

fair share. Most Americans think it is unacceptable for those at the top to pay less in taxes than teachers and firefighters. God bless the rich—I have nothing against them—but I applaud the President's proposal for making sure the ultrarich chip in to growing our country.

Finally, I commend the President for releasing a budget that honors our Nation's promise to Ukraine while keeping Americans around the world safe from harm.

Now compare the President's budget, President Biden's budget, to the bewildering vision laid out by Senate Republicans in recent weeks.

While Democrats want to lower costs for American families, Republicans are openly calling on raising taxes on most Americans.

Yesterday, the junior Senator from Florida went on FOX News Sunday to deny this part of his plan, only for the anchor—the FOX anchor—to remind everyone watching: “No, it's in the plan.”

While Democrats want to strengthen Medicare and make healthcare more affordable, Republicans have resurrected calls to repeal healthcare and even possibly put Medicare on the chopping block. And lest anyone forget, a few months ago, the junior Senator from Florida, in another example, openly said inflation was a “gold mine”—a gold mine—for the Republican Party, a gold mine. People are hurt; it is a gold mine for the Republican Party.

Just how callous, how retrograde, how backward is the Republican vision for America? raising taxes on working people? cheerleading inflation? stoking divisions and even putting things like Medicare at risk while pushing tax breaks for the ultrarich? If that is their pitch to the American people, God help Republicans.

In the meantime, I thank President Biden for releasing a strong, optimistic, and responsible plan that will build on the historic recovery our Nation has seen in the past year.

Senate Democrats will work with the administration to put these proposals into concrete legislation in the weeks and months to come.

H.R. 4521

Madam President, now on the competition bill, it is an important day here on the Senate floor. In a few hours, we will hold a vote on final passage for the bipartisan jobs and competitiveness legislation many of us have worked on for over a year.

For the information of all, today's action will come in two steps. We will first vote on cloture on the substitute amendment, which contains the text of the Senate-passed United States Innovation and Competition Act. Then we will proceed to final passage. Both votes are set at a 60-vote threshold, and I am confident that we will wrap up this important work by the end of the day.

As I have said since the beginning of this process, the actions we are taking

on the Senate floor will enable us to enter a conference committee with the House, which we need in order to finalize our competitiveness bill. I believe we can see a conference committee initiated by the end of this work period.

If enacted, I believe this legislation will be one of the most important accomplishments of the 117th Congress. This bill, for all its provisions, is really about two big things: creating more American jobs and lowering costs for American families.

It will help lowering costs by making it easier to produce critical technologies here at home, like semiconductors. It will create more jobs by bringing manufacturing back from overseas.

And just as importantly, this legislation will fuel another generation of American innovation. Whichever nation is the first to master the technologies of tomorrow will reshape the world in its image. America cannot afford to come in second place when it comes to technologies like 5G, AI, quantum computing, semiconductors, bioengineering, and so much more.

This bill is a necessary step toward securing the bright future of American ingenuity, which has always helped us lead the way.

I want to thank my colleagues from both sides of the aisle for everything they have done to help us each this moment. It has been a long, hard road, but almost every Member of this Chamber has had a hand in putting this bill together. It was a blend of various proposals across various committees, and it was a product of a healthy amendment process both in committee and on the floor.

We are, hopefully, just a few hours away from reaching the next important step in the process, putting us on a glidepath to initiating a conference committee with the House.

CORONAVIRUS

Madam President, on COVID, over the past few weeks, our country has made major strides in the fight against COVID. Cases, deaths, and hospitalizations are coming down and staying down. Schools and communities are opening up and staying open.

But in order to preserve this progress, Congress must now act to make sure that our communities, our healthcare workers, and our families have the resources they need to keep our country open. Sadly, public funding for COVID relief is in critical danger of actually running out.

That is why right now I am working with my Republican colleagues to reach a bipartisan agreement on another COVID-19 package. The White House has been unambiguous in saying they need more funding with all due haste, so that is what we are working to secure ASAP.

A new bipartisan bill will pay for all the tools we know work best against new variants: It will ensure we have enough vaccines; enough testing; enough therapeutics, which do amazing

things if you get them in time; and support our schools to stay open in a safe way. We also need to do more to boost global vaccination efforts and support cutting-edge research into new vaccines.

We already know what to do in order to keep life going as normally as possible should another variant threaten to unravel our progress. Now we simply need to secure the funding to make sure we can keep schools open and our communities as safe as possible. If you don't go for the funding and a new variant hits and it gets bad, shame on you. Everyone should be for this.

Over the next few days, we will keep negotiating with our Republican colleagues in good faith. While we are not there yet, talks have been encouraging, and I hope we can reach an agreement very soon.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 7108 and H.R. 6968

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6968) to prohibit the importation of energy products of the Russian Federation, and for other purposes.

A bill (H.R. 7108) to suspend normal trade relations treatment for the Russian Federation and the Republic of Belarus, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar on the next legislative day.

Mr. SCHUMER. Thank you.
I yield the floor.

AMERICA CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR MANUFACTURING, PRE-EMINENCE IN TECHNOLOGY, AND ECONOMIC STRENGTH ACT OF 2022—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, during the first few months of President Biden's term, he has tried to brush off the surge of illegal immigrant apprehensions as nothing more than a seasonal trend. But after month 6, seasonal migration was no longer a valid explanation for what turned out to be a record-breaking year.

This border surge wasn't by accident. President Biden pledged to enact an open border agenda by halting border wall construction, reversing successful Trump-era immigration policies, and hamstringing our law enforcement officers. It was one promise he has kept.

And over a year into the Biden administration, we are seeing the consequences of that promise.

Just last year, nearly 2 million illegal immigrants were apprehended at our southern border from more than 160 different countries. And for 2022, it looks like we are on track to exceed that record, as this February was the 12th—the 12th—consecutive month with over 100,000 illegal immigrant apprehensions. And if President Biden's administration stops invoking title 42, and it doesn't secure the border, the crisis is going to be dramatically different.

A lot of attention is paid to who is coming across the border, and rightfully so, but it is time we all turn our attention to what is coming across the border, and it is called deadly fentanyl.

Just as our border continues to be overwhelmed by illegal immigrants, our communities are overwhelmed with this lethal drug. I have been to the border, and I have seen firsthand the impact of President Biden's open border policies and agenda.

At a checkpoint in McAllen, TX, I saw a truck bed filled with fentanyl, filled to the brim—a deadly synthetic opioid.

Thankfully, our Border Patrol officer stopped this particular truck from making it across the border, but for that one being stopped, there are several more that get across the border. Thankfully, our Border Patrol officer stopped this truck, stopped it from making it across the border, and it saved many lives. But for every truck of fentanyl, many, many more continue to come across.

It is hard to understand the significance of a truck bed full of fentanyl, so just let me break it down.

Look at my chart. Two milligrams of fentanyl is considered a lethal dose; 2 milligrams is the weight of a mosquito. Ten pennies weigh one ounce. One ounce of fentanyl can kill nearly 30,000 people. A football weighs 1 pound. Just 1 pound of fentanyl can kill over 200,000 people.

In October of last year, in South Alabama, Baldwin County sheriff deputy seized 14 grams of fentanyl. That is enough to kill upward of 7,000 people. And, of course, in any arrest, sometimes you have problems with fentanyl. One of his deputies just happened to touch fentanyl and was immediately put into the hospital.

We are seizing these deadly drugs across America every day. Last year, in San Diego, a trucker was arrested after attempting to smuggle more than 389 pounds of fentanyl, which is enough to kill 88 million people.

The connection between President Biden's open border policies and the rise of fentanyl is clear, and the American people are paying a heavy, heavy price.

Since President Biden's inauguration, Customs and Border Protection seized nearly 3,000 pounds of illicit fentanyl. That is a 41-percent increase from last year.

Over the last year, opioids took the lives of over 100,000 Americans. To put that into perspective, that is half the size of our capital city in the State of Alabama, which would be almost wiped off the map. This is bone-chilling.

But these numbers are more important than a stat. They are the sons and daughters, the mothers and fathers, the brothers and sisters who were all taken too soon—bright futures darkened by deadly drug addiction.

I spent 40 years traveling across this country visiting young athletes and their families from every walk of life. I had players who battled addiction or who had close friends who battled addiction. It is a heartbreaking procedure to watch a student worry about stepping in for a parent who is suffering from addiction. That happens daily. When they should be only worrying about studying or getting ready for a game, they are also covering for parents who are addicted to drugs.

It is true that drug addiction has plagued our country for decades, but we have seen a sharp rise since the pandemic: isolations, loss of work, depression, all making the problem worse. And the data confirms this. So it only makes sense to do all we can to help Americans. That would include cutting off the drugs at the primary source, which is the southern border. Yet the President refuses to take decisive action to stop these deadly substances from flooding into the country.

In fact, the answer from the Biden administration is there will be a strategy for dealing with addiction and fentanyl crisis coming “soon.”

When President Biden's drug czar, Dr. Gupta, was asked about the administration's plans to address the addiction crisis, he responded that the drug control strategy was in its “advanced stages of being finalized.”

To that I say, Americans are losing their lives right now. Lives are being lost every day when we are coming up with a strategy. We don't need a bureaucratic talking point or a bureaucrat wasting our time. We need a plan—and we need a plan now—to stop these drugs.

Since President Biden has been in office, he has failed to take charge in every situation. Sadly, the drug overdose epidemic is no different. While the folks at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue continue to work on their strategy, I propose President Biden take a logical and long-overdue first step today: enforce our immigration laws at the border—that would be a great start—end the free flow of fentanyl, and stop the loss of innocent lives.

For a White House that is so laser-focused on the health of Americans as it relates to the pandemic—masks, 6 feet apart, airports—the same emphasis should be cast on the people's lives that we are losing and the deadly drugs coming into our country illegally.

By creating and then failing to address this disastrous situation at the southern border, President Biden has

fueled another crisis as fentanyl ravages our communities.

You know, we all watched this weekend as President Biden gave a great speech in Poland. He put the wrath down on the Russian people, military, and the President of Russia, Vladimir Putin. He showed anger—and he should have—at the destruction that is going on in Ukraine and the innocent lives lost.

President Biden needs to show the same anger. We will lose more people in the next 6 months than they will lose in this war in Ukraine—people in our country—and it is being overlooked. It is not being worked on. The problem is not trying to be answered. It is like we are having to just deal with it.

We have got a problem here, Mr. President, and we need to address it.

The President has the tools and the authority to act quickly and save lives. I just hope, sooner or later, somebody recognizes it and does something about it because, as we speak, we are not answering this problem.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

REMEMBERING RAY MARK LINDSEY

Mr. YOUNG. Madam President, in May of 2013, one of my constituents, Bob Evans from Lawrence County, was placed on the kidney transplant list. His particular kidney ailment was hereditary, meaning family members who might have been a match could not donate. So Bob was left waiting for someone—someone—to step forward.

Unbeknownst to Bob, an acquaintance, Ray Lindsey, quietly went to get tested. Now, Ray took several days off work, traveling 3 hours round trip to Indianapolis to see if he would be a match. He was. And only then did Ray tell Bob what he had been up to. In the summer of 2014, Ray donated a kidney, and he saved Bob's life.

Yesterday, Ray, one of the most selfless people I have ever met, passed away after a courageous battle with cancer.

Ray was a humble and unassuming family man with a sense of humor. On his Facebook page, he called himself a “part-time hillbilly.” Ray worked hard and, by the way, didn't get any compensation whatsoever for the weeks he had to take off while recuperating from surgery.

Ray's sacrifice has made a lasting impact on public policy. His story impacted and informed my interest in organ donation policy. I introduced the PRISE Act to incentivize new breakthroughs in kidney disease treatment options. In 2018, the Trump administration created a similar program called KidneyX.

We know Ray saved one life, but his story and selflessness impacted potentially thousands more.

Bob, by the way, is still going strong today, 8 years after the transplant surgery.

Ray was a man of deep faith, and I can think of no better tribute to Ray than words found in John, chapter 15:

My command is this. Love each other as I have loved you. Greater love has no one than this: to lay down one's life for one's friends.

Ray lived those words, and I and countless others are going to miss him deeply. I offer my condolences to all who loved Ray, including his wife Debbie, three children, and eight grandchildren. Ray's incredible life and impact will never be forgotten.

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.

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

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

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam President, well before we gaveled in to last week's Supreme Court confirmation hearing, our friends in the mainstream media had made it clear what the approved narrative was going to be. According to them, we were supposed to talk about what a historic moment it was and what a historic nominee Judge Jackson is.

My Democratic colleagues on the Judiciary Committee spent most of their time focusing on the approved talking points memo, but those of us who didn't play along were punished in print.

But, back home in Tennessee, these unhinged attacks by the media went over like a lead balloon, and I think my Democratic colleagues would benefit from listening to what people outside of Washington, DC, have to say because they—the people—are the ones who will bear the practical consequences of what happens here in DC.

Now, on Thursday, my Democratic colleagues declared victory for Judge Jackson, but Tennesseans I talked to this weekend still have a lot of questions. They expected more from her. They don't appreciate being called racist for saying they expected more. They wanted her to answer tough questions about the Constitution. They wanted assurance that a Justice Jackson would protect their constitutional rights.

They have no problem with having a former public defender on the Court. That could even be a good thing. But they wanted her to account for her record of granting light sentences to dangerous criminals. Why did she choose to let some of them out of jail on compassionate release?

I asked those questions, and I commend all of my colleagues on the committee who dug in and did the same thing. Many of my Democratic colleagues, on the other hand, accused us of "tarnishing" their historic moment. But Tennesseans didn't see it that way. They say it was the Democrats who tarnished the proceedings by ignoring their duty to vet Judge Jackson, who is up for a lifetime appointment to the

highest Court in the land. They feel it was the media that tarnished the moment by politicizing—politicizing—the hearings.

Now, I cannot support Judge Jackson's nomination to the Supreme Court, but I am withholding my support for reasons my Democratic colleagues and the media have chosen to ignore. For all the focus my colleagues placed on "judicial philosophy" in previous confirmation hearings, I had hoped that Judge Jackson would come ready to tell us about hers, but she didn't. Instead, she came armed with a methodology that spoke to the thoroughness of her process but said very little about her approach to constitutional interpretation.

After the hysteria that broke out during Justice Barrett's hearings about the so-called dangers of originalism, I thought we might discover what sort of jurist my Democratic colleagues think would be more effective than a constitutionalist. But oh no—to ask that—you are not supposed to do that.

But, suddenly, judicial philosophy meant nothing. As I said, don't ask that question. What role the Constitution plays in Judge Jackson's "methodology" meant nothing to them. Don't ask that question.

Well, I hate to be the bearer of bad news, but this is not a subject the American people are willing to ignore. They want you to ask the questions and get answers. They don't expect to agree with a Justice 100 percent of the time, but they do expect those nominees to adhere to a standard. They want a constitutionalist, not a judicial activist, and at this point, they have no idea what rules she will follow if indeed she is confirmed.

All we can do is look at her record. Judge Jackson spent a lot of time defending her work. Tennesseans are just as worried about what she was trying to distance herself from. What did she want us to not know?

Associations are important. You can tell a lot about a person by looking at who their friends are, and, as it turns out, Judge Jackson has some pretty controversial friends.

Over the past few years, we have seen progressive activists use critical race theory to try and redefine our history and change the way Americans view their place in the world. It is a pernicious philosophical lens, and the effect it has on kids in the classroom is weighing heavily on the hearts of Tennessee parents.

Now, in her hearing, Judge Jackson brushed aside my questions about her views on CRT. She wrote it off as an "academic theory," which it is, but my questions were about how she may or may not apply that academic theory to her decisions. Why does she choose to give that academic theory the same weight as administrative law or constitutional law when she is making those decisions?

One particular item she tried to distance herself from is her praise for the

so-called progressive curriculum at Georgetown Day School, where she sits on the board. Here is what she said in the winter 2019 edition of the school's magazine.

Since becoming part of the GDS community 7 years ago, I have witnessed the transformative power of a rigorous progressive education.

As Judge Jackson pointed out, Georgetown Day is a private school—an elite private school. They can teach what they want, and parents can choose to take their kids out and go elsewhere if they don't like it.

But here is the wrinkle. It is getting harder for parents in Tennessee to do that because so-called progressive education is taking over public schools also. And part of that progressive education requires getting in between parents and their children.

Here is why it was so important to air this out during a confirmation hearing. We were examining a nominee who has spent nearly a decade on the bench yet cannot describe her fundamental approach to the law—not her approach to deciding cases or sentencing criminals but to reading and interpreting the Constitution.

So when Tennesseans hear a nominee refuse to answer these questions—when she gives an opening statement and talks about how she makes decisions by starting from a point of neutrality, by looking at the facts of the case, by looking at precedent, you have to say: Where does the Constitution fit into your decision?

At the same time that she is practicing that methodology of deciding cases, she is associating herself with philosophies meant to divide children from their parents. They feel entitled to know what role these associations are going to play in her decision matrix.

Questions are not attacks, and that is a point that needs to be made. To ask questions is not an attack. How do we keep our Nation free and strong? We do it by robust, respectful debate. That requires that you ask questions of individuals who come before you, that you ask questions of individuals who have a different opinion than you have or who hold a different political or governmental philosophy than you hold. Questions are not attacks.

Challenging the application of CRT in elementary school classes is not "racism." Standing firm on the definition of "woman" is not "transphobia." This isn't personal. We are talking about a lifetime appointment, and the people deserve to know who this nominee is and what she believes.

I thought it was so interesting that so regularly through the hearing, people would reference her background and her family and the strong connections as part of what makes her who she is and informs her decisionmaking and how important that is. The letters of support to her all mention that. But if you question some of this, then the media, then my Democratic colleagues

say that is an attack. No, my friends, it is not. It is not an attack because words have meaning. You don't leave words like "parenthood" and "womanhood" up for interpretation. You know what they mean.

Judge Jackson had 3 days to convince this country that her methodology—not her judicial philosophy but her methodology—can help her answer these questions. In my opinion, she failed at that task.

In this building, I don't speak for myself; I speak for the people of the great State of Tennessee. I cannot in good conscience give their endorsement to a nominee who by all accounts is legally and constitutionally adrift. What is her standard? We still don't know. What keeps her grounded in the law? We are not sure about that one either. What keeps her from infusing politics into her rulings? We don't have an answer for that. Those are things that, this weekend, Tennesseans would say: I want to know this.

My Democratic colleagues don't want to talk about this; neither does the media. They have spent their time whipping up people, looking for outrage, looking for click bait. But here is what I will say in conclusion: Every single one of Judge Jackson's contemporaries have been more than happy to answer these questions. They do regularly as they have come before us for Supreme Court confirmation hearings. So why will not Judge Jackson?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

BIDEN FAMILY

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, today, Senator JOHNSON and I begin a series of speeches on our investigations into the Biden family's financial deals. We will make these presentations with two themes.

First, we will refute and we will dismantle the talking points that the liberal media and our Democratic colleagues pushed onto the American people. Their talking points said that our investigations over the years advanced and spread Russian disinformation. On November 29, 2021; May 11, 2021; March 18, 2021; December 14, 2020; December 10, 2020; October 19, 2020; and September 29, 2020, I came to this Senate floor to rebut those false charges.

Now—or at least then—the liberal media and my Democratic colleagues ought to be ashamed of themselves for the outright lies that they peddled about our investigative work. As a result, Senator JOHNSON and I did what any good investigator would do: We gathered even more records to prove all these people wrong, which brings me to the second theme.

Senator JOHNSON and I will produce new records to show additional connections between the Biden family and the communist Chinese regime. Before we get to those records, I am going to discuss the background of our investigation.

We started this investigation last Congress. Then, I was chairman of the

Finance Committee, and at that time, Senator JOHNSON was chairman of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee.

It began in August 2019. I started at that time an inquiry into a transaction involving Hunter Biden that was reviewed by the Federal Government's Committee on Foreign Investment.

On September 23, 2020, Senator JOHNSON and I released our report. On November 18, 2020, we released our supplement to that report. Those reports were based in large part on Obama administration government records and also almost a dozen transcribed interviews of government officials.

In both reports, Senator JOHNSON and I made financial information public that hadn't ever been known before. Our report exposed extensive financial relationships between Hunter and James Biden and Chinese nationals connected to the communist regime. More precisely, these were Chinese nationals connected to the Chinese Government's military and intelligence service.

One of those individuals was a person by the name of Patrick Ho. According to reports, Hunter Biden said of Patrick Ho:

I have another New York Times reporter calling about my representation of Patrick Ho—

Then Hunter Biden says the f-word—[denoting] the spy chief of China who started the company that my partner, who is worth \$323 billion, founded and is now missing.

We will get into more detail with respect to Patrick Ho in future speeches. We will do the same with Gongwen Dong, another close associate of Hunter Biden's who was connected to the communist regime.

Now, Hunter Biden's reference to "my partner" is an apparent reference to Ye Jianming. Ye had connections to the People's Liberation Army. Ye had a company called CEFC, which had multiple variations. Today and in future speeches, Senator JOHNSON and I will simply refer to that company as CEFC.

Documents show that CEFC's corporate mission was "to expand co-operation in the international energy economy and contribute to national development." Now, let me emphasize that word "national" in that quote, "national development." CEFC existed for the communist state. Indeed, records show that CEFC is dedicating itself to serving China's national energy strategy, developing national strategic reserves for oil, and "partnering with centrally-administered and state-owned enterprises."

Records prepared by one of Hunter and James Biden's business associates, James Gilliar, say the following about this company, CEFC:

At the time, China was hungry for crude, but its state-backed companies were having difficulty closing some deals abroad. The optics of China's state-backed giants marching into a country to buy and extract oil weren't great for central Asian politicians. This paved the way for private firms like CEFC,

which can strike oil deals in Europe and the Middle East where Chinese State Owned Enterprises could bring political liabilities.

Documents also show that CEFC "is building an energy storage and logistics system in Europe" to connect China, Europe, and the Middle East. You may ask, why? Plainly, to serve "China's ambitions to have overseas storage locations connected with world markets."

The document further states that CEFC's investment bank division has investments in the energy sector "which are in tandem with the government's 4 trillion dollar One Belt One Road foreign investment program."

Then CEFC operated under the guise of a private company but was for all intents and purposes an arm of the Chinese Government.

Hunter Biden and James Biden served as the perfect vehicle by which the communist Chinese Government could gain inroads here in the United States through CEFC and its affiliates.

And these inroads were focused on Chinese advancement into the global and U.S. energy sector. Hunter and James Biden were more than happy to go along, of course, for the right price.

So now let's turn to the first poster, which shows bank records that haven't been made public before now. This is a portion of a document that we—meaning Senator JOHNSON and I—will release in full.

The topic of this poster shows a wire transaction on August 4, 2017, from CEFC to Wells Fargo Clearing Services for \$100,000.

Now, look at the bottom of the poster. This is the underlying data of this transaction. It states:

Further credit to OWASCO.

OWASCO is Hunter Biden's firm.

Now, there is no middleman in this transaction. This is \$100,000 from what is, effectively, an arm of the communist Chinese Government direct to Hunter Biden.

So a second question, a question to the liberal media and my Democratic colleagues, who accused us, over the last 2 years, of distributing Russian disinformation: Is this official bank document Russian disinformation?

Now, beyond this document, in future speeches, Senator JOHNSON and I will show you more transfers between and among such companies as CEFC, Northern International Capital, Hudson West Three, Hunter Biden's OWASCO, and James Biden's Lion Hall Group.

In doing so, please keep in mind the players in this game: Hunter Biden, James Biden, Ye Jianming, Gongwen Dong, Mervyn Yan, and Patrick Ho, to name a few. All of these individuals mixed and mingled with related corporate entities over a period of years and with respect to millions of dollars.

Now, the next poster, those connections are illustrated by this second poster which I made public last November. It is an original bank record with one typographical error and all. Here

you have Hunter Biden, Gongwen Dong, and Mervyn Yan executing an assignment and assumption agreement together.

Now, a third question to those who accuse us of disseminating Russian disinformation, so especially to the liberal media who are the ones who ought to be policing our government system to make sure that everything is done honest—they shouldn't have to have Members of Congress giving all this information out—but is this official record Russian disinformation?

In our next speeches, we will show you more records that haven't been seen before, records that undeniably show strong links between the Biden family and communist China.

Today is just a small taste. I would like to note one thing before Senator JOHNSON takes over. He is going to describe to you the ridiculous attacks that we received, claiming that our reports were Russian disinformation.

On March 16 of this year, the New York Times unwittingly substantiated our reports by reporting on Hunter Biden's connection to foreign corporations and his potential criminal exposure.

So what Senator JOHNSON and I made public last Congress is now a prevailing fact pattern that even the liberal media can't ignore any longer and falsely label "Russian disinformation."

I will turn it over to Senator JOHNSON to provide additional examples of the media's attack last Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HIRONO). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Madam President, I first want to thank the senior Senator from the State of Iowa for his tenacity in pursuing the truth and ignoring all of the false attacks lobbed against us during the course of our multiyear investigations into corruption at the highest levels of the Federal Government.

Both of us have been firsthand witnesses and at the same time victims of the dishonesty of our Democratic Senate colleagues and their willing accomplices in the media.

When it comes to our investigation into the vast web of foreign financial entanglements of the Biden family, those attacks have had one goal in mind, to cover up the extent to which President Biden might be and almost certainly is compromised.

Over the course of our investigation into how Hunter Biden used his father's position and name to enrich himself and his family, the dishonest press published countless stories reporting on the Democrats' false charge that Senator GRASSLEY and I were soliciting and disseminating Russian disinformation.

Once we issued our September and November 2020 reports, which were based almost exclusively on U.S.-sourced documents and interviews with U.S. citizens, the media largely ignored it. When they did write a story, they

declared that our reports found nothing new, a classic media coverup.

I have always said the bias in the media is revealed far more in what they don't report than what they actually do report. But all the false attacks did not deter us. We have continued to uncover the truth and, fortunately, our reports also served as a catalyst for others to come forward and for more investigative journalists to keep digging.

The American people deserve the truth. That is why we are presenting additional evidence today and over the next few days. For example, this is the first time this document is being made public. As Senator GRASSLEY described in detail, it shows that money from CEFC, which is effectively an arm of the Chinese Government, went directly to Hunter Biden.

Bank records like this piece of evidence are pretty hard to deny and sweep under the rug. Our reports were chockful of irrefutable evidence like this, and yet the media buried those details in an attempt to keep it hidden from the American people.

Because the mainstream media and our Democratic colleagues had no substance to refute our reports, they reverted to their time-honored tradition of lying, making false accusations against us, and engaging in the politics of personal destruction.

Again, their goal was to destroy the credibility of our reports before the American people even had a chance to read them. They were fully aware that the lie can travel halfway around the world before the truth has a chance to put on its shoes. For example, listen to what New York Times journalist Nicholas Fandos said about our report: "lack of meaningful new information" and, again, "overlap [of the] Russian disinformation campaign."

The then-Democratic minority leader was quoted saying about our report, "as if Putin wrote it, not United States Senators." A Democratic Senator described our investigation as being "rooted in disinformation" from Russian operatives.

Separately, a Democratic Senator also said about our report:

Bottom line: the Johnson-Grassley investigation is baseless. It's laundering Russian propaganda for circulation in the U.S.

But, of course, all those quotes were disinformation, disinformation designed to distract all of us from the truth. As Senator GRASSLEY reiterated, our reports were based almost exclusively on government records from the Obama administration and transcribed interviews of government officials.

So how did the Democrats and the liberal media allies carry out this false attack on us? We describe part of what they did in section 10 of our September 2020 report. Their disinformation and smear campaign against us in our reports was extensive, but in the interest of time, I will give you a shorter Cliff's Notes version.

On July 13, 2020, then-Minority Leader SCHUMER, Senator WARNER, Speaker

PELOSI, and Representative SCHIFF sent a letter to the FBI to express a purported belief that Congress was the subject of a foreign disinformation campaign. The letter included a classified attachment that had unclassified elements that attempted to tie Senator GRASSLEY's and my work to Andriy Derkach, a Russian agent.

The Democrats speculated that, based on this unclassified information, Senator GRASSLEY and I had received materials from Derkach. This was false. Nothing could be further from the truth, but this information purportedly linking Senator GRASSLEY and I to Derkach was leaked to liberal media outlets to start a false narrative to smear us.

Until news reports of this false allegation surfaced, I had never even heard of Andriy Derkach. We immediately and forcefully denied the false allegation, but Democrats and the media continued to spread the lie. To this day, no one has ever apologized to either of us for spreading that lie, even though it was proven conclusively to be a lie and disinformation.

Next, my staff and Senator GRASSLEY's staff did a transcribed interview with George Kent. During that interview, Democratic staff members introduced Derkach's materials into our record. Then Democratic staff members asked Mr. Kent about it. He stated:

What you are asking me to interpret is a master chart of disinformation and malign influence.

That was Mr. Kent's evaluation of the Derkach disinformation that Democrats were spreading that they entered into our record.

So the actual truth of the matter is that Democrats—not Senator GRASSLEY nor I—introduced known Russian disinformation into our investigatory record. They did the exact thing they were falsely accusing us of doing.

Again, not my staff, not Senator GRASSLEY's staff, Democrats were disseminating Russian disinformation just like they did with the Steele dossier. Then-Ranking Members WYDEN and PETERS sent me and Senator GRASSLEY a letter asking for an intelligence briefing relating to our investigation.

Now, such a briefing was completely unnecessary, but it was an effort by our Democratic colleagues to further falsely taint our investigation, hoping to discredit it and discredit the truth.

On July 28, 2020, Senator GRASSLEY and I reminded them that the FBI and relevant members of the intelligence community had already briefed the committees in March of 2020 and assured us that there was no reason to discontinue our investigation.

Then, in August 2020, Senator GRASSLEY and I were provided a briefing from the FBI, a briefing that we did not request that was also leaked to the press to further smear us.

This unsolicited FBI briefing was also not necessary and was completely

irrelevant to the substance of our investigation.

The FBI briefers did tell us that they weren't there to "quash, curtail, or interfere" in our investigation in any way.

No government entity ever warned us that our investigation into the Biden family's financial deals was connected to any kind of Russian disinformation campaign—because it wasn't.

But, again, the substance of that FBI briefing was later leaked and contorted to smear us, which was exactly why we suspect we were given the unsolicited briefing in the first place.

Those briefers promised confidentiality. Clearly, that confidentiality was breached and resulted in another smear operation on Senator GRASSLEY and me to deflect allegations of corruption and conflict of interest that could compromise a President Biden.

To date, we do not know who all was involved in this smear campaign, but even after repeated requests, Director Wray and Director Haines have refused to come in and fully explain who requested and directed this briefing and why it was provided.

I think we know why it was provided.

So to review, senior Democrats and liberal media cooperated to smear Senator GRASSLEY and me with false accusations of receiving and spreading Russian disinformation. They created documents, leaked them, asked for briefings, and then leaked those, too, and then they themselves disseminated Russian disinformation.

You can't make this up.

Fortunately, they failed to discredit our investigation because we stayed true to government records. We stayed true to the facts and the evidence. And the evidence is stunning, and it is growing.

Over the next few days, Senator GRASSLEY and I will come to the floor to present additional evidence that has not yet been made public. These records show extensive connections between the Biden family and elements of the communist Chinese regime. We are talking high-dollar transactions, some of which we have already highlighted in our September and November 2020 reports, but our speeches will introduce new financial documents into the record for all to see.

Now, we expect Democrats and the media to continue to use their power to smear us and cover up for the Bidens. But the truth has a power of its own, and we intend to continue to reveal the truth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to complete my remarks before the vote.

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

H.R. 4521

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I come to the floor tonight happy that

the Senate is going to move forward on substituting what is originally the Senate-passed Schumer-Young bill on the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act. That is what we are going to be voting on and then sending that over to the House of Representatives to basically convey that that is our desire here in the Senate and, hopefully, get this process of going to conference and a response back from the House of Representatives so we can move forward on reinvigorating America's supply chain.

Madam President, I know you know how important this is, but the Senate bill, again, brought to us by Senators SCHUMER and YOUNG, I think, was quite prescient on the problems that we were going to face as it relates to supply chains. But I don't think that everybody really understands that the Senate position is really about the fact that we need to have technology transfer happen at a faster rate; that other countries, because the United States has been such a prolific publisher of information and content, actually have taken that content and information and been able to turn it into actual commercial applications.

So in the United States we want to do something to create, while still protecting NSF, the National Science Foundation, on basic research and advanced research and the Department of Energy on research, and also work faster at translating the successes of our science into true application and translating that into helping our manufacturers here in the United States of America.

This is so important because we know that in various sectors of our economy, we are seeing much of the supply chain controlled in other parts of the world. We see that Asia now controls much of the supply chain for pharmaceuticals.

We are having a big debate about how we are going to drive down the cost of pharmaceuticals. We are going to invest here in the United States, I think, in more biotechnology and synthetic biology to find new ways to discover and make lifesaving drugs, and it is very important that we do that research here.

In the Senate bill, we are very focused on: In what areas do we want to do faster translational science to help bring the supply chain back to the United States?

As we talked last week, we see that Taiwan makes more than 90 percent of the world's leading-edge chips which drive our national security and our economic security, and we want to do the research here in the United States through the acceleration with the Tech Directorate to invent the next generation of chips and build them here domestically.

And we have heard about the risk of Americans falling behind on advanced communications, like 5G or 6G, and so we have ideas here about how to translate that into faster deployment of technology that could help our manufacturing base.

So I am actually very excited about all of that innovation because if we all work together, we collaborate, we have done the R&D, and we actually work harder at getting it translated, I think there are lots of solutions that we can put before our manufacturers here to help them with their competitiveness on a worldwide basis.

That is what the Tech Directorate does. The Manufacturing USA Institutes, the technology hubs, and the technology centers are all parts of this legislation that would help us move technology out into the world at a faster pace and work collaboratively to solve these problems that, again, would bring the manufacturing and the supply chain back into the United States of America.

I get really excited about the issues related to the automobile sector and the grid. Coming from a State that has had cheap electricity for a long time, it has built our economy over and over and over again; that is, that people want to locate there because the electricity is so affordable.

It is one of the reasons why we have one of the highest deployments of electric vehicles in the country, because it really only costs you about a dollar a gallon to fill up versus the rising, well-above \$4 a gallon that we are seeing today.

So people are very excited about an electricity grid and a supply chain here in the United States that would build here the battery technology, implement this faster integration into our economy, and get a grid that works and enables that kind of electrification of the transportation sector.

I guarantee you the United States could be world leaders in the deployment of this if we get this legislation passed and we continue to make investments in the National Science Foundation and the Tech Directorate.

Now, I know some of our colleagues have been concerned that this somehow takes away from the National Science Foundation's focus on basic research. I would tell you that it does both. The Senate bill that we will be voting on does both. It basically continues to invest in the NSF in their traditional role and also gets this idea of a Tech Directorate which focuses on the translational science—again, to help us get more of the supply chain back in the United States. It does both.

This underlying bill, also, as I said, is the Senate version which made the same investment in the Department of Energy, which was so important because the Department of Energy plays such an important aspect in this.

It also does something that my colleague Senator WICKER and I and others worked on, which is trying to make sure that we are getting more technology development in a variety of places; that is, that we are building on STEM and the amount of investment in STEM education—the fact that we want to have innovation everywhere so that opportunity is also anywhere.

And we also make more investments in the idea of our EPSCoR Program, which is helping areas of the United States that may not have as much tech investment, to continue to increase the investment in their institutions.

I hope this is something my colleagues understand, that this is about growing the capacity for us to innovate in many different parts of the United States and across many different sectors of our economy and with increasing the capacity of women and minorities to also participate in the kinds of programs that will help America be competitive.

So I encourage my colleagues to support the underlying Senate bill. Help us get it moved forward and to also send this over on the second vote to the House and continue the process to get us to real negotiations and get us working on these supply chain issues.

I yield the floor.

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 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 amendment No. 5002 to Calendar No. 282, H.R. 4521, a bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Benjamin L. Cardin, Tammy Duckworth, Mark R. Warner, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Mazie Hirono, Mark Kelly, Tammy Baldwin, Jacky Rosen, Ron Wyden, Margaret Wood Hassan, Maria Cantwell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 5002, offered by the Senator from New York, to H.R. 4521, a bill to provide for a coordinated Federal research initiative to ensure continued United States leadership in engineering biology, 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. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) would have voted "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 68, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 108 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Baldwin	Booker	Capito
Bennet	Brown	Cardin
Blumenthal	Cantwell	Carper

Casey	Klobuchar	Rounds
Cassidy	Leahy	Sasse
Collins	Lujan	Schatz
Coons	Manchin	Schumer
Cornyn	Markey	Shaheen
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Sinema
Crapo	Menendez	Smith
Daines	Merkley	Stabenow
Duckworth	Moran	Sullivan
Durbin	Murkowski	Tester
Feinstein	Murphy	Tillis
Gillibrand	Murray	Van Hollen
Grassley	Ossoff	Warner
Hassan	Padilla	Warnock
Heinrich	Peters	Warren
Hickenlooper	Portman	Whitehouse
Hirono	Reed	Wicker
Kaine	Risch	Wyden
Kelly	Romney	Young
King	Rosen	

NAYS—28

Barrasso	Hawley	Rubio
Blackburn	Hoeven	Sanders
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Burr	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Ernst	Lummis	Tuberville
Fischer	Marshall	
Hagerty	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Blunt	Graham
Cotton	Kennedy

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HEINRICH). On this vote, the yeas are 68, the nays are 28.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in a few minutes, the Senate is going to take a final vote on the major bipartisan jobs and competitive legislation.

As we all know, it has been a long road to reach this point. I want to thank my Democratic and Republican colleagues for working in good faith on the bill. Nearly every Member of this Chamber has had a hand in shaping this legislation.

There are three important reasons for passing the bill. It will create more American jobs. It will lower costs for American families. It will help ignite another generation of American scientific research and innovation.

After we pass this bill, we will be one step closer to initiating a conference committee so we can resolve the House and Senate bills. I am hopeful we will be able to reach a conference committee before the end of this work period.

I thank all my colleagues for their good work on this bill and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the motion to commit falls, as inconsistent with cloture; and, under the previous order, the remaining amendments are withdrawn, amendment No. 5002 is agreed to, the cloture motion on the bill is withdrawn, and the bill, as amended, is considered read a third time.

The amendments were withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 5002) was agreed to.

The cloture motion on the bill (H.R. 4521) was withdrawn.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass?

The yeas and nays have been requested.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) would have voted "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 68, nays 28, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 109 Leg.]

YEAS—68

Baldwin	Heinrich	Risch
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Kaine	Rounds
Brown	Kelly	Sasse
Cantwell	King	Schatz
Capito	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Lujan	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Cassidy	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	McConnell	Sullivan
Coons	Menendez	Tester
Cornyn	Merkley	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Moran	Van Hollen
Crapo	Murkowski	Warner
Daines	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Padilla	Wicker
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Grassley	Portman	Young
Hassan	Reed	

NAYS—28

Barrasso	Hawley	Rubio
Blackburn	Hoeven	Sanders
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Braun	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Burr	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Thune
Cruz	Lee	Toomey
Ernst	Lummis	Tuberville
Fischer	Marshall	
Hagerty	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Blunt	Graham
Cotton	Kennedy

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 68, the nays are 28.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for passage of this bill, the bill, as amended, is passed.

The bill (H.R. 4521), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.