

What is the PROMISE Act? Is it the solution to the problem with Social Security? No, but it is a procedure so that we can reach that solution.

Here is what it says: We are going to set up a system where the Social Security Advisory Board sends us a proposed change in Social Security. That is the starting point—just the starting point—for hearings and for a national discussion about where we want Social Security to go at the end of 2032.

That does not presume any solution. There are many Senators who have come up with ideas on what to do with Social Security—some surprising. A Republican Senator from Ohio joined a Democratic Senator from Massachusetts just 2 weeks ago, and they came up with a bipartisan proposal to save Social Security beyond 2032. The same thing has been offered by the Senator from Vermont and other Senators. They have ideas. The junior Senator from Rhode Island has a proposal as well.

What I am trying to do is not to pick the winners and losers, not to choose one plan over others but to create a process on the floor where we actually, physically, verbally debate the issue.

Trust me, Congress is not overworked. The House of Representatives taking off this week for 4 or 5 weeks of being back home for the August recess is fine. We do it every year. But before they leave, I think they should take up some procedure that says we are going to return to fix Social Security after the August recess.

The same thing should be true in the Senate. It is a bipartisan Senate in one respect, but the majority is on the Republican side. If they believe Social Security is important enough to make it a priority, let's put it on the legislative agenda when we return this year. Let's give peace of mind to the millions of Americans who currently live with Social Security benefits and those that work every week and every month paying into Social Security for their own retirement in the future.

This is not easy, but it is doable. I was part of that process many years ago, and I want to be part of it again before I retire at the end of this year.

So we have a bipartisan procedure. It does not assume any changes. It basically says we have to reach a point where we pass something that gives us another 50 years of solvency for Social Security.

It is not too much to ask. I have seen it done. I voted for it 50 years ago, and I am prepared to vote again if we have—not quite 50 years ago. It was 44 years ago I did it, and I would do it again. It is a challenge, which I think we can meet. We have the bipartisan starting point: the PROMISE Act.

I want to see, I hope, a bipartisan vote to set up that procedure that we will return to in September or October of this year so that we get something done and we give peace of mind to the people who are depending on Social Security for their future.

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.

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

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

The Senator from Iowa.

THE NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again, as I have before, to discuss misleading reporting in the New York Times.

The New York Times has a global reputation. They work hard to maintain that. So I don't understand why their journalists can miss so many important facts. This time the misleading article was written by Devlin Barrett and a second one was written by Charlie Savage.

Barrett's article discusses the White House's release of government records about an alleged scheme by China to meddle in the 2020 election. The records at issue showed that FBI personnel suppressed intelligence of that alleged Chinese interference.

Barrett's article said, in part:

Mr. GRASSLEY and others have cited the Albany memo as evidence that F.B.I. leaders covered up evidence that China might be taking aggressive steps to interfere with the U.S. election results in 2020, because admitting it might contradict prior testimony to Congress from then-F.B.I. Director Wray.

That is not what I said when I made those records public. That is what the FBI said 6 years ago.

The Albany memo, as the New York Times called it, is actually an FBI memo. It contained information from an FBI Confidential Human Source and was titled by the FBI. The titles by the FBI:

Chinese Government Production and Export of Fraudulent U.S. Driver's Licenses to Chinese Sympathizers in the United States, in Order to Create Tens of Thousands of Fraudulent Mail-in Votes for US Presidential Candidate Joe Biden, in late August 2020.

End of the FBI title.

Let me emphasize what I said. The memo was an FBI memo based on an FBI Confidential Human Source. It was not a CHUCK GRASSLEY-created memo.

The FBI analyst involved said the FBI memo "was coordinated and disseminated in textbook fashion."

But based on the records the FBI provided to me, the allegations weren't fully investigated at the time because the FBI decided to recall its own memo.

The FBI also described the FBI's sources as competent and authentic with reporting. So let the FBI do their job and investigate.

An FBI analyst said in an email—and when I quote this email, the words "me" and "I" refer to the FBI analyst.

Most concerning to me, is stating the reporting would contradict Director Wray's

testimony. I found this troubling because it implied to me that one of the reasons we weren't putting this out is for a political reason, which goes directly against our organization's mission to remain apolitical and simply state what we know. . . . My concern is that I think it gets dangerous if we cite potential political implications as reasons for not putting out our information.

This FBI analyst raises legitimate concerns. Is the New York Times digging into those concerns? In other words, is the New York Times journalist doing what journalists should be doing? They ought to be good investigators, get all the facts.

And guess who was involved in recalling the FBI memo: That person was then-Deputy Assistant Director Nikki Floris. She was also the main briefer for the fake briefing Senator JOHNSON and I received in August of 2020 from the now-disbanded Foreign Influence Task Force. You will remember, that was the briefing that was used to attack the Grassley-Johnson Biden family investigation.

So I ask, Is the New York Times investigating that material connection?

By the way, my and Senator JOHNSON's investigation was based on authentic bank records, authentic Treasury records, authentic Obama administration records, and transcribed interviews. In other words, it was not Russian disinformation, as the partisan media tried and failed to argue.

Here, with this FBI memo, I released records last year because the facts and evidence ought to breathe. Let the American people see what is happening on their watch.

I also issued the records as support to those FBI agents and analysts who were just trying to do their job under extreme pressure from inside the FBI.

I don't know why people in the FBI care if the truth gets out, but a lot of people at the FBI get pressured not to let the truth out. And I want you to know that I will continue to make records public because that is what the taxpayers need and deserve and expect.

As I said last July about this same FBI memo:

One way or the other, intelligence must be fully investigated to determine whether it's true, or if it's just smoke and mirrors.

End of this Senator's quote from last July. That is a quote, by the way, that the New York Times failed to mention.

Now, turning to the Savage article from the New York Times, Charlie Savage wrote in part:

Since President Trump returned to office last year, the senator—

Referring to CHUCK GRASSLEY—has released a flood of internal law enforcement files that normally would be off limits to disclosure, sometimes attributing them to "whistle-blowers" or not saying who gave them to him.

The New York Times seems to be very obsessed with how I have obtained government records, maybe because they haven't been able to or maybe they haven't even tried to get these records. For too many years, the executive branch, under both Republicans

and Democrats, has failed to produce certain records to the Congress of the United States. The fact that the Trump administration has produced what the New York Times believes wouldn't be normally produced ought to be good news to the American people and good news to the New York Times. You see, these records are exactly the type that should be produced to Congress just as a matter of course, and the Trump administration understands that, and I thank them for their cooperation.

Now, I am still not fully satisfied. There are many more records that ought to be public. For many years, whistleblowers have been hard at work to expose those and many other records. As difficult as it may be for the partisan media to understand this, I have made public thousands of pages of records to this Congress pursuant to lawful whistleblower disclosures. True whistleblowers stick their neck out just for telling the truth, and they do it no matter the risk to them. And a lot of these whistleblowers ruin themselves professionally by just doing what the law requires. So when I do get records, I owe it to the whistleblowers to make those records public. That is called congressional oversight, and it is my constitutional responsibility to get the job of congressional oversight done as the Constitution requires.

This Senator's work will continue. I encourage the Trump administration to continue making records public for transparency, and hopefully the New York Times will get future stories right.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHEEHY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant executive clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent for the previously scheduled vote to begin now.

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

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Benjamin M. Flowers, of Ohio, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

#### VOTE ON FLOWERS NOMINATION

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

Mr. HAGERTY. 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. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) is necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 49, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 202 Ex.]

#### YEAS—49

|           |            |            |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Armstrong | Fischer    | Moran      |
| Banks     | Graham     | Moreno     |
| Barrasso  | Grassley   | Paul       |
| Blackburn | Hagerty    | Ricketts   |
| Boozman   | Hawley     | Risch      |
| Britt     | Hoeven     | Rounds     |
| Capito    | Husted     | Schmitt    |
| Cassidy   | Hyde-Smith | Scott (FL) |
| Collins   | Johnson    | Scott (SC) |
| Cornyn    | Justice    | Sheehy     |
| Cotton    | Kennedy    | Sullivan   |
| Cramer    | Lankford   | Thune      |
| Crapo     | Lee        | Tuberville |
| Cruz      | Lummis     | Wicker     |
| Curtis    | Marshall   | Young      |
| Daines    | McCormick  |            |
| Ernst     | Moody      |            |

#### NAYS—46

|                 |           |            |
|-----------------|-----------|------------|
| Alsobrooks      | Hirono    | Sanders    |
| Baldwin         | Kaine     | Schatz     |
| Bennet          | Kelly     | Schiff     |
| Blumenthal      | Kim       | Schumer    |
| Blunt Rochester | King      | Shaheen    |
| Booker          | Klobuchar | Slotkin    |
| Cantwell        | Lujan     | Smith      |
| Cortez Masto    | Markey    | Van Hollen |
| Duckworth       | Merkley   | Warner     |
| Durbin          | Murphy    | Warnock    |
| Fetterman       | Murray    | Warren     |
| Gallego         | Ossoff    | Welch      |
| Gillibrand      | Padilla   | Whitehouse |
| Hassan          | Peters    | Wyden      |
| Heinrich        | Reed      |            |
| Hickenlooper    | Rosen     |            |

#### NOT VOTING—5

|       |           |        |
|-------|-----------|--------|
| Budd  | McConnell | Tillis |
| Coons | Murkowski |        |

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RICKETTS). 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.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant executive 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. 829, Michael C. Martin, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

John Thune, Tim Sheehy, John Barrasso, Pete Ricketts, Thom Tillis, Rick Scott of Florida, John Cornyn, Steve Daines, Bernie Moreno, John R. Curtis, Chuck Grassley, Jim Banks, Mike Crapo,

James Lankford, Kevin Cramer, Mike Rounds, Ted Budd.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Michael C. Martin, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Coons), is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 60, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 203 Ex.]

#### YEAS—60

|           |            |            |
|-----------|------------|------------|
| Armstrong | Graham     | Moran      |
| Banks     | Grassley   | Moreno     |
| Barrasso  | Hagerty    | Paul       |
| Blackburn | Hawley     | Peters     |
| Boozman   | Heinrich   | Ricketts   |
| Britt     | Hirono     | Risch      |
| Capito    | Hoeven     | Rosen      |
| Cassidy   | Husted     | Rounds     |
| Collins   | Hyde-Smith | Schmitt    |
| Cornyn    | Johnson    | Scott (FL) |
| Cotton    | Justice    | Scott (SC) |
| Cramer    | Kaine      | Shaheen    |
| Crapo     | Kennedy    | Sheehy     |
| Cruz      | King       | Slotkin    |
| Curtis    | Lankford   | Sullivan   |
| Daines    | Lee        | Thune      |
| Durbin    | Lummis     | Tuberville |
| Ernst     | Marshall   | Whitehouse |
| Fetterman | McCormick  | Wicker     |
| Fischer   | Moody      | Young      |

#### NAYS—35

|                 |              |            |
|-----------------|--------------|------------|
| Alsobrooks      | Hickenlooper | Sanders    |
| Baldwin         | Kelly        | Schatz     |
| Bennet          | Kim          | Schiff     |
| Blumenthal      | Klobuchar    | Schumer    |
| Blunt Rochester | Lujan        | Smith      |
| Booker          | Markey       | Van Hollen |
| Cantwell        | Merkley      | Warner     |
| Cortez Masto    | Murphy       | Warnock    |
| Duckworth       | Murray       | Warren     |
| Gallego         | Ossoff       | Welch      |
| Gillibrand      | Padilla      | Wyden      |
| Hassan          | Reed         |            |

#### NOT VOTING—5

|       |           |        |
|-------|-----------|--------|
| Budd  | McConnell | Tillis |
| Coons | Murkowski |        |

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ARMSTRONG). On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 35. The motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael C. Martin, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

#### HONORING TYLER FEEHAN

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I am heartbroken on behalf of everybody in