

that, of course, he wouldn't do this, he simply went back on his word. This is blatant corruption and an abuse of the office and a blatant example of President Biden continuing to mislead and lie to the American people.

Justice means nothing if it is not applied evenhandedly. The notion that someone could be above the law simply because his father happens to be President is an affront to law-abiding citizens. It is a terrible example because without any accountability for people breaking the law—getting a pass, in other words—there is no deterrent effect or no accountability that teaches our young people and others that, yes, you need to follow the law and, yes, there are consequences if you don't.

It is, frankly, absurd and contrary to all available facts for President Biden to claim that his son was "selectively and unfairly prosecuted," especially after a sweetheart deal that was almost struck in his favor. But for the timely and pointed questions of the judge who was asked to pass on a plea deal that ultimately blew up, they would have gotten away with it. And there wouldn't have been any pardon because there wouldn't have been any conviction.

No, Hunter Biden was rightfully prosecuted for committing crimes and breaking the law. It is unfair and selective for this President to single out his son for a pardon, and it sets a horrible example for future administrations. So any future administration could simply point back to this and say: Well, apparently, it is OK for the President to do whatever the President wants to do without regard to the law or the message it sends to the Nation or nations around the world.

We need to restore respect for the rule of law within the Department of Justice and the FBI and confirm more qualified judges to our courts. But I must say that I am disappointed and dismayed that Senator SCHUMER continues to lecture Republicans about the importance of bipartisanship, which he does on a regular basis, while he, himself, is engaged in a partisan show of procrastination.

The people of Texas and of America, for that matter, deserve better.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill 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 Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.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 (Ms. BUTLER). 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. 842.

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 bill clerk read the nomination of Anthony J. Brindisi, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

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 bill 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. 842, Anthony J. Brindisi, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Ben Ray Lujan, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Peter Welch, Jeff Merkley, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine.

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. 843.

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 bill clerk read the nomination of Elizabeth C. Coombe, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

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 bill 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. 843, Elizabeth C. Coombe, of New York, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of New York.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Ben Ray Lujan, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Peter Welch, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine.

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. 844.

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 bill clerk read the nomination of Sarah Morgan Davenport, of New Mexico, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

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 bill 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. 844, Sarah Morgan Davenport, of New Mexico, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Mexico.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Ben Ray Lujan, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Peter Welch, Jeff Merkley, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine.

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. 845.

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 bill clerk read the nomination of Tiffany Rene Johnson, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

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 bill 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. 845, Tiffany Rene Johnson, of Georgia, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Ben Ray Lujan, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Peter Welch, Jeff Merkley, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine.

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. 846.

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 bill clerk read the nomination of Keli Marie Neary, 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 bill 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. 846, Keli Marie Neary, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Ben Ray Lujan, Patty Murray, Alex Padilla, Peter Welch, Jeff Merkley, Richard Blumenthal, Amy Klobuchar, Christopher A. Coons, Debbie Stabenow, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Elizabeth Warren, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

SOCIAL SECURITY FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, before the Thanksgiving holiday, my colleagues—we—voted late into the night. And I have no problem with that if we are voting on meaningful legislation. But that is not what we have been doing. We are voting on last-minute, lameduck Biden-Harris judicial nominees.

But we have serious legislation for millions of Americans that the House overwhelmingly passed in mid-November, sent to the Senate, and it is waiting for a vote.

I am speaking of the Social Security Fairness Act, which repeals the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset—WEP and GPO. This is something which affects my State of Louisiana and affects the President of the Senate's State of California. We are particularly affected, but so are others—Texas and Illinois, Massachusetts, Maine, New York, New Jersey—I could go down the list—both blue States and red States.

It recognizes, first, that Social Security is a sacred trust between generations; a promise to workers that when they retire, they will not live in poverty. But right now, Social Security's future is in danger. According to the people who run this program, if Social Security does nothing, the Social Security trust fund would be busted in 9 years—flat bankrupt.

And then there will be an automatic 20- to 24-percent cut in benefits for everyone receiving Social Security and for those who will receive it in the future. Someone once said: Well, won't I be grandfathered in?

And she was a female, so I said: I think you mean "grandmothered" in, but it doesn't matter. No, if you are already on Social Security, you get a 24-percent cut.

So I will state here, we must save, strengthen, and secure Social Security. And I am pleased to say there is a plan to do so.

But one thing, what we cannot do as we work to save Social Security is perpetuate an unfairness, an unjustness—an unjustness that began decades ago. This unfairness targets people who have dedicated their lives to serving communities on the State and local level, such as first responders and teachers.

So, today, we can take a step toward that fairness. We can repeal two unfair Social Security provisions with the Social Security Fairness Act if the majority leader schedules a vote. WEP and GPO penalize families—and I have already mentioned particularly in States like Louisiana, California, Maine, Texas—who have worked a public service job for part of their career with a separate pension from Social Security.

We are talking about first responders, the police officers, the firefighters but also the teachers and other public employees who are being punished for serving their communities.

How did we get here? WEP and GPO were introduced decades ago to address perceived inequalities in the Social Security system, but they have had the opposite effect of creating real, tangible inequalities.

When my firefighters, police officers, and teachers in Louisiana have a second job or second career or get married, they are being unfairly punished, receiving far less from Social Security than if they had never worked in public service at all, and that is not right.

WEP reduces the earned Social Security benefits of individuals who also receive a pension from a non-Social Security government job. This has resulted in thousands who have paid into the system during their careers receiving a significantly reduced Social Security benefit when they retire.

GPO reduces earned Social Security spousal or survivor benefits for individuals who also receive a government pension.

This provision can reduce or even eliminate the Social Security benefits that a spouse or widow might have expected and relied upon. Public servant spouses would receive more than if they had never worked at all. Let me repeat that. If you have a teacher married to someone who has a great job, he dies, she doesn't receive but a fraction of the Social Security benefit that she would have received from her husband's Social Security benefit.

As a guy who used to work in a hospital for the uninsured run by the State, I worked a lot with nurses, I consistently hear from the people I worked with and from constituents that they feel like they are being punished for serving community, and that is in Louisiana, but it is for public servants across the country who feel the exact same way.

WEP and GPO affect Americans in every single State, and there is no excuse to treat our public servants this way. It should never have become law, but we have an opportunity to fix it. In mid-November, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Social Security Fairness Act. As a longtime original cosponsor of the Senate version, I have been waiting to proudly vote yes and finally repeal WEP and GPO.

Instead, day after day, Senate Democrats have focused their attention on ramming through partisan nominees rather than passing serious legislation.