

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The majority leader is recognized.

FILIBUSTER

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, last week the Washington Examiner published an article highlighting Democrats' third—third—filibuster of this new Congress. That is right. You heard it—third.

The party that mere months ago literally was gleefully making plans to destroy the filibuster is now using the filibuster left and right. But as we know, for Democrats, it is, "One rule for me, another for thee." As the Washington Examiner piece made clear, some Democrats are even embracing their hypocrisy.

"You use the rules that exist," one Democrat said. "I might advocate for a higher speed limit, but I still observe the speed limit until it is changed."

Well, OK, but are Democrats still crusading to abolish the filibuster while Republicans are in charge? The answer is, of course, not because abolishing the filibuster isn't about principle for Democrats; it is about political advantage. So Democrats will unashamedly support different rules depending on who is in charge.

Now, I could spend my whole time today talking about Democrats' rank hypocrisy when it comes to the filibuster, but I would also like to talk about the content of the bills that they filibustered and what that says about the Democratic Party.

In the few short weeks of this new Congress, Democrats filibustered three bills: the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act; the Illegitimate Court Counteraction Act, otherwise known as the ICC sanctions bill; and the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act was a simple bill. It simply stated that a baby born alive after an attempted abortion must be given the same protection and medical care that any other newborn baby would be given. That is it. You would assume such a bill would be entirely uncontroversial.

Democrats may not believe in protecting unborn human beings, but surely—surely—they still believe in protecting born human beings. But as it turns out, protecting born human beings, at least when they are born alive after an abortion, is not on the Democrats' priority list.

In fact, every Democrat in the Senate—every Democrat, without exception—voted against this bill. And I am afraid the sad truth is, the Democrats are so deeply concerned with preserving the supposed right to kill unborn babies that they couldn't bring themselves to protect born babies for fear that it would eventually lead to

recognizing the humanity of the unborn.

All I can say is that a party that was so committed to killing unborn babies that it can't vote to protect born babies is nothing short of morally bankrupt. So that was the first bill the Democrats filibustered.

The next was the ICC sanctions bill, and that was another straightforward bill. It would have sanctioned foreign individuals who are involved in International Criminal Court efforts to investigate, arrest, or prosecute U.S. citizens or citizens of U.S. allies that are not party to the ICC or the International Criminal Court.

The bill was a response to the ICC's decision to pursue warrants for Israeli officials, and it was also designed to protect Americans and American soldiers, in particular, who had been targeted by the ICC in the past. But once again, Senate Democrats—with one lone exception—found themselves incapable of taking a stand.

Now, I am not sure if it was anti-Israel animus or if they were afraid of antagonizing the anti-Israel wing of their party or if they are simply too beholden to Big Tech, which lodged some tenuous concerns about this legislation, but for whatever reason, Democrats filibustered the bill.

In doing so, they not only failed to rebuke the ICC for its illegitimate targeting of Israeli leaders, but they failed to protect U.S. citizens.

The third bill the Democrats filibustered—and filibustered just this past week, I might add—was the Protection of Women and Girls in Sports Act. This legislation was designed to restore the original intent of title IX, which is giving women equal opportunities in education by ensuring that women and girls, and women and girls only, are permitted to play in women's sports at federally funded educational institutions.

The bill, of course, is a response to the growing problem of women's sports being invaded by biological males.

I want to quote for you something from August 2024. This is a United Nations report from just last August, a report from the United Nations on violence against women and girls.

The replacement of the female sports category with a mixed-sex category has resulted in an increasing number of female athletes losing opportunities, including medals, when competing against males. According to information received by March 30, 2024, over 600 female athletes in more than 400 competitions have lost more than 890 medals in 29 different sports.

"[O]ver 600 female athletes in more than 400 competitions have lost more than 890 medals in 29 different sports."

That is a quote out of a United Nations report on violence against women and girls in August of last year.

It is not even remotely fair. Girls should not be having to compete in races that are stacked against them. Women deserve their own athletic opportunities—opportunities that are not taken away from them by biological

males who have their own spaces in which to compete. But try explaining that to Democrats. Democrats like to portray themselves as leading the charge on women's issues, but not one Democrat—not one—could bring himself or herself to vote in support of women and girls. Biological males, not women, got Democrats' support last Monday.

Well, apparently, Democrats' commitment to equal opportunity for women only runs so deep and quickly falls by the wayside when the left demands adherence to some new ideology.

The outcome of the 2024 Presidential election was partially a rebuke of far-left dogmas and ideologies. Apparently, Democrats have learned nothing from that electoral rebuke.

Today, the supposed party of the little guy, the underdog, the disadvantaged, has become a party willing to sacrifice born human beings to abortion extremism and equality for women and girls on the altar of transgender ideology. I have to say it is no wonder the American people rejected them in November of 2024.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BRITT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, last week, I came to the floor to debunk some of our Democratic colleagues' myths, disinformation, mistaken information about the work of Elon Musk and the Department of Government Efficiency.

Ronald Reagan liked to say that facts are stubborn things. It is important to talk about the facts because, hopefully, even in Washington, DC, we can agree on the basic facts. We may have some different interpretations, different policy preferences; but facts are facts.

Today, I want to do the same thing about the Republican efforts to extend the upcoming expiration of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, or what is sometimes called the Trump tax cuts, through the budget reconciliation process.

Now, I don't blame the American people or anybody else, when listening to all the process we talk about, and just their eyes glazing over and just tuning us out. But the truth is, if we don't extend the expiring provisions of this tax bill that we passed back in 2017, during President Trump's first term, a vast majority of the American people will experience a tax increase. And that, of course, is on top of a 40-year high inflation during the Biden administration.

I guess nobody likes to talk about taxes because, on one hand, people say: Well, you know, people need to keep more of their hard-earned money. On the left, what they like to say is, you are giving billionaires a tax cut and leaving average wage earners and working families high and dry.

The truth is, on the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act bill that we passed in 2017, the individual rates that will expire at the end of this year, if we don't continue the current policy using the budget reconciliation process, 62 percent of American taxpayers will experience a tax increase. That is not just millionaires and billionaires. That is everybody across the income spectrum.

On the left, our Democratic colleagues, some of them have been claiming that extending these tax cut provisions, as I said, will benefit the very rich at the expense of the rest of us. Our colleague from Massachusetts, Senator MARKEY, said:

Instead of fighting for working people, Trump is selling them out to give billionaires tax breaks.

There they go again.

And to no one's surprise, our colleague from Vermont, Senator SANDERS, accused President Trump and Elon Musk of being "oligarchs"—"oligarchs." He went on to say: "The oligarchs"—that is the very rich people who have accumulated massive wealth, primarily in Russia and in Europe.

He said:

The oligarchs, with their tremendous resources, are waging a war on the working class of this country . . . the needs, the concerns, the ideas, the dreams of ordinary people are simply an impediment to what they, the oligarchs, are entitled to.

This accusation, if true, would be serious. But it is not true.

Representative NEAL from Massachusetts, on the other side of the Capitol, went so far as to describe the Trump tax cuts as a "reverse Robin Hood scam."

And the list goes on and on and on. It is almost as if there is a concerted or orchestrated effort to use disinformation and propaganda to try to prejudice the American people against what it is we need to do in order to avoid this huge tax increase on the vast majority of Americans.

But let's set aside for a moment the fact that President Trump won this last election—promising to do what? Well, to extend the tax cuts that passed in 2017.

We know, before COVID hit, our economy was hitting on all cylinders. All cohorts of the population—African Americans, Hispanics, everyday working Americans—were experiencing record-high levels of employment, and the economy was the best it has been in my lifetime.

We know what happened these last 4 years. We know that Biden economics, or Bidenomics, as they like to call it—I don't know why in the world President Biden embraced the name "Bidenomics," because it was associ-

ated with just so much misery and pain and a reduced standard of living by average working-class families across the country.

But we know that inflation—again, the 40-year high inflation that we have experienced in the last few years—has a disproportionate effect on low-income families. Now, that is no surprise because for your purchasing power, if you are on a fixed income or if you are just getting by paycheck to paycheck, the more inflation goes up, the more everything you buy costs.

And households across the spectrum are affected. We have seen that with our own eyes. And, in fact, I believe that was one of the reasons President Trump was elected in 2024.

When you spend a higher percentage of your paycheck on necessities, you have less of a cushion as prices increase. It is just common sense.

To add insult to injury, what did our Democratic colleagues do, when they were in the majority, in response to this massive inflation, which was the direct result of their policies? Well, they poured gasoline on the fire of inflation by using reconciliation to pass something called the Inflation Reduction Act.

Hold that thought for a minute because the Inflation Reduction Act, even at the time it passed, was evaluated and calculated not to reduce inflation.

Again, this is deception, really, at the outset, claiming that this Inflation Reduction Act maybe would have a negative impact on inflation. But President Biden himself later admitted it "has less to do with reducing inflation"—that is what President Biden said—and was full of even more spending.

Milton Friedman, the Nobel Prize-winning economist, would say the main cause of inflation is too much spending. You flood the economy with more dollars, and then, naturally, the price of everything tends to go up.

You don't need a Ph.D. economist like Dr. Larry Summers, who was probably the most prominent Democratic economist in our country, to tell anyone, especially not the President of the United States, that the answer to runaway inflation is not more government spending. But that is exactly what the Inflation Reduction Act did.

But that is not all. Not only did the Inflation Reduction Act do nothing for inflation, it actually did what Democrats have wrongly accused Republicans of doing. It benefited high earners at the expense of ordinary Americans.

You don't have to take my word for it. Just look at the data. Look at the facts.

By some estimates, the Inflation Reduction Act's electric vehicle and charging infrastructure provisions are projected to cost \$180 billion over the next decade. The average cost of an electric vehicle was nearly \$7,000 more than an internal combustion engine in

2023. So most working-class families, rather than pay \$7,000 more for an electric vehicle—assuming they wanted an electric vehicle—have opted for the lower price internal combustion engine. So the ones who were taking advantage of the subsidy of \$7,500, if you bought an EV, were wealthy people, by definition. So our Democratic colleagues, contrary to their propaganda and misinformation, have been the ones who have been providing your hard-earned dollars to subsidize wealthy people to buy luxury items like an electric vehicle.

Households that earn more than \$200,000 reportedly represent 42.6 percent of electric vehicle sales. So people who make more than \$200,000 a year represent 42.6 percent of electric vehicle sales, while those earning between \$100,000 and \$200,000 represented 32.9 percent. So if anything deserves to be called "reverse Robin Hood," it would be the Democrats' Inflation Reduction Act.

Given the inflationary and regressive policies that the Democrats promoted during the last 4 years, it is ironic—and maybe you would say even laughable—to hear them accuse Republicans of being disconnected from everyday Americans. The reason why Republicans won the majority in both Houses and President Trump was reelected is because he connected with the concerns of everyday Americans, and particularly their concerns about overspending and inflation, not to mention the border.

So our Democratic colleagues really don't have a leg to stand on when it comes to the facts.

Failing to extend the Trump tax cuts would mean—this is according to the Wall Street Journal—that 62 percent of Americans would see a tax increase in 2026. On the other hand, extending the tax cuts would result in a 3.4 percent increase in after-tax incomes in 2026, by some estimates.

In the 2 years after President Trump signed his tax cuts into law, the median household income grew by \$5,000. That is more money to spend on the necessities of life. And in the same period, real wages grew by nearly 5 percent.

Again, those are the facts. You would think that the facts would be something we could agree on, and then we can talk about policies. But, unfortunately, our Democratic colleagues seem to gloss right over those facts, while making wild accusations, which, frankly, are way off the mark.

Contrast this with President Biden's policies, slapping working families with an effective pay cut. With higher prices for food, gasoline, and other necessities, inflation-adjusted disposable income per capita during the Biden Presidency went down 7.7 percent. No wonder people felt squeezed, particularly if you earn a relatively modest income or you were a senior on a fixed income. Your purchasing power went down 7.7 percent.

The stark reality and the fact is, if Congress fails to extend the Trump tax cuts that expire at the end of this year, the average family of four making \$75,000 a year will face a \$1,500 tax increase next year. Working families will see the child tax credit cut in half.

So the facts are pretty obvious, as plain as the nose on your face: Extending the Trump tax cuts will actually benefit working families, and doing nothing, which is what our Democratic colleagues seem to want, will make them worse off.

At the end of the day, we work for the people we represent in our respective States. And, certainly, the voters in Alabama and Texas and in the majority of the country have made their preference clear. President Trump campaigned on extending these tax cuts. Republicans in the House and the Senate did the same. And we were rewarded with majorities in both Houses and with President Trump being re-elected to the White House.

Working families in Texas and across the country voted for the President and the political party they thought would benefit them the most, especially their pocketbooks and their standard of living, and they voted resoundingly for President Trump and congressional Republicans. So it is simply not true to say that Republicans are somehow out of touch with the voters that gave us the majority in both Houses and President Trump re-elected to the White House.

I know our Democratic colleagues are angry. They don't like being in the minority. It is not a lot of fun. But there is a reason. And they still haven't learned that the policies they promoted and that they sold to the American people were rejected on November 5. So sometimes, as Ronald Reagan liked to say—again—facts are stubborn things. So I would invite our colleagues across the aisle to look at the facts and maybe look in the mirror and say: What we were doing didn't work out so well, so maybe we ought to work with Republicans to change our policies.

The American people simply cannot afford a tax increase on top of 40-year-high inflation. I look forward to working with my Republican colleagues in the House and the Senate to deliver by extending the Trump tax cuts and to make life better for working families in Texas and across the country. And I would invite our Democratic colleagues to join us, if they will. I am not sure they are there yet. They are still pretty angry. They are still pretty upset. They are still—what do they call it? They call it the resistance. They are the party of the resistance. Well, right now, they are resisting what is best for the American people, and that is a bad place to be.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ABORTION PROVIDER APPRECIATION DAY

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, since 1996, we have recognized March 10 as Abortion Provider Appreciation Day.

I rise today, therefore, in gratitude for the doctors and healthcare professionals who bravely continue to provide necessary care despite attacks on reproductive rights and abortion providers, to express gratitude for the hard work and commitment of abortion providers and their staff across the country, and in remembrance of those providers tragically lost to extreme anti-abortion violence—providers like Dr. David Gunn.

On this day 32 years ago, Dr. Gunn, a dedicated medical professional, was murdered while walking into the clinic where he worked. Dr. Gunn was targeted by an anti-abortion extremist for simply doing his job—providing crucial, lifesaving care to his patients.

Tragically, this kind of violence against abortion providers, patients, and clinics has only increased over the years since his murder and even before. Since the 1970s, there have been at least 11 murders, 42 bombings, 531 assaults, and thousands of other criminal incidents against innocent people, doctors, patients, and staff simply providing or receiving necessary reproductive care.

Congress enacted the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act in 1994—more than 30 years ago—to prevent this kind of violence at our reproductive healthcare centers and clinics, and the Justice Department prosecuted people who violated this law.

Rather than supporting this law, within days of being sworn in office as President, President Trump pardoned 23 anti-abortion extremists incarcerated for violating the law. Moreover, his Department of Justice announced they would stop prosecuting most cases under this law.

As the Trump administration is taking steps to dismantle safe, licensed clinics that provide quality, lifesaving reproductive care, Republicans are also working to fund unregulated anti-abortion centers or crisis pregnancy centers nationwide.

Earlier this year, Missouri Republicans introduced a bill that would let their taxpayers take 100 percent deduction on State income taxes for donations to crisis pregnancy centers. Essentially, in Missouri, they want to redirect funding from critical State services to these so-called crisis pregnancy centers that spread dangerous misinformation while doing very little to actually help women seeking fact-based medical counseling.

Republicans aren't trying to help women; they are attacking fundamental healthcare and emboldening violent anti-abortion extremists by not prosecuting violations short of murder,

effectively eliminating any serious consequences for those who attack, threaten, or intimidate innocent people in reproductive healthcare spaces—patients and providers alike.

Democrats, on the other hand, remain committed to protecting abortion access and protecting the professionals who provide it where legal.

Today, on Abortion Provider Appreciation Day, we remember Dr. David Gunn and those killed and targeted by senseless acts of anti-abortion violence, and we honor the bravery of abortion providers across our country. These providers, their staff, and counselors continue to provide essential care despite the threats they face.

While Republicans work to ban abortion nationwide, we Democrats reaffirm our commitment to protecting and strengthening reproductive rights for all.

To abortion providers in Hawaii and across the country, mahalo for your critical, courageous work.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### VOTE ON CHAVEZ-DEREMER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Chavez-DeRemer nomination?

Mr. BOOZMAN. 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 32, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 111 Ex.]

#### YEAS—67

Banks	Hassan	Peters
Barrasso	Hawley	Ricketts
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Risch
Blackburn	Hoeben	Rosen
Boozman	Husted	Rounds
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Schiff
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Justice	Scott (FL)
Collins	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Kelly	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	Kennedy	Sheehy
Cotton	Klobuchar	Slotkin
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Crapo	Lee	Thune
Cruz	Lummis	Tillis
Curtis	Marshall	Tuberville
Daines	McCormick	Warner
Ernst	Moody	Warnock
Fischer	Moran	Whitehouse
Gallego	Moreno	Wicker
Graham	Mullin	Young
Grassley	Murkowski	
Hagerty	Ossoff	