

as high as \$300 a dose, and a person suffering from diabetes may need three doses a month—\$900 for insulin.

Well, let's take a comparative cost and take a look at what insulin costs in other countries. The United States, while it is paying \$98 for a dose of insulin—look—Japan is paying \$14; Canada, \$12; Germany, \$11; France, \$9; UK, \$7; Australia, \$6, \$7. And the good news is these are the same companies, the American companies, charging a fraction of the cost to the other countries for insulin. This is one of the drugs which we are working on now, Senator SHAHEEN and others, to bring down the cost.

I am going to close by saying this. If you care about the costs that families face, if you care about inflation, and you care about life-or-death medications, and you want to make them affordable, don't take the position of Senator MCCONNELL that this is socialism to demand negotiation in pricing. Don't take his position that it is just a free lunch to say that people will never have to pay more than \$2,000 a year out of pocket for drugs. This is a life-or-death decision. Even 70 percent of Republicans agree with that.

I wish the Senate Republicans would agree with it and join us in supporting this bill.

#### NOMINATION OF GREGORY BRIAN WILLIAMS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, today, the Senate will continue its vital work of confirming highly qualified judicial nominees to the Federal bench. We will vote on an outstanding district court nominee: Gregory Williams to the District of Delaware.

Mr. Williams is currently a partner at the firm Fox Rothschild LLP, where he has an extensive trial practice that focuses on intellectual property and other matters. Mr. Williams joined the firm immediately after law school, rising through the ranks to become the first African-American equity partner in the firm's history.

In addition to his work in private practice, Mr. Williams has dedicated countless hours to serving the Delaware legal and judicial communities. He has worked as a Special Master in complex civil cases for the District of Delaware; as president of the Delaware State Bar Association; and as chair of the State's judicial nominating commission. A graduate of Millersville University of Pennsylvania and Villanova University School of Law, Mr. Williams received a unanimous "well qualified" rating from the American Bar Association and has the strong support of Delaware's Senators, Mr. CARPER and Mr. COONS. With his depth of experience and impeccable credentials, Mr. Williams will serve Delaware with distinction.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this outstanding nominee. I yield the floor.

#### VOTE ON WILLIAMS NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Williams nomination?

Mr. DURBIN. 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 43, as follows:

#### (Rollcall Vote No. 263 Ex.)

##### YEAS—52

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Padilla
Bennet	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Hassan	Reed
Blunt	Heinrich	Rosen
Booker	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Brown	Hirono	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Capito	Kelly	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carper	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Lujan	Stabenow
Collins	Manchin	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Cramer	Murkowski	Warnock
Duckworth	Murphy	Wyden
Durbin	Murray	
Feinstein	Ossoff	

##### NAYS—43

Barrasso	Hawley	Rounds
Blackburn	Hoeven	Rubio
Blunt	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Boozman	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Braun	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Burr	Lankford	Shelby
Cassidy	Lee	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Thune
Cotton	Marshall	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Toomey
Cruz	Moran	Tuberville
Daines	Paul	Wicker
Ernst	Portman	Young
Fischer	Risch	
Grassley	Romney	
Hagerty		

##### NOT VOTING—5

Kennedy	Markey	Whitehouse
Leahy	Warren	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 actions.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Bernadette M. Meehan, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Pleni-

potentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Chile.

#### VOTE ON MEEHAN NOMINATION

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

Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, 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 Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

#### (Rollcall Vote No. 264 Ex.)

##### YEAS—51

Baldwin	Hassan	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Portman
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Romney
Brown	Kaine	Rosen
Cantwell	Kelly	Sanders
Cardin	King	Schatz
Carper	Klobuchar	Schumer
Casey	Lujan	Shaheen
Collins	Manchin	Sinema
Coons	Menendez	Smith
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Stabenow
Duckworth	Murkowski	Tester
Durbin	Murphy	Van Hollen
Feinstein	Murray	Warner
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warnock
Hagerty	Padilla	Wyden

##### NAYS—44

Barrasso	Fischer	Risch
Blackburn	Graham	Rounds
Blunt	Grassley	Rubio
Boozman	Hawley	Sasse
Braun	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Burr	Hyde-Smith	Scott (SC)
Capito	Inhofe	Shelby
Cassidy	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tillis
Cramer	Lummis	Toomey
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Wicker
Daines	Moran	Young
Ernst	Paul	

##### NOT VOTING—5

Kennedy	Markey	Whitehouse
Leahy	Warren	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). 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 actions.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUESTS—S. 3086 AND S. 4571

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of S. 3086 and the Senate

proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHATZ. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4571, which is at the desk; further, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Across the country, American families are fighting harder every week to make ends meet as they deal with President Biden's raging inflation crisis. Food prices are up. Gas prices remain at unbearably high levels, and too many families are having to make the impossible decision of whether to put gas in the tank or food on the table. It is so tough to be a family in that position.

I know all too well how this feels and the impacts these high prices have on families. I grew up in a poor family, with a mom who worked long hours at her job and also picked up odd jobs just so our family could get by. We never had any extra money, so when prices went up, we had to go without.

Families all across the country are in that same spot. People who have never visited food banks are having to turn to them to feed their families. Folks are being forced to pawn their things just to afford gas. It is heartbreaking and makes me furious. Reports are showing it is happening across America—in Reno, NV; Macon, GA; Yakima, WA; and the cities in my home State of Florida, like Pensacola and Fort Myers. These people have to turn to their local pawn shops as they see their monthly bills grow higher and higher. When President Biden said that we are going through “an incredible transition,” is this what he meant—Mom and Dad having to sell Bobby's PlayStation and Suzy's doll collection just so they can afford to take them to school?

Since day 1, President Biden has led a campaign against energy independence. The White House, EPA, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Energy have done everything in their power to make life more expensive for American families. They have implemented one policy after another to raise the price of gas and make life tougher and tougher for hard-working families.

The American people deserve transparency into Biden's Green New Deal agenda and ought to know why these prices keep going up. That is why I introduced the GAS PRICE Act last October. Even then, far before the horrible war in Ukraine began, gas prices were surging higher.

My bill is pretty simple. It would require the Energy Information Administration to report to Congress on any Federal Agency policies or regulations that it determines will cause energy prices to rise. All it does is ask a Federal Agency to provide information to Congress with a statement of facts on what is causing rising energy prices. Then we can take this information, see what needs to be fixed, and help the American people.

I want to thank Senators MARSHALL, LUMMIS, CAPITO, JOHNSON, MORAN, BLACKBURN, and KENNEDY for cosponsoring this legislation. I also want to thank Senator SULLIVAN and Senator LEE for joining me here on the floor today to talk about the energy inflation Joe Biden is imposing on Americans.

Considering that we, as Senators, are trusted by the people of our States to enact policies that improve their lives, I cannot imagine why anyone would oppose this legislation. Sadly, when I came to the Senate floor last year to pass this bill, Senate Democrats opposed it.

At that time, I noted that the national average cost was \$3.36 per gallon. Sounds like a bargain today. Since then, the price of gas has risen dramatically. The average has increased to \$4.46. In 15 of the 17 months Joe Biden has been in office, the price of gas has risen.

When I introduced my bill in October, President Biden said he didn't “have a near-term answer” for reducing gas prices. Well, clearly not—his answer was to raise prices and continue his radical Green New Deal agenda.

Senate Republicans, meanwhile, do have a plan and have offered solutions. I have introduced the FREE American Energy Act to expedite the Federal Agencies' review process of applications for permits, waivers, licenses, or other authorizations related to energy production. But we can take a simple first step today by giving ourselves more information on rising energy prices and pass my GAS Price Act.

For the sake of American families, we need to figure out what the heck is going on. So while my colleagues on the other side of the aisle blocked my bill from passing last year, my hope was that, as they have watched their constituents suffer for months now under Biden's leadership, they would have a change of heart. Sadly, that is not what happened today. It is an absolute shame what has happened in this Chamber.

I came here with my Republican colleagues to promote and pass legislation that would improve the lives of American people and make America less de-

pendent on foreign oil. We came here asking for answers into Biden's Green New Deal agenda. We are here responding to the pain American families are facing at the gas pump and trying to solve problems.

Senate Democrats, meanwhile, have come here to obstruct and blame shift. They didn't come here to solve problems. They didn't come here with a different proposal that would alleviate gas prices and ensure long-term energy independence and sustainability. They came here to make the problem worse. They want to emulate the policies of Germany and California, where rolling blackouts and energy rations are a looming threat and where gas has spent most of this year at over \$6 per gallon.

This is not the way forward. The Senate need leaders who are going to come in and put Americans first. I am grateful for colleagues like Senator SULLIVAN and Senator LEE, who are here to do that. But I hope the American people have been watching what has happened today and see who it is who really cares about the problems they are facing.

I yield the floor to my colleague from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Thank you to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, President Biden has wasted no time—no time at all—in embarking on his crusade to hamstring American energy production.

On day 1 of his Presidency, President Biden halted all new oil and gas lease sales on Federal land. Now Americans are paying the price. Across the Nation, people struggle to fill their gas tanks, as prices climb to over \$5 a gallon, but there is apparently no need to worry. According to the President, Americans' pain at the pump is merely part of an energy “transition,” as he puts it.

It is important to note here that this transition is a transition away from affordable, reliable fossil fuels.

It is not that high gas prices are a problem to be fixed but, rather, high gas prices somehow are the solution. They are what will facilitate this transition. The President is getting the results that he wants. This is a feature, the ultimate feature. It is the end goal, not a bug in his plan.

Despite this being part of the plan and, in fact, his objective, it didn't take long for the President to realize how unpopular high gasoline prices really are. Now he is trying to take credit for even a slight reduction in gasoline prices. First, by no means is this reduction sufficient. Second, we can't attribute that reduction to the President's policies.

To be clear, placing a moratorium on the sale of oil and gas leases on Federal land is outside the President's authority. If the President actually possessed that authority, he wouldn't have attempted to portray this as a temporary pause. It is clear that this is a thinly veiled attempt to enact the most radical climate policies our country has

ever seen—policies that have never been enacted by Congress and policies that Congress would not enact.

Our suspicions were confirmed when Gina McCarthy, the President's climate adviser, said during an interview: President Biden remains absolutely committed to not moving forward with additional drilling on public lands.

So much for a temporary moratorium.

Confused as to whether Ms. McCarthy's statement represented the administration's policy, I asked Interior Secretary Deb Haaland whether it was indeed the administration's intention to indefinitely pause the sale of all Federal oil and gas leases. She responded: "I don't know."

"I don't know" is not an acceptable answer to the Utah communities who rely on those oil and gas leases. "I don't know" is not an acceptable answer to Americans paying over \$5 a gallon for gas. "I don't know" isn't an answer to the Americans who have found every aspect of their lives rendered unaffordable by this administration's policies, and now this only adds insult to injury.

The American people simply cannot endure President Biden's clear-as-mud policies any longer. I have introduced legislation to reaffirm that under the Mineral Leasing Act, the President of the United States absolutely does not have the authority to hold the country's domestic energy production hostage. Their continued efforts are coming at the expense of struggling families.

The Biden administration is fighting in court for Presidential authority to enact sweeping changes to American energy policy on a whim. While I believe the courts will arrive at the same conclusion, we can act now to ensure citizens and companies receive the certainty they deserve.

We could end this crusade today if we enacted this legislation and get to work securing American energy independence for generations to come. It is for that reason that I was disappointed when my friend and colleague on the other side of the aisle came and objected to passing this by unanimous consent today. It does, in fact, state what the law already provides anyway. It shouldn't hurt us to make it obvious. Yet he objected even though this policy is harming the American people.

It is disappointing that it had to end this way today, but this is not over. No, we will be back. We will be back as often and for as long as it takes in order to give the American people the relief that they need and that they definitely deserve.

Now I yield the time to my friend and colleague, the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Thank you to my friends from the great State of Utah and the great State of Florida, Senator SCOTT and Senator LEE.

Mr. President, I want to explain to any American who is watching just what happened here because, to be honest, it is kind of shocking what just took place.

Senator SCOTT came down to the floor. He had a bill, S. 3086. Normally when you have a bill that is considered pretty noncontroversial, you can come down and do what is called a unanimous consent, which is you ask the Senate: Do you want to pass the bill? And if anyone objects, they actually have to come down and object in the Senate Chamber.

So what does S. 3086 bill do? Here is the language: "to require the Energy Information Administration to submit to Congress and make publicly available an annual report on Federal Agency policies and regulations and Executive orders that have increased or may increase energy prices in the United States." That is it. That is it. That is the bill. It is one page—less than one page. It is two paragraphs.

All we were doing was asking, why are energy prices in America going through the roof, and is the Federal Government contributing to that through its actions and regulations? It is a really important question. Why is it an important question? It is an important question because when you get out of this bubble in DC and you go home—like I was just home in Alaska last weekend—energy costs and inflation are the No. 1 issue hurting American families—the No. 1 issue. So shouldn't we in the Senate want to know why it is happening?

Now, look, what else happened here—a little bit of inside baseball in the Senate—when a Senator comes down and objects to a UC, usually he gives a strong reason why—strong: Here is my reason why this bill is bad for the country, and I am going to object.

You may have seen my colleague object and say "I am getting the heck out of here; I am not going to explain this" because there is no reason to object to this—none. So he objected and left. He didn't try to defend objecting to this, because every American wants to know.

It is the biggest issue back home, but here is another reason we need the bill: because this President has come up with excuse after excuse after excuse on why energy costs since he got into office have gone through the roof. Let me give you a couple of examples.

He first said: Well, we are emerging from the pandemic, and the supply chain couldn't keep up with demand.

All right, if that is really true, let the Energy Information Administration—of the Biden administration, by the way—see if that is one of the reasons.

OK. Then he said: Well, shoot, the pandemic is kind of over so it is Putin's invasion of Ukraine that is driving the increase in energy prices. Putin's unprovoked, brutal war—which it is unprovoked and brutal—has led to higher energy prices.

And President Biden then started to say it is Putin's price hike. No one is buying that one either because energy prices were spiking way before the brutal invasion of Ukraine.

So then the President started saying: Well, it is COVID and Putin. OK. Then

he started blaming the oil companies. Then he started to say: Well, we have all these amazing permits that we want the oil companies drilling on, but they are not using them.

So we need Senator SCOTT's legislation because the Biden administration, the President himself, has put out all these ideas on why Americans are getting crushed by inflation and high costs at the pump. Yet the one thing the President hasn't done, has never talked about, is he hasn't looked internally and said: Hmm, maybe it is my own administration's policies that are driving up energy costs. Maybe. By the way, it is not maybe; it is certainly. And my colleagues have talked about this. Heck, I talked about this earlier today. I talk about it every day because it is crushing my home State and my constituents.

But what we want the Energy Information Administration to look at is possibly these reasons: Day 1, this administration came in and said: We are going to limit production of American energy.

Anyone who went to econ 101 in college knows that when you start to limit supply, prices go up. Well, that is a culprit.

No. 2, from day 1, they said: We are going to shut down, kill, and delay moving energy through infrastructure—pipelines, LNG terminals. They are doing that all the time. So that is a policy, those are Executive orders limiting the ability to move energy. That sends up costs.

No. 3 is that they have actively gone to the American financial sector—the Biden administration—and told them not to invest in American energy, choking off capital. That increases prices.

So Senator SCOTT's bill would simply ask the experts in the Federal Government, the Energy Information Administration, to just take a look: What is driving up the cost of American energy? What is crushing middle-class working families?

And the reason my colleague objected and then ran off the floor without saying anything is because everybody here knows what the answer is going to be: Joe Biden has done this. It is his policies that are driving up energy costs.

And here is the thing that Senator LEE touched on, and this is the thing that should scare everybody. It is likely purposeful. Pain is the point. They are all talking about this wonderful, glorious transition. Gina McCarthy talks about: Hey, if the prices go up, it will accelerate the transition to renewables. They don't give a damn about the people who are suffering. It is all this green utopia stuff.

All we are asking for is what is driving up the cost of energy on the backs of working-class Americans? That is it. A two-paragraph bill, and my colleagues came and objected to it. And

every American should know this. They don't want you to know what we all know, which is this: The pain at the pump is the purposeful policies of the Biden administration, and the American people are paying for it.

We want the Federal Government to look into the details of this, and the Democrats were just now objecting to that transparent information request. And, in my view, it is shameful.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

(The remarks of Mr. MANCHIN and Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 4573 and S. 4574 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Ms. COLLINS. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, if this body were to look at the tests and the homework, the quizzes, and the essays of the Department of Homeland Security and give them a grade based on their performance for the last year and a half, what would the grade be?

DHS says they have six missions, and they detail out those missions. One of those missions reads: Secure U.S. borders and approaches. Then they give this little piece behind it to describe that.

The Department of Homeland Security secures the Nation's air, land, and sea borders to prevent illegal activity while facilitating lawful travel and trade. What would their grade be on that? And is anyone going to hold them to account for their grade or is this body going to continue to just ignore what is happening on the southern border?

It is the role, it is the task, it is the responsibility of the Department of Homeland Security to help secure our Nation, but this Department is currently facilitating illegal immigration, not stopping illegal immigration.

I wish I was wrong on that, but I am not. In fact, as recent as the last 2 weeks, I met with DHS leadership who described to me the new method they have laid out so you can apply for asylum, come to the United States and come to any airport in the country. So you wouldn't have to come through the southern border; you would just come in. But it would be the same process as what is happening on the southern border where people from 150 countries just this year have crossed our border. They have been checked in by Border Patrol, who know full well they are not legally present here. Then they are released into the country and given 8 years until their hearing—8 years.

Instead of responding to be able to slow down the more than 2 million people who have illegally crossed in just the last year, this administration is actually working to say it is actually not enough people. They are increasing the access points to increase the number of people rather than decrease.

The administration was proud to be able to say in May and in June that the numbers went down slightly from what they were in the previous months. The problem with that is, the previous month was a record, and so was the month before that. If you look at just the June number that, yes, was slightly down from May, it is still the highest June ever recorded by the administration.

We are being overwhelmed with the number of people coming in illegally across our border. The administration is currently releasing people, and their sole focus seems to be on making illegal immigration more efficient rather than more enforced.

What grade would you give DHS? A more specific question: Mr. President, do you want to stop illegal immigration? Because I don't think you do. And I think it is clear that the policies you put in place are directly leading to this record influx of illegal immigration from all over the world.

I wish you could even say: Well, at least we vetted them, but I know that is not true, and so do you. Not a single one of these people entering the country has their criminal background check from the country they are from. We are doing a quick fingerprint analysis to see if they have committed a crime here, but we have no idea of the 150 countries-plus that they are coming from because right now the goal is not to check their criminal history; it is to get them released in the country within 8 hours. Keep it moving. Keep it moving. You don't want to have a clog up at the border. When they cross the border, the goal is to just keep them moving into the country.

Last weekend, I spent the weekend again at our southern border. Serving on the Homeland Security Committee, I spend a lot of time back and forth across that border to be able to evaluate what is happening now because it changes from week to week.

I was in the Rio Grande Valley last weekend spending time with CBP, the Border Patrol, individuals from Air and Marine Operations, from the Department of DPS in Texas, from the National Guard. All of them expressed incredible frustration.

When I got there last Thursday night late, we went on a midnight patrol with Border Patrol. Literally within minutes, we ran through our first group of folks coming across the border, a group of teenagers. Minutes later, literally while that group was being processed, another group was interdicted coming across the border not far away. This time it was 6- and 7-year-old children and a couple of families. While we watched them being processed, they called us on the radio and said that about 2 miles down, they just picked up another group. This time, it was adults, including one pregnant lady who was deep into her eighth month coming across the border to make sure she delivered here in the United States.

One hundred fifty-plus countries just this year are crossing the border because it is open.

I hear the Secretary of DHS say they have secured the border. As I just came from the border, I wonder when the President of the United States is going to actually go to the border to be able to see what is actually happening on the border and the policies they put in place, because so far the President has been able to make it to Saudi Arabia but has not been able to make it to our own southern border to even look once at what is happening on our southern border.

If he goes—someday, I hope—I hope he meets with Border Patrol because the Border Patrol agents I talk to tell me about a time when the border was secure. They tell me about a time not long ago that we added forcible borders and where the policy wasn't to release within hours and the enforcement priority wasn't to get them moving as fast as possible; it was to actually secure the border.

You could meet with the landowners, like I did last weekend, who live in that area. Some of them have lived there for generations, and they are absolutely furious because although they have lived there—and their family—for generations, they have never ever experienced this.

They tell me about how, when they were children, they used to play in this area, and now literally they will not walk out their own door without a firearm on their hip. They told me about multiple vehicles being stolen from their property, windows being smashed at all hours of the day and night, and people walking up to their windows and peering inside.

One rancher told me about his wife, who is pregnant, and his child, who is 2—how they literally fear for their lives every day because of the number of people who are coming across their property and for him personally, the number of dead bodies that they found on their property just this year. This wasn't happening before.

They had a very simple request. Their simple request was: I am an American. Why does my property not count? Why do my rights not count?

The only rights that seem to count are people who are illegally crossing the border. Their rights seem to count, but the rights of Americans do not.

Mr. President, would you be willing to answer his question? Would you be willing to talk to his wife and explain to her why there are bodies on their ranch and people are peering in their windows at all hours and they can't live in safety on their own ranch? That was different just 3 years ago. Would you be willing to explain to them what has changed in your policies, because the goal of this administration seems to be efficient movement of illegal immigration, not stopping illegal immigration.

I met this Monday with leadership from the Oklahoma Bureau of Narcotics, who explained to me about the

overwhelming amount of methamphetamine that is coming into my State and the number of people who are dying in my State because much of the meth is laced with fentanyl, and it is killing people in my State.

I asked them if the meth is being cooked in Oklahoma, as it used to be, and they said: No, we hardly ever find a lab making meth anymore. It is all coming from Mexico—all of it.

Mexican cartels are actively working in my State to distribute methamphetamine, partnering with Chinese groups who are doing not only the supplies but the distribution network in my State.

When I was in the Rio Grande Valley this weekend, individuals with Customs and Border Protection showed me the numbers. Just this year, just in the Rio Grande Valley, 144 pounds of fentanyl has come in and 27,550 pounds of meth that they have interdicted just in the Rio Grande Valley just this year. Let me run that past you again: 27,550 pounds just in that one area, just this year.

Oklahoma Bureau of Narcotics has explained to me that if you go back to 2020, we didn't have the drugs moving this way because the border was not open at that time. Now the drugs are flooding into our State because the border is open.

What grade would you give the Department of Homeland Security when they are allowing our country to be flooded with drugs, when they are choosing to make illegal immigration more efficient rather than stopping illegal immigration? What grade would you give them?

When is this going to change?

I have to tell you, I believe one of the main roles of the Department of Homeland Security is to be able to shut down transnational criminal organizations from functioning inside my State, but instead, just in the Rio Grande Valley, when I talked to them this week, just in that one sector, they estimate that the cartels make \$153 million a week—\$153 million a week just in that area of the Rio Grande Valley, moving people across the border illegally, because each of them has to pay the cartels. In fact, we saw the wristbands that they all wear. Once they pay the cartels, they are marked that they can actually be moved across the border; they paid their amount.

That is \$153 million a week the Biden administration is facilitating in payment to transnational criminal organizations just moving people, based on a liberal policy of "We are going to open the border up to be nice." That policy is facilitating the cartels in Mexico being enriched. They make more a week—a week—in moving people than is the budget for Border Patrol in a year in that area. That is all being facilitated based on this administration making it easier to cross the border and more efficient to cross the border than stopping it.

I am tired of hearing about the number of people who illegally cross the

border. And many in this body just ignore it. I am tired of hearing from the FBI in my State that the price of methamphetamine is going down in my State. It seems like the price of gasoline has soared, the price of food has soared, the price of housing has soared, but the price of meth is going down. Why would that be? Because the supply of meth is going up because it is coming from the cartels in Mexico, and this administration is just looking the other way.

When is this administration going to talk to the landowners in South Texas like I did and hear from them the threats that they face? They are American citizens. When does their life matter?

It is time we address this issue. It is time we actually step up and say that DHS is failing in its most basic task of securing the Nation.

It is time we stopped the illegal drugs coming into our country and killing our kids. It is time. And I am going to continue to come to this floor and to show what the media will not show anymore. They have looked away, and my Democratic colleagues have done the same. They just look away like it doesn't exist, while 2 million people illegally cross the border.

One more stat: Right now, we have somewhere between 4,500 and 8,000 people a day illegally crossing the border—between 4,500 and 8,000 a day illegally crossing the border. May I remind you, President Biden, years ago, called it a humanitarian crisis when 2,000 people a day crossed the border. Now we have between 4,500 and 8,000 a day, day after day after day.

This administration is not only opening up the borders, they have also changed the enforcement priorities here in the United States. So we have round numbers—6,000 people a day illegally entering the country. The Biden administration has changed the role for ICE in deportations. We are currently allowing 6,000 people a day to cross the border, but we are only deporting 161 people a day from the country.

Six thousand a day, every day, day after day after day, illegally coming into the country; 161 people now that we are deporting a day. What would be your grade for DHS in their task of securing the country?

I know what mine is. It is time this body actually does something rather than just look away.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

#### BUDGET RESOLUTION

Mr. BRAUN. Madam President, I come to the floor this evening—I have been talking about this subject for nearly the 3½ years I have been a Senator. And I will tell you why I think it is important.

We have grown the Federal Government to a level where all the people who look to it, where they are dependent upon it, try to work with it, need

to know honestly where this all ends up if we do not change the trajectory.

I think the easiest way to understand how we have gotten to where we are now is to look to what we used to do in the past.

The country was never founded upon the principles that you borrow money to consume it. Any household, any local or State government knows you can't be successful doing that.

Money should only be borrowed if you are going to invest it or get a tangible return on it; even maybe an intangible one, when you look at investing in education or something like that.

But there has been no system that has ever worked that ends up borrowing money from the future, from its kids and grandkids, to where that is a good business plan. You get immediately derailed in the real world. Imagine in a household, if you take in money and you spend 20 percent more than whatever that is, you will go to a financial counselor. They may get you out of trouble. You keep doing it, you end up in bankruptcy court.

Businesses have the rigor of competition in addition to earning revenues, balancing their own budgets, and being able to invest into the future.

If you follow principles that work everywhere else, it can work here, too, and we owe it to the American public. Like I said earlier, so many look to this place to be their partner in some fashion, and it ought to be one that is going to be there in the future.

Let's look where we have come.

From the founding of the country, we raise revenues, generally, on the basis of need. You would go into debt; you would pay it off.

If you look at 1920, World War I—it is way over here—you borrowed money, defend the country, save others, and you paid it off.

Look what happened during the Great Depression, World War II. That is the deepest we have ever been in debt until we just eclipsed it recently. That is generally measured by how much debt you have as a percentage of your GDP—Great Depression; World War II.

Look where we went after that.

We were savers. We were investors then. We weren't consumers and spenders by nature, and we especially didn't do it through the Federal Government. We kept our debt in check. Even through the great recession, which occurred 2008, 2009, you were starting to see problems crop up. That happened when we put two wars on a credit card.

Like the other side of the aisle said: Well, if you are going to do that, there are a lot of needs in our own country, and certainly there are, from healthcare, education, across the spectrum—Social Security, Medicare.

Look what has happened since then. We have gone from being in relatively good shape pre-Gulf war, Afghanistan. We borrowed that money and then ran into the great recession and spent what

seems like very little compared to how significant that was—\$800 to \$900 billion.

And from that time to the present, I think we just said: We are borrowing money, and we might as well do more. And then you start doing it for things that don't make sense.

I got here 3½ years ago, 18 trillion in debt. We were just approaching the percentage coming out of World War II. Here. We have now passed that and doubling down and going way beyond that.

We are now, here, after the pandemic, where we spent close to \$4 trillion in 2020—a lot of it out of uncertainty. We didn't know much about it. We should have treated that with respect. We now know a lot about it, and we probably didn't need to shut the economy down, which cost us a lot, but we are through it. We certainly shouldn't have doubled down and spent another 3 trillion in 2021.

I am not going to go over—you hear it on the news, you see it. We have got inflation embedded in the economy currently. The last time this occurred, back in the late seventies and the early eighties, when inflation peaked around 10 or 11 percent, it took 5 years to get it back to 2 percent, where we were pre-COVID. We can expect probably something similar. We don't know.

The big difference between now and then is we have got a lot more debt, especially in government, so it is going to be trickier.

So how do we get out of it?

Well, unless we turn the tide, unless we start doing things differently, Medicare, which isn't even being addressed here, has completely depleted its trust fund in about 4½ or 5 years—automatic benefit cuts when that occurs.

Social Security, which has been around since the Depression paying into it, that is depleted in about 10 years.

Those are two large trust funds that will have no balance in them, and then you would have to borrow even more money to pay the benefits.

Let's show a comparison of where we stack up now with other major economies.

Look at that. We have known for a long time Japan, which is the third largest economy, has struggled to figure out how it is going to grow, how it is going to do for future generations what it has done since World War II. It has taken debt to where it is a stranglehold on its economy. Its debt is 237 percent of its GDP.

Now look who is in second place, and this isn't something you want to be in second place on—United States. Our debt currently is 107 percent of our GDP.

India, Germany, China—China, our main geopolitical competitor, under half of the sovereign debt as a percentage of its GDP. That is not a good place to be. They are our geopolitical competitor, and I sense they know that you need to be savers and investors if

you are going to be successful in the future, if you are going to give your people what they are going to need out of a government.

Financially, we are going to be up against them, and they, to me, look like they are doing a lot of things that someday pivot to where we are caught by surprise, and then you don't have the options. We start increasing to be more indebted than what we are, it will be even harder to compete with somebody like them.

We now have a 9.1-percent inflation rate. That is a pay cut for everyone. We now know, I think, what caused it. We need to just quit digging the hole deeper. Let's get out of it. Let's go back to what we know was working, at least financially, pre-COVID. We had no inflation, nominal that is built into what is considered zero inflation, wages rising in the toughest places, and a growth rate that was better than what we had before, close to 3 percent.

We need to start spending less through government, return the productive capacity back to the private sector, and then look at—once we get the ship righted here—what we do better policywise. I am a believer. We need to fix healthcare; it is a broken system. It drives our structural deficits more than anything. Medicare each year—like Warren Buffett says, healthcare in general is a tapeworm on the economy.

What I want to do is face reality. Regardless of the tax rate, over 50 years, we average about 17½ percent of our GDP in Federal Government revenues. If that is all you can get, regardless if you have high tax rates that gives you a lower economic growth or lower tax rates that maybe gives you a percent or more in economic growth, we need to acknowledge it.

My plan does two simple things: acknowledges what our revenue has been over 50 years—17½ percent of our GDP—tapers what we spend into it, takes what we have done here as a maneuver to escape budgeting and appropriating by putting spending on mandatory versus discretionary, which is nothing other than saying: I don't want to budget. I don't want to allocate resources. We are just going to do more each year.

If we keep doing it, we are not going to be able to fund the programs that we all consider important.

So it acknowledges a reasonable revenue level. It moves 375 billion that used to be discretionary that is now mandatory back to discretionary. And then it is going to be up to all of us, as stewards of the Federal Government, to see how we are going to make the right decisions to take that amount and get it down to where we cut it out of the budget.

That would put us, in 10 years, in primary balance, meaning that the only thing that contributes to our deficit is our interest. It would clearly show, too, how the big drivers of our current deficit—Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid, other mandatory spending features—are driving it.

And, yes, if we want to get to a real balanced budget that covers your interest, you would have to actually find ways to do the same things with less money.

Defense is always a topic on my side of the aisle. This spends on defense—arguably the most important thing we need to do as a Federal Government. I think there is a lot of bipartisan interest in defending our country and financing it accordingly. This spends on defense above the CBO line and gets its numbers from the Senate Armed Services Committee, plugs it in.

It is going to be more robust there than what the CBO has by a little bit because I am a believer that what has driven this issue over the long run is what I call the unholy alliance. Folks on my side, whatever it takes, will spend it on defense. I said it is the most important thing we do. Medicare, Social Security, Medicaid—those are important too. They are going broke over time. So we need to work on all of that to rein it in. But defense, the most important thing, is going to be at a level that keeps us secure.

If we don't exercise fiscal restraint, if we don't make the tough decisions that everybody does in running their own budgets, whether it is in a business, a local or State government or even a household, it is going to be a hard landing someday that none of us will like.

A lot of what is about running anything successfully is having a good plan. I don't think our plan makes sense for the future.

But the other component—and I will never forget the first budget meeting I was in here. One of the Senators said: Mike, the reason this keeps coming back and back is we do not have political will.

And whether it is political will that you need to make things work here, whether it is determination, whatever you want to call it—it is the marketplace when you run a business, it is a balanced budget amendment in statute when you have got a State government—there has got to be more discipline.

Let's put that last chart up here.

And I want to re-emphasize, because I got some on my side that think we are not being robust enough on defense. We just looked at that chart where it is the most robust. But I want to go back to this one again. This one says it all. Look at where we have come from where the “greatest generation” left us. Remember, they paid off the debt from World War II and built the Interstate Highway System—to where we are now in literally 40 years.

That is shameful.

All I am saying is, my budget makes it to where we have got 10 years. We don't even have to cover the interest, but we need to bring it back into what is called primary balance.

I would hope we have some friends on the other side of the aisle that see that this makes sense, because we will need it for their priorities. All I can tell you

is, if we have to remediate this by running the system into the ditch, it will be a lot harder of a proposition to get it back to where it was when the greatest generation left us in good shape.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MURPHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader following consultation with the Republican leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 399, H.R. 7776; that the Carper-Capito-Cardin-Cramer substitute No. 5140 be considered and agreed to; that there be up to 1 hour of debate, equally divided in the usual form, that upon the use or yielding back of time, if a budget point of order is made, the Senate vote on the motion to waive; and that if the point of order is waived, the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill with 60 affirmative votes required for passage; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I might just add: What is all this about? It is about the Water Resources Development Act. We are trying to move it along and expedite it. I want to thank everybody. Senator CAPITO I notice is on the floor, but Senator CARDIN is here and Senator CRAMER as well. Many thanks to all of them and to the leadership on both sides of the aisle. It is important legislation. We are happy to get it moving.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

#### SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2023 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2024 THROUGH 2032—Motion To Proceed

Mr. BRAUN. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 448, S. Con. Res. 43.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 448, S. Con. Res. 43, a concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2023 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2024 through 2032.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to proceed.

Mr. CARDIN. 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 bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY).

The result was announced—yeas 34, nays 63, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 265 Leg.]

#### YEAS—34

Barrasso	Fischer	Romney
Blackburn	Grassley	Rubio
Blunt	Hagerty	Scott (FL)
Boozman	Hawley	Scott (SC)
Braun	Hoeven	Sullivan
Cassidy	Johnson	Thune
Cornyn	Lankford	Tillis
Cotton	Lee	Toomey
Crapo	Lummis	Tuberville
Cruz	Marshall	Young
Daines	Moran	
Ernst	Risch	

#### NAYS—63

Baldwin	Heinrich	Peters
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Portman
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Hyde-Smith	Rosen
Brown	Inhofe	Rounds
Burr	Kaine	Sanders
Cantwell	Kelly	Sasse
Capito	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Luján	Shaheen
Casey	Manchin	Shelby
Collins	Markley	Sinema
Coons	McConnell	Smith
Cortez Masto	Menendez	Stabenow
Cramer	Merkley	Tester
Duckworth	Murkowski	Van Hollen
Durbin	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warnock
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Warren
Graham	Padilla	Wicker
Hassan	Paul	Wyden

#### NOT VOTING—3

Kennedy	Leahy	Whitehouse
---------	-------	------------

The motion was rejected.

(Mr. OSSOFF assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). The majority leader.

#### CHIPS ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, as I announced earlier today, in a few moments, I will file cloture on a major piece of legislation that will help our country lower costs, increase American manufacturing, strengthen supply chains, and preserve American competitiveness on into the 21st century. It is a very significant piece of legislation, and it will ensure that America and the American economy remain No. 1 on into the 21st century.

Specifically, our chips-plus package will now include incentives for domestic microchip projection, including ITC; support for our wireless communication supply chain—ORAN—and bil-

lions dedicated to scientific research, which includes many of the provisions Senator YOUNG and I authored in the Endless Frontier Act in partnership 2 years ago.

By filing cloture tonight, we are keeping this bill on track for final passage very soon. There has been strong bipartisan support already behind this legislation so I hope we can come to an agreement to get it done as quickly as it can because it is so important for the future of the country.

Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany H.R. 4346, a bill making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes.

#### Pending:

Schumer motion to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate to the bill, with Schumer amendment No. 5135 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment), relating to the CHIPS Act of 2022.

Schumer amendment No. 5136 (to amendment No. 5135), to add an effective date.

Schumer motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with instructions, Schumer amendment No. 5137, to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 5138 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 5137), to modify the effective date.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

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 legislative 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 motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4346, a bill making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, with amendment No. 5135.

Charles E. Schumer, Maria Cantwell, Ben Ray Luján, Jon Tester, Richard Blumenthal, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Tina Smith, John W. Hickenlooper, Mazie Hirono, Mark R. Warner, Debbie Stabenow, Jack Reed, Tammy Baldwin, Jacky Rosen, Raphael G. Warnock, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 996, Carmen G. Cantor, of Puerto Rico, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Interior; that the Senate