed, it would have been the toughest border

security bill in our lifetime. Arguably, it would have been the toughest border security bill ever—\$20 billion for border security, more detention beds, more patrol officers, more asylum officers, more equipment to intercept fentanyl, a new power for the President to close parts of the border when crossings get too high, an end to the era in which an asylum applicant could spend 10 years in the country before their application was heard.

It was tough. It would have helped to fix the border. It was a compromise. Get this: It was supported by the conservative pro-Trump Border Patrol union and the left-leaning association of immigration attorneys. The Washington Post was for it, and the Wall Street Journal was for it.

It was a true compromise, but within hours of the bill's release, Republicans killed it. When it came to the floor, only four Republicans voted for the bill they asked for.

It has now been 22 days since Republicans killed the toughest border security bill of our lifetime—a bipartisan bill that would have helped us control the border. Why did Republicans do this? Because Republicans do not want to fix the border. The secret is out. For Republicans, the border is a money-making grievance machine, and if we passed our border bill and fixed the problem, Republicans literally wouldn't know what to do with their days. FOX would lose ratings. Republican Senators would lose clicks and donors. Donald Trump would lose an issue to campaign on. What would some of my Republican Senate colleagues do with their weekends if they couldn't go down to the border and dress up as Border Patrol officers and scream about fake outrage? If the border bill passed, if the border was under control, Republicans might have to get hobbies.

If the bipartisan bill to control our border had passed, our border would be more orderly, our immigration system would be vastly improved, and America would be better off and more secure, but, yes, Republicans would lose their moneymaking grievance machine—the broken border.

That is what happened. Republicans killed the toughest bipartisan border bill that they have ever seen because they don't want to fix the border. They want to keep it a mess because they think it helps them politically.

Twenty-two days since Republicans killed the toughest bipartisan border security bill in over a decade.

Do you know who does want to fix the border? President Joe Biden and Democrats in Congress. Joe Biden asked for those additional resources to hire more Border Patrol Agents, to build more detention capacity, and to install more technology at the border to interrupt the fentanyl trade. Joe Biden helped write the bipartisan border bill which gave him those new powers I talked about.

Today, Joe Biden is going to be at the border to talk about his agenda to

put border security first but also to make other badly needed changes to our immigration system, like improving our asylum system and getting a pathway to citizenship for people who have been living in the shadows of our society for far too long.

Donald Trump is going to be at the border today, too, but for a different reason. Donald Trump does not see the border as a problem that needs to be fixed; Donald Trump sees the border as a problem to be exploited. He openly brags about instructing his followers here in the U.S. Senate to kill the bipartisan border bill because its passage would have been good for Joe Biden and the country.

To Joe Biden, the border is a serious issue that he wants to fix, and he has a plan to do it. For Donald Trump and Republicans, the border is just a moneymaking grievance machine that they refuse to solve.

The problem is, nothing can pass in Washington without Republican support. I know there are Republicans who voted for the bipartisan bill—only four—but the rule is that Republicans refuse to support more resources, more patrol officers, more detention beds, and the rule is that they will vote against any bipartisan legislation to make the border more secure.

So 22 days since Republicans killed the toughest border security bill during our time in the Senate, and unfortunately the border is going to remain unresolved so long as Republicans don't want to solve it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first of all, I want to thank Senator MURPHY for his extraordinary leadership. He and Senator LANKFORD and Senator SINEMA came together, leading an effort that was amazing—intense, hard-fought negotiations on something so very, very important. And they got it done. They got it done—a bipartisan border security bill, the toughest in our generation.

I want to thank Senator MURPHY for that and for his continual advocacy and putting a spotlight on the fact that we can still do this. We have this bill. We have this bill in front of us.

The President of the United States, President Biden, has gone to the border to say: Pass the bill, the bipartisan bill.

Donald Trump has gone to the border to say: Yay, more chaos. Keep it coming.

The truth is—and we hear it all the time; I have heard it my whole time in the Senate—Republicans like to portray themselves as being the party of national security. If you want your family to be safe, you need to vote for Republicans.

Well, 22 days ago and counting—we will see how high this number gets—22 days ago, we had a chance to boost our national security by voting for the strongest border security bill in our

lifetime; and 22 days ago, they killed it. That is a fact, and we all know why. Donald Trump told them to do it, and if Donald Trump tells Republicans to jump, the only question they ask is, How high, sir?

Democrats are committed to solving the challenges at the border. There are multiple issues that need to be addressed and that are addressed in this bill, and we know it is critical that we give President Biden the tools he has been asking for, ever since he came into office, to be able to resolve these issues. Again, that is exactly what this legislation would do. It is bipartisan. It meets all of the tests that people have been asking for for months.

And, if it passed, it would significantly improve our Nation's security in a number of important ways. It would reform our broken asylum system so that decisions would be made more quickly on who should be allowed to remain in the country and who should be deported. Those allowed to stay would be provided authorization to work so that they could take care of themselves and their families and fill crucial jobs in our economy while waiting for their cases to be resolved.

The legislation would create a new emergency authority that would allow the President of the United States to pause the processing of asylum claims of migrants who arrive between ports of entry when cases rise beyond a certain number.

The legislation provides important resources to increase our border security: more border security agents and more equipment that our agents have been asking for over and over again and that the President has asked for over and over again. This is one of the reasons that the border security union strongly supports this as a major step forward that will make a major difference in solving the problems at the border.

And, so importantly, this legislation included the FEND OFF Fentanyl Act, which would make our communities safer by helping government Agencies more effectively disrupt the flow of opioids and penalize traffickers. By the way, that is the whole country impacted by that. People in Michigan, families in Michigan, are impacted by that, not just those at the border. Oftentimes, people forget that Michigan is, in fact, a border State. We are a border State.

This bill would provide up to \$75 million in grants that are critically needed for our State and local communities and Tribal law enforcement Agencies to help secure our northern border.

You know, Republicans say they care about our national security, but actions speak otherwise. Growing up, I had heard over and over again from my mom, "Actions speak louder than words," and it has never been more true than on this issue of border security.

Democrats stand ready. We have been ready. We are ready. We are ready tomorrow. We are ready next week to

pass this critical legislation to improve our border security and keep our communities safe. Now, 22 days have gone by—22 days have gone by—since the Republicans said no. Let's come together and do the right thing. It is not about just talk; it is about action. The American people deserve action, and we are ready to act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

#### NOMINATION OF MARJORIE A. ROLLINSON

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, in a few minutes, the Senate will vote on the confirmation of Marjorie A. Rollinson to serve as Chief Counsel of the Internal Revenue Service, and I want to make a few key points about her.

First, she has exactly the right experience to do the job. She has decades of tax and management experience in both the private sector and the public sector. She spent several years at the IRS Office of Chief Counsel. She has also been the Technical Deputy Associate Chief Counsel and the Associate Chief Counsel—both times on international tax issues—so she has real expertise on these issues. That is a big reason she got bipartisan support in the Finance Committee.

And this is a crucial time for the Agency in terms of implementing and enforcing tax laws, and I will just give colleagues a couple of quick examples that I know Members feel strongly about, and I would like to start with energy.

One of the big implementation jobs in the works—something that I have been very involved in and I know Members on both sides have—deals with a key part of the Inflation Reduction Act, specifically the area of incentives for energy production. This was the centerpiece of the Finance Committee's Clean Energy for America Act, a bill that I first introduced in 2015.

What motivated that legislation—and I see a number of my Finance Committee colleagues here—is we said that, for the future, to tackle climate in the right way, we had to set aside the old system of picking winners and losers and just propping up the old, carbon-intensive technologies and, in effect, go to a new system—a brandnew system—of technological neutrality—in effect, giving all the energy sources in America the opportunity to compete and compete in a way where there are no mandates—in effect, private sector style competition—with one goal: reducing carbon emissions.

The Senate Finance Committee—and there are several members on the floor right now—understands this. Our committee had never done anything like this in 100 years—to create this kind of market incentive, a market incentive to actually reduce carbon emissions.

Now, the administration has been working through, right now, a number of challenging rules. Technology neutrality is the next big one for them. It is essential to get this guidance out there so that taxpayers and clean en-

ergy producers can take full advantage of the law and, particularly, be part of this new system, this new approach, that we call technological neutrality. It will give every Member of this body—and I see additional members of the Finance Committee coming in—an opportunity to be part of this very new world in energy, and Ms. Rollinson will play a chief role as IRS Chief Counsel once she is confirmed.

If she is confirmed, she is going to play another important role in terms of tax enforcement. Every member of the Finance Committee feels strongly about making sure audits are dealt with in a responsible way. We want to do it by the book so it is not just low-income families who get audited. Everybody who is skirting the law should be subject to equal treatment under the law, and we ought to crack down on the sophisticated, wealthy tax cheats who pay for the best tax lawyers and accountants. It is a matter of basic fairness with respect to audits, and Ms. Rollinson will handle that in the right fashion.

I will close by saying I think Ms. Rollinson is an excellent pick for the job. This is a crucial time for this position. They are going to be implementing a very new energy world, a world based on technological neutrality and marketplace competition, and they are going to have the responsibility of ensuring the enforcement of tax law in a fair way, particularly as it relates to audits. That is why she got bipartisan support in the Finance Committee. It is why she deserves bipartisan support today.

I urge my colleagues now to approve the Rollinson nomination.

I yield the floor.

#### VOTE ON ROLLINSON NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Rollinson nomination?

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 41, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 60 Ex.]

#### YEAS—56

Baldwin	Cassidy	Hickenlooper
Bennet	Collins	Hirono
Blumenthal	Coons	Kaine
Booker	Cortez Masto	Kelly
Brown	Duckworth	King
Butler	Durbin	Klobuchar
Cantwell	Fetterman	Luján
Cardin	Gillibrand	Manchin
Carper	Hassan	Markey
Casey	Heinrich	Menendez

Merkley  
Murkowski  
Murphy  
Murray  
Ossoff  
Padilla  
Peters  
Reed  
Romney

Rosen  
Rounds  
Schatz  
Schumer  
Shaheen  
Sinema  
Smith  
Stabenow  
Tester

Tillis  
Van Hollen  
Warner  
Warnock  
Warren  
Welch  
Whitehouse  
Wyden

#### NAYS—41

Blackburn  
Boozman  
Braun  
Britt  
Budd  
Capito  
Cornyn  
Cotton  
Cramer  
Crapo  
Cruz  
Daines  
Ernst  
Fischer

Graham  
Grassley  
Hagerty  
Hawley  
Hoeben  
Hyde-Smith  
Johnson  
Kennedy  
Lankford  
Lee  
Lummis  
Marshall  
McConnell  
Mullin

Paul  
Ricketts  
Risch  
Rubio  
Schmitt  
Scott (FL)  
Scott (SC)  
Sullivan  
Thune  
Tuberville  
Vance  
Wicker  
Young

#### NOT VOTING—3

Barrasso Moran Sanders

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION RELATING TO "WAIVER OF BUY AMERICA REQUIREMENTS FOR ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGERS"—VETO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session and proceed to the consideration of the veto message with respect to S.J. Res. 38, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message, a joint resolution (S.J. Res. 38) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Highway Administration relating to "Waiver of Buy America Requirements for Electric Vehicle Chargers".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 2 minutes prior to the vote.

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

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise today in strong opposition to override President Biden's veto on S.J. Res. 38, a Congressional Review Act resolution to disapprove of the Biden administration's phase-in of "Buy American" requirements for electric vehicle charging infrastructure.

We continue to see almost daily reminders that our planet is on fire. Scientists tell us we are running out of time to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and avoid the worst of the climate crisis. The world is looking to the