

So I hope you will cherish it, to all the Denison student athletes. It is a special, special thing.

In this era of NIL, it is also great to see people who excel in excellence for the love of the game, just because they are competitors at heart. They love their sport, and they compete.

This is an interesting thing about a Division III athlete: No one pays them to be up at 6 a.m. when they don't want to be to bust their butts, to excel in the weight room, on the field, running, conditioning, whatever it might be. No one makes them do it; they do it for the love of the game. They sacrifice. When other friends may be out having fun in the evenings or on the weekends, they sacrifice. They embrace the grind because they want to be a champion. You have to be willing to sacrifice and dedicate yourself to your craft if you want to be a champion, if you want to be a winner, if you want to be excellent.

That is why it was so great to be with these young men and women earlier today, because I know they have made the investment, and they have reaped the reward of that investment. It will carry them much further than just the athletic field, the court, the pool; it will carry them on in their life. They will be winners. They will be winners for their family, they will be winners for their community, winners for their State, and winners for their Nation.

That is why I think it is so important that we preserve the integrity of college athletics, that we continue to offer these great opportunities for student athletes to earn the resilience—to define the resilience and the character that it takes to be successful in athletic competition because that translates into life's success.

So these Ohio student athletes have made our State proud through their hard work, perseverance, and commitment to excellence. Their accomplishments serve as a reminder of what can be achieved when you are willing to pay the price of teamwork, discipline, and determination.

I am grateful for the opportunity to recognize these remarkable student athletes at Denison University and what they all stand for. On behalf of the people of Ohio, congratulations on an extraordinary year. I wish them continued success in the years ahead.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. BANKS assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORENO). The Senator from Iowa.

SOCIALISM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, with recent political victories in Democrat primaries in Colorado, New York, Pennsylvania, and elsewhere by socialists, I wanted to spend some time with my colleagues sharing the failed results that we have witnessed throughout history under socialism regimes. And if any of my colleagues consider themselves democratic socialists, I would like their attention.

The expansion of candidates and people who want to institute socialism in the United States is very concerning. What they desire is going to destroy everything America has stood for.

The recent trend toward socialism in the Democratic Party frankly surprises me. It ought to make every traditional Democrat worry about the trend of their party and be a warning for all of us.

I am glad some Democrats share this concern, as Democrat pollster Mark Penn wrote in the Wall Street Journal. Democrats could take a playbook out of the 1947 effort by Eleanor Roosevelt and Hubert Humphrey, as recently reported in the Washington Post.

Socialism is a failed ideology and experiment. It claims to focus on the good of society as a whole over the rights of individuals. This is in contrast to America's founding principles.

Socialism, whether it is the revolutionary kind or the democratic kind, is aimed at government ownership of industry and the elimination of private property.

Countries that have adopted socialism have found themselves less prosperous, even witnessing starvation and economic ruin followed by lawlessness and corruption. The only people that benefit from it are the people in the political system.

Socialist countries have also seen private property confiscated and constitutional rights taken away from the people. Recently, there is a group of socialists called Democratic Socialists that have won Democrat Party primaries. Where I sit, socialism is still socialism. They may think that calling themselves democratic somehow would cancel out all of the negatives of socialism, but they want to bring about the same negative outcomes that will produce less prosperity and less freedom. Example after example in history backs up my point.

In 2021, I spoke here on the Senate floor about Sweden's experiment with socialism. I encourage my colleagues to go back and read that speech. In case they don't have time, I will summarize it right now.

In the 1950s, Sweden gained newfound wealth and economic freedom. Then it started to adopt socialist policies. During Sweden's experiment with socialism between the 1960s and the 1980s, it experienced short-lived prosperity, massive government spending and taxation, and a highly regulated economy that eventually came crashing down. During that time, not a single net job was created in Sweden's private sector, and inflation took away almost all of the value of any wage increases. Sweden's socialist policies killed off its wealth creation that was needed to fund all of that government spending.

By the 1990s, Sweden realized its mistake and reversed course, and its left-wing Swedish Social Democrats recognized their mistake as well.

According to a White House Council of Economic Advisers report, if the

United States had moved toward Nordic country-style policies in the 1970s, by 2018, America's GDP would be at least 19 percent smaller, coming out to about 11,000 fewer dollars of wealth per person here in the United States.

We can learn a lot from Sweden so we don't go down the dead-end road called socialism. We can also learn a lot from Cuba's experience moving from freedom to socialism. That happened in 1959. Cuba's standard of living over the past 50 years has been destroyed.

In 1959, after Fidel Castro came to power, the Cuban Government took away private property and established price controls. This led to food shortages, and you can see that on our own televisions being a problem today in Cuba. Castro's regime even killed political opposition.

Decades of socialism meant that by the 2000s, Cuba lacked basic infrastructure and reliable energy.

A 2005 report found:

Instead of blackouts, Cubans jokingly refer to periods when electricity was available as "lights-in."

That energy crisis continues today, and you see it reported on American television.

Cuba's story under socialism can be summed up by Margaret Thatcher's words. When she was Prime Minister of Great Britain, she said:

The problem with socialism is that you eventually run out of other people's money.

Not everyone in Cuba has suffered. Its dictators have taken care of themselves.

If Sweden and Cuba aren't enough reasons why socialism has failed as an idea, let's take a look at Venezuela.

In 1998, socialist Hugo Chavez became President of Venezuela. At the time, Venezuela was the richest country in South America, and now it is one of the poorest. One of Chavez's first actions was to nationalize the agriculture sector and rob landowners of their property.

Food production fell 75 percent over two decades. Chavez went on to nationalize other parts of the economy, including electricity, water, oil, banks, supermarkets, construction, and other parts. He did this all while also expanding the welfare state with money that the country didn't have.

Not only is the country poor, but it has also been ruled by brutal dictators, under Chavez and Nicolas Maduro, and riddled with corruption. One analysis about Venezuela's experience with socialism put it this way:

So, what are the results of socialism in Venezuela? Well, we have experienced hyperinflation. We have people eating garbage, schools that do not teach, hospitals that do not heal, long and humiliating lines to buy flour, bread, and basic medicines.

So history is very clear: Economic freedom is a ticket to broad prosperity. Today's American socialists espouse more than just economic ruin and fewer freedoms. They want less law and order by abolishing ICE, defunding the police, and emptying out our prisons.

Don't take my word for it; just look at the agenda of some of the recent people who have won Democratic primaries in New York City. The Democratic socialist platform also wants to defund the Department of Defense, get rid of the U.S. Senate, and draft a new Constitution. Other countries that tried socialism have failed. Socialists' ideas and candidates offer failed ideas.

We should not forget what history has taught us or, as George Santayana once said almost 100 years ago: If you don't learn from history, you are going to repeat the same mistakes.

The United States was founded on principles of individual liberty and on unalienable natural rights, with the government's primary function being to preserve those rights and prevent fellow citizens or attacks by foreign powers from violating our constitutional rights.

Americans have been reluctant to grant too much power to the government since the very beginning. Ultimately, free markets have helped America become the richest country in the world and have lifted more people from poverty than anything else in human history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 808

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I rise today with a very simple request: I am asking that the Senate speak with a unanimous voice in condemning one of the worst acts of judicial misconduct we have seen in years.

Judge Eleanor Ross has been a district judge in the Northern District of Georgia for over a decade, and it is clear that she engaged in conduct that falls beneath the dignity of her high office in the Federal judiciary.

After a courageous law clerk came forward, a special committee on the Eleventh Circuit was appointed and ultimately made several deeply disturbing findings.

First, based on testimony from Judge Ross' law clerks, the committee found that over the course of 2 years, Judge Ross engaged in a sexual relationship with a high-ranking official of the Atlanta Police Department. This conduct occurred in her judicial chambers during normal business hours within earshot of her law clerks.

Now, think about that.

On top of that, the Atlanta Police Department, in the words of the special committee, "undoubtedly was involved in numerous criminal and civil cases being litigated" in the Northern District, underscoring how reckless the judge's misconduct truly was.

Not only did this misconduct create a possibility of an appearance of impropriety, an affair like this also exposed Judge Ross to the possibility of extortion and blackmail, as the special committee noted.

In addition to this egregious behavior in her chambers, the special committee also found an equally disturbing act of

judicial misconduct: making false statements material to the committee's investigation.

Judge Ross told the Eleventh Circuit's chief judge that she "never engaged in sexual intercourse in [her] office, nor anywhere else in the Courthouse" and that she was "astounded and confused" to be accused of this misconduct.

Now, based on the committee's findings, we know that Judge Ross' statements to Chief Judge Pryor were patently false. They were knowingly false.

We also know that it took Judge Ross nearly 2 weeks to retract the false statements. By the time she finally backtracked, the special committee had already collected substantial evidence that proved Judge Ross had made false statements.

In short, once Judge Ross realized where the investigation was going, she decided to retract her false statements and admit to the misconduct allegations. The Judicial Code of Conduct explicitly prohibits the type of conduct that Judge Ross engaged in, specifically Canon 2 states that "a Judge Should Avoid Impropriety and the Appearance of Impropriety in all Activities."

Canon 2A states that "a judge should act at all times in a manner that promotes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary."

Commentary to Canon 2A states:

Public confidence in the judiciary is eroded by irresponsible or improper conduct by judges, including harassment and other inappropriate workplace behavior.

The committee's findings, which I have just outlined, show that Judge Ross blatantly violated all three of these judicial canons.

Now, I want to be clear, what I have just outlined is all that my resolution is asking that the Senate condemn. We are condemning this inappropriate sexual misconduct by a sitting Federal judge, and we are condemning her subsequent lying about that misconduct. That is it.

I do want to note for the record that there was misconduct in the Eleventh Circuit report that I have not included in the resolution. The committee included in its misconduct findings that Judge Ross attended a political function for DA Fani Willis. I find it unconscionable for a sitting Federal judge to have attended a partisan event with a district attorney who weaponized the judicial system in the way that Fani Willis did.

I also firmly believe that Judge Ross, by lying to Chief Judge Pryor during the course of the Eleventh Circuit's investigation committed an impeachable offense, and I fully support the House's impeachment efforts.

But I have not included those aspects in my resolution that I am about to ask unanimous consent for. The reason why? As I mentioned at the outset, I believe the Senate should speak with one voice and unanimously condemn Judge Ross' conduct. I don't want to

give my Democrat colleagues any reason to object to this resolution.

So what I am asking unanimous consent for is simple: a condemnation of Judge Ross' sexual misconduct and subsequent lying during the course of a judicial investigation.

The American people deserve Federal judges who uphold the highest standards of integrity and professionalism on the bench; not those who turn their chambers into a venue for extramarital affairs. There is no reason any Member of this body should object to that resolution today.

Mr. President, with that, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 808, which is at the desk; I further ask that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, you heard her lay out the case of wrongdoing by a judge. I am going to ask for the Senate to take action to condemn that conduct. Seems pretty straightforward, doesn't it? Turns out, it would be the first time in the history of the Senate that we do something like this.

We asked the Congressional Research Service: Is there any Senate precedent for what the Senator from Tennessee is doing? They responded: There is no Senate precedent for either introducing or passing a Senate resolution condemning a judge's illegal misconduct.

What? Out of thousands of judges in the United States at the Federal level, surely in history, someone has done something wrong that should be condemned, but it has never been done.

Well, it gets down to some basic elements of constitutional law. You start with this, the Constitution of the United States. And the Constitution of the United States says in article I, section 2, the House of Representatives shall have the "sole power of impeachment"—removal from office. The sole power of impeachment is in the House of Representatives, not the Senate.

So why is that stopping us from this condemnation? Well, let me explain. Under the Constitution, Congress does not respond to judicial misconduct in the form of a Senate resolution. It never has.

It is the responsibility of the House of Representatives, specifically the House Judiciary Committee, to investigate the allegations of misconduct and consider the next steps, including impeachment.

But here is the critical element: Who is the jury? Where is the trial? It is right here. After someone has been impeached in the House of Representatives, for example a President, the case comes to the Senate for trial. I have sat through at least three of those,