

gives victims of these tech platforms the same right that victims of some car company or drug manufacturer or other product maker would have: the right to get into court; the basic American right to be heard; the right to hold accountable the most powerful corporations in the history of this Nation. That is what this bill does. I am proud to cosponsor it. I am proud that it received unanimous support in the committee.

Mr. President, I will just say this: We have had hearings and hearings and hearings. We have had talks until there is no more talk to be done. It is time for Congress to act.

Mr. Zuckerberg's apology is nice, but that is not going to help the victims of child sex abuse. What will help the victims of child sex abuse is the right to hold these companies accountable.

It is time for Congress to act because, let's be honest, Congress helped create the problem. Do you want to know why there is sex abuse content overwhelming the internet? Because Congress enabled it. Congress did. Congress did. And the refusal now to allow victims to have their basic rights in court is allowing that child sex exploitation to continue and continue and continue. It is time to break the cycle.

After Zuckerberg and the others came before the committee, after they apologized, I said now it is time for Congress to act. Let's take the work we have done, and let's put it on the floor. Let's act. Let's see where we are. Let's do something for victims. Let's right the wrongs that this body has helped create, and let's give victims the right to be heard.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 69, S. 1199; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WYDEN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I very much share the stated goals of the STOP CSAM Act. Child sexual abuse material is a toxic plague on the internet. There are real victims who need real support and criminals who must be hunted down and locked up.

I take a back seat to no one when it comes to helping kids and punishing predators. However, this bill would weaken the single strongest technology that now protects children and families—that's strong encryption. It will make it easier to punish sites that use encryption to secure private conversations and personal devices. While STOP CSAM's sponsors have argued that the bill does not target encryption, the bill explicitly allows courts to punish com-

panies that offer strong encryption. It also would encourage scanning of content on user's phones or computers before information is sent over the internet, which has the same consequences as breaking encryption.

Weakening encryption is probably the single biggest gift that you can give to the predators and the monsters who want to stalk and spy on kids. Sexual predators will have a far easier time stealing and extorting photographs of children, tracking their phones, and spying on their private messages once encryption is breached.

Doing so threatens the privacy and security of every single law-abiding American.

I also think it is surprising that the Senator is asking to pass this bill at the very same time its sponsor is reportedly circulating an updated version of the bill with a number of changes. Although that new version of the legislation has not been made public, it certainly would be a mistake to pass legislation that apparently is still in the process of being revised.

Mr. President, what this is all about is talking about doing something effective or actually taking effective action. I have proposed doing just that. We ought to focus on giving law enforcement officials the tools they need to find and prosecute criminals responsible for exploiting kids and spreading these vile materials online. That way, we can help keep kids from becoming victims in the first place.

Let me also say that we can do this if Members support my bipartisan Invest in Child Safety Act. The bill directs \$5 billion in mandatory funding to do three things which would ensure that we have an effective response for families and parents: one, give law enforcement agencies the tools and personnel they need to catch the predators who are creating and spreading CSAM; two, fund community-based programs to prevent at-risk kids from becoming victims in the first place; three, invest in programs to support survivors of abuse.

Any legislation that doesn't include these pieces is missing the point; therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, there you have it. There are the Big Tech talking points. The problem is that they are entirely false. I have the bill text in front of me—the bill text that, again, passed unanimously out of the Senate Judiciary Committee—that explicitly exempts encryption technology: page 184, lines 15 and following; page 185, lines 1 through 18. You can read it for yourself—explicitly exempts. That is not true at all. It is flatly false.

I have been on this floor over and over and over again on this issue, and every time, we are told: Not today. Not this. A little more of that. Maybe if it were more bipartisan.

This has unanimous support from the Judiciary Committee. Unanimous. Every Republican. Every Democrat.

And we all know the truth here: that until victims can get into court and have the rights and dignity of every other American challenging any other company, this will not change.

Congress created this problem. Congress created it by giving the most powerful companies in the world a sweetheart deal that they still have to this day.

It is an easy choice: Are you with the corporations or are you with the American people? Are you with the big companies or are you with the child victims? That is the choice.

I would just say to those who continue to support 230 with no exceptions, no exemptions, no reform, no recognition of the incredible danger it has unleashed for children, that they are on an island.

This state of affairs cannot continue. It cannot continue to be that if Big Tech sells products that kill kids, they cannot be held responsible.

It cannot continue to be that only these companies, the most powerful companies in the world, get a pass that nobody else gets, because nobody should get it.

I am committed to coming to this floor and forcing votes as long as it takes—as long as it takes—until we get justice for victims, until they are heard, and until these companies are finally held accountable.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent to briefly respond to what my colleague has just repeated.

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

Mr. WYDEN. And then I would ask unanimous consent for 5 minutes to speak in favor of a very talented jurist in Oregon, who will be voted on shortly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, first, with respect to my response to our colleague from Missouri, let me be clear on a point that technologists are clear on. This bill would weaken the strongest technology that protects children and families online: strong encryption. And this bill explicitly allows courts to punish companies that offer strong encryption. That is right at the center of my objection.

NOMINATION OF AMY M. BAGGIO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Amy M. Baggio to the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon.

Judge Baggio received her B.A., cum laude, from Wake Forest University and her J.D. from Lewis & Clark Law School. After law school, she became a public defender in Portland, where she represented clients in State court.

From 2002 to 2012, she served in the Office of the Federal Public Defender for the District of Oregon in Portland. She handled both trials and appeals in that role, representing her clients in Federal district court and before the Ninth Circuit. In 2012, Judge Baggio opened a solo practice in Portland, where she worked until 2019. During her time as a litigator, she tried 12 cases to verdict, including 8 jury trials.

In 2019, Judge Baggio was appointed to the Oregon State Circuit Court in Multnomah County by then-Governor Kate Brown. Judge Baggio was subsequently elected to the position in 2020. Over the past 5 years, she has handled civil, criminal, and family law matters, and she has presided over more than 40 trials.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Judge Baggio “well qualified” to serve on the District of Oregon. She has deep ties to Oregon and enjoys the strong support of both of her home State Senators, Mr. WYDEN and Mr. MERKLEY. Her extensive litigation background and experience as a State court judge will serve her well on the Federal bench.

When Senator WYDEN introduced Judge Baggio at her confirmation hearing, he noted that she has never had a party before her file a request for a different judge, a testament to her fairness. I strongly support this nominee, and I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am going to move now to my brief remarks with respect to our judge from Oregon. I come to the floor today to reiterate my strong support for Judge Amy Baggio's nomination to serve on the U.S. District Court for the District of Oregon.

Judge Baggio has a proven track record as both a jurist and a litigator. She spent a decade as a public defender; and in her career on the bench, she has presided over hundreds of civil and criminal matters and handled 42 trials, half of which were jury trials.

And I note, because Members have been asking with respect to her values in terms of prosecuting and dealing with cases and her attitude towards criminals, in one case the judge sentenced a man to many more years for first-degree sexual abuse than anyone had thought was even being discussed, certainly longer than was sought by defense counsel. So it is a testament to Judge Baggio's fairness and professionalism that during her career as a judge, she has never once had a party file a request for a different judge.

In addition to being fair, she has consistently demonstrated an ability to make thoughtful decisions that protect communities and their values.

I urge my colleagues—and I gather that we will be going to the vote now—to support a very dedicated public servant—and I emphasize that—a public servant who has got a real track record as a public defender and in her career on the bench.

I urge my colleagues to support Judge Amy Baggio.

VOTE ON BAGGIO NOMINATION

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

Mr. WYDEN. 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 senior assistant executive clerk called the roll.

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

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 38 Ex.]

YEAS—54

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Sanders
Brown	Kaine	Schatz
Butler	Kelly	Schumer
Cantwell	King	Shaheen
Cardin	Klobuchar	Sinema
Carper	Lujan	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warnock
Durbin	Murphy	Warren
Fetterman	Murray	Welch
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Graham	Padilla	Wyden

NAYS—44

Blackburn	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hagerty	Romney
Braun	Hawley	Rounds
Britt	Hoeven	Rubio
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Capito	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Cruz	Moran	Vance
Daines	Mullin	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young
Fischer	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—2

Barrasso

Lummis

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDING

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, in December, President Zelenskyy came here to Congress. He came to us because he is fighting for his country's future and for his citizens' lives. This supplemental spending bill, the portion for Ukraine, will fulfill our commitments to our allies, defend democracy, and save innocent lives.

Let's be absolutely clear about that. Ukrainian civilians will live or die based on what we decide to do here in the Senate, in this Chamber. Are we

going to ignore the requests, the pleas, the cries for help from our fellow champions of democracy in Ukraine?

President Zelenskyy has told us that Ukrainians will continue to fight with or without us. By that, he did not mean that they don't need us. No, they need us more than ever. With our help, they have pushed back against the Russian invaders. Without our help, they will run out of ammunition to hold back the Russians.

Our White House has conveyed this message:

We are out of money—and nearly out of time.

That is our government speaking. Our White House has warned us that “while our allies around the world have stepped up to do more, U.S. support is critical and cannot be replicated by others.”

Putin himself told us the deadly stakes. He said:

[Ukraine] will only have a week to live when the ammunition runs out.

And Ukrainians are running out of ammunition.

Now, the United States could choose to stop funding, but the Ukrainians can't choose to stop fighting—nor would any of us if war came to our hometowns. If you had to defend your home, if you had to defend your family knowing that, if you stopped fighting, that death would fall from the sky as bombs and rockets obliterated your communities; that as Russian soldiers marched down your quiet street, your neighbors would be tortured, raped, your children stolen, your family executed, would you stop fighting even if you ran out of ammunition?

And those actions are what Russia has already done in the cities and towns they ran over in Ukraine. We know it will continue to happen if they run over other cities.

So the Ukrainian people really are fighting for their lives, and we are here debating whether we are going to abandon them. This is a conversation I can't believe we are having. I can't believe, with all of the foreign engagements we have been involved in, that when a fellow Republic which has repeatedly pushed hard to be out from under Russia's thumb, which had the Orange Revolution, which threw a President out of their country who wanted to betray them, who are now fighting in the streets against this Russian invasion—I can't believe we are having this conversation here in the Senate with so many colleagues ready to abandon Ukraine.

But this is certainly a critical debate. Ukraine is not some regional conflict on a faraway map. Putin himself put it this way in October. He said:

This is not a territorial conflict or even the establishment of a regional geopolitical balance.

He continued, and he said:

The question is much broader and more fundamental: We are talking about the principles on which the new world order will be based.