



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 25, 2022

No. 123

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, July 26, 2022, at 12 p.m.

Senate

MONDAY, JULY 25, 2022

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Honorable MAZIE K. HIRONO, a Senator from the State of Hawaii.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, the judge of our desires and faults, You have withheld nothing we need. Today, continue to meet the needs of our lawmakers. Give them so much more than they expect that they will rejoice because of Your goodness. May their rejoicing and gratitude empower them to face the challenges and seize the opportunities of these turbulent times. Provide them with faith, courage, and good will to make the world a better place. Lord, use our Senators as Your servants to bring healing to our Nation and world.

We pray in Your powerful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. LEAHY).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, July 25, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable MAZIE K. HIRONO, a Senator from the State of Hawaii, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Ms. HIRONO thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

SERGEANT FIRST CLASS HEATH ROBINSON HONORING OUR PROMISE TO ADDRESS COMPREHENSIVE TOXICS ACT OF 2022

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the House message to accompany S. 3373, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

House message to accompany S. 3373, a bill to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service

Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant.

Pending:

Schumer motion to concur in the House amendment to the bill.

Schumer motion to concur in the House amendment to the bill, with Schumer amendment No. 5148 (to the House amendment to the Senate amendment), to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 5149 (to Schumer amendment No. 5148), to modify the effective date.

Schumer motion to refer the bill to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with instructions, Schumer amendment No. 5150, to add an effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 5151 (to the instructions (Schumer amendment No. 5150) of the motion to refer), to modify the effective date.

Schumer amendment No. 5152 (to amendment No. 5151), to modify the effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, the Senate gavels back in for another busy week of an exceedingly busy work period. There is a lot we must continue working on to lower costs for the American people; strengthen healthcare and prescription drug costs, make sure they are low; confirm highly qualified nominees; protect our fundamental rights; and fortify U.S. national security interests. None of this is easy, but we are moving ahead.

In a few hours, the Senate will take another important step towards finally passing our bipartisan chips and innovation bill by voting to invoke cloture.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S3619

After more than a year of hard work on fixing U.S. chip supplies and boosting American scientific innovation, we are on the brink of closing the book and passing these critical investments into law.

If cloture is invoked, Members should plan to vote on final passage as early as tomorrow evening or Wednesday.

When signed into law, the impacts of this bipartisan chips and innovation bill will last years, if not decades. It will mean an increase in American jobs, increased manufacturing here at home, relief for our supply chains, and lower costs for the American people.

Of course, we will also preserve America's security interests. One of the most important struggles of this century will be the fight for global semiconductor supply. Sadly, America is lagging behind. A recent article from the Wall Street Journal revealed that the Chinese Communist Party is planning 31 major semiconductor fabs planned over the next few years in a bid to become the world's leader in new chip factories. American chip producers are working hard to match this output, but they are waiting for Congress to finish work on this bill. Tens of billions of dollars and countless good-paying jobs are at stake. For that reason, I am glad we are close to pushing this bill over the goal line.

Of course, there is a lot more to celebrate about this bill. The bipartisan science provisions—many of which I authored in partnership with Senator YOUNG under the Endless Frontier Act more than 2 years ago—will unleash a new wave of American scientific innovation that will last and create millions of good-paying jobs for decades to come.

We will invest tens of billions to strengthen the National Science Foundation and plant seeds to cultivate the tech hubs of tomorrow in regions of the country that have tremendous potential but have long been overlooked. When we invest in science jobs, that will keep America No. 1.

For decades, the United States was consistently the world leader in innovation and scientific research because we made the investments necessary to stay on top, and the result was millions and millions of good-paying jobs that made us the strongest economy on Earth, the envy of the world. In the last decade, unfortunately, we have slipped from our place on the mountaintop. This bill will help us recapture that goal and that dream.

The 21st century will be won or lost on the battleground of technological innovation. This is perhaps the most competitive era in human history. Will American workers, will American tech, will American ingenuity shape the world over the next hundred years in the same way that we have shaped it in the last hundred?

I believe we can. I believe we must. When we pass this bill, I believe we will. Let's move forward today.

HEALTHCARE

Madam President, now on healthcare reforms and reconciliation: Senate Democrats continue our work to advance legislation that will lower costs and improve the lives of tens of millions of American families.

Last week, Democrats and Republicans held our bipartisan prescription drugs Byrd bath meetings with the Parliamentarian. As a reminder, this important preliminary step will clear the way for passing our reforms through the reconciliation process. I want to thank Chairs WYDEN, SANDERS, and MURRAY and the tireless work of their Finance, Budget, and HELP Committee staffs for working around the clock on this important effort.

If you want to fight inflation, then you should support passing this much needed proposal on lowering prescription drug costs. Here is why: For the first time ever, we will empower Medicare to negotiate the price of many expensive and vital prescription drugs, directly lowering what patients and taxpayers pay for these drugs. We will cap Americans' out-of-pocket drug expenses to \$2,000 a year. Medicare will offer free vaccines and additional support for the low-income elderly. And, crucially, we will ensure that millions don't see their healthcare premiums skyrocket in the coming months.

Let me say it again because it is key, and I say it to our Republican colleagues across the aisle. If you want to help Americans better afford their healthcare and medications, then you should support passing this bill.

United States citizens pay more, on average, for prescription drugs than any other people on Earth, all for the exact same medicines that other countries use. The Democratic plan will finally help change that.

Too many in this country find themselves in the confounding indignity of having to choose between getting their prescription drugs filled or putting food on the table for their families. The Democrats' plan will finally help change that.

And even as working Americans struggle to afford high-quality healthcare and medications, the Nation's largest pharmaceutical companies face little accountability for jacking up prices on consumers. Again, the Democrats' plan will help change that.

For months, we have heard Republicans complain and complain about the need to lower costs for the American people. Well, Democrats will present the Senate with a proposal that will do precisely that in a very big way. What will they choose on the other side of the aisle? Will they work with us to lower the costs for prescription medications? Will they shore up our healthcare system and prevent devastating price hikes? Will they finally join us holding Big Pharma accountable?

This isn't complicated. Senators can vote to lower costs, or they can vote for higher costs. The American people will be watching.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

INFLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, for the past year and a half, Washington Democrats have continually found new ways to be wrong about the U.S. economy. Last springtime, Democrats insisted their plan to dump \$1.9 trillion onto the economy would not cause inflation.

Here was the Democratic leader in March of 2021:

I do not think the dangers of inflation, at least in the near term, are very real.

And here was President Biden:

The biggest risk is not going too big . . . it's if we go too small."

Well, obviously, they were entirely wrong. Their reckless spending fueled the worst inflation in 40 years. As Ms. Alvarado, a teacher and mother of three, explained to a reporter—here is what she said:

When I say, "OK, we cannot buy anything this week or else we'll go into overdraft," [my husband] says, "No, what are you talking about? We're both working. That shouldn't happen."

Well, it shouldn't have happened, but it is exactly what Democrats' policies have inflicted on working families in this country.

Every time I fill up our van, I'm flabbergasted—

Ms. Alvarado explains—

I'm always worrying. . . . I can postpone the mortgage by two weeks, but then it becomes two more weeks, and then all of a sudden they're calling you.

After Democrats' policies that did cause inflation, they moved on to their next wrong prediction. President Biden admitted inflation did, in fact, exist but said it was "expected to be temporary." That one didn't work out either. That was over a year ago.

Then, 7 months ago, in early December, President Biden promised inflation had peaked—wrong again. It didn't peak in December. It just kept getting worse. Inflation set a fresh new 40-year high just last month.

These same folks are preparing for yet another battle against reality. In advance of the GDP numbers coming out later this week, the Biden administration has begun their latest project: a frantic effort to redefine the word "recession." The White House published a whole explanation insisting that even if the new data suggested our country is in recession, we actually won't be.

It is almost beyond satire. The White House isn't focusing their energies on

correcting their mistakes and making the economy better for working families who are hurting. Instead, their priority is telling everybody things aren't as bad as they look or feel. They want working Americans like Ms. Alvarado to believe Democrats' spin instead of their own lying eyes.

I guess the whopping 42 percent of Americans who say they are struggling to stay where they are financially are supposed to read the White House press release and cheer up. The same people who said inflation wouldn't happen and then said it would be transitory and then said it had peaked last year are now insisting we aren't heading into a recession. Well, draw your own conclusions.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Madam President, on another matter, staring down the barrel of the economic disaster they have created, Washington Democrats still don't appear to be pumping the brakes on their reckless agenda. For example, the same Democrats who spent our country into inflation are now angling to regulate our medical cures industry into fewer new cures and fewer lifesaving treatments.

American researchers and manufacturers are the driving force behind cutting-edge treatments that the entire world relies on. American innovators are leading the races to cure terminal illnesses like Parkinson's and Alzheimer's.

The entire world benefits from our genius, but, in particular, the American people get first and fastest access to the latest new treatments, cures, and medical marvels. But the Democrats' pursuit of prescription drug socialism could put all of this at risk.

Arbitrary, top-down, government price controls would dry out the wells of American innovation to the tune of hundreds of billions of dollars in lost research and development, and American patients would feel the pain. The cost of breakthrough cures is measured in dollars, but the cost of neglecting them would be measured in lost years of American life.

One academic analysis pegged that true cost at a cumulative 331.5 million years.

Let me say that again: One expert says the negative effects of Democrats' proposal on medical research would cost a collective total of 331.5 million cumulative years of life.

In other words, their proposal would eventually destroy as many years of Americans' lives as there are Americans to live them.

Just 2 years ago, Democrats were lining up with Republicans and the rest of the country to cheer the American researchers and innovators who were driving the race for a COVID-19 vaccine—a race they finished in record time.

The American people know what it looks like when lifesaving advances happen right here at home. Unfortunately, they may be about to find what happens when they don't.

BURMA

Madam President, now, on one final matter, over the weekend, Burma's long and difficult struggle toward democracy and freedom took another dark step backward. The brutal military junta controlling Burma executed—executed—four political prisoners, including the well-known activist Ko Jimmy and Phyo Zeya Thaw, a former elected official and protest musician—yet more innocent bloodshed for the crime of dissenting against the junta's illegitimate rule.

This is yet another atrocity in a long list of horrors committed by the junta with no legitimacy, no regard for the sanctity of human life, and no respect for its fellow citizens. It provides even further evidence that the junta does not fear any consequences for its actions—not from internal chaos, not from civil war, not from its neighbors, not from the so-called international community.

The United States has led efforts to support Burma's people and to impose costs and consequences on the junta. Clearly, it is time for Burma's neighbors to shoulder a larger burden as well. It is time for ASEAN states to step up, individually and collectively.

As the junta plunges Burma deeper into chaos and civil war, the turmoil will affect the entire region. It is Burma's neighbors who have the most economic influence over the junta, and it is Burma's neighbors who have the most at stake.

Do they want a failed state wracked by civil war like Syria on their borders? Do they want a Russian- or Chinese-backed client state in their midst?

If they will not step up and impose meaningful costs on the junta, the Biden administration should use authorities already given to it by Congress to sanction Burma's energy sector, including Myanmar Oil and Gas Enterprise, notwithstanding the concerns of those neighbors.

The people of Burma are risking their lives and, in some cases, losing their lives to defend their freedom. The Biden administration claims to prioritize democracy and human rights in its foreign policy. Here is an opportunity to demonstrate that it means what it says.

So in sum, it is time for Burma's neighbors to act. If they do not, the Biden administration should sanction Burma's energy and other major sources of revenue for the junta.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

JANUARY 6 HEARINGS

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, like 17 million other Americans, I watched the January 6 committee in its latest session last Thursday night. For 2 hours, I was there watching closely as they presented witnesses and evidence of the obvious. It reminded me that our committee—the Senate Judiciary Committee—last October released a report that showed in alarming detail how

former President Donald Trump tried to bully the Justice Department into overturning an election which he lost.

Our report showed just how aggressively the defeated President tried to hold on to power, how some with the Justice Department were actually conspiring to help him, and how hard the Department's leadership had to work to prevent Trump's illegal scheme from succeeding.

We knew when we produced our report that it was just one chapter in an intricate plot to subvert America's democracy.

In eight public hearings over the last 6 weeks, the House Select Committee to Investigate the January 6 Attack on the U.S. Capitol has laid out in clear and chilling detail more chapters in the plot to overturn the 2020 Presidential election.

The facts are damning. What makes them even more shocking and credible is that they have been revealed, under oath, not by former President Trump's political foes but by people who once believed in him—people who worked with him for years, close aides, advisers, even his own family members.

I am sure you remember January 6, 2021. Those of us who were in this Chamber will never forget it.

We were here in the Senate to count the electoral ballots forwarded from the States to the Senate and the House to confirm the results of the 2020 Presidential election. We heard the furious mob outside. They attacked Capitol Police officers with hockey sticks, iron bars, toxic bear spray, flagpoles—whatever weapons they could find. The Trump mob was on the march. They smashed windows and doors, broke into this Capitol Building.

Capitol Police officers ordered the Senators to evacuate the Chamber immediately. I remember it well. They first told us: Well, wait here. This will be a safe room. Ten minutes later, they said: Leave through these back doors as quickly as you can; the mob has taken over the Capitol. We rushed to a secure location.

For hours, as the Capitol Police and DC Metropolitan Police battled the mob in brutal hand-to-hand combat, we asked the same questions: Where is the protection? Where is the National Guard? Where is the President? Donald Trump set this carnage in motion by riling up his supporters with the Big Lie and ordering them to march on the Capitol. We thought to ourselves, Why won't he tell them to stop? This has gone too far.

The public hearings of the January 6 Committee have answered the question in frightening detail. Where was the President? We now know from last Thursday's hearing, Donald Trump knew within 15 minutes of finishing his remarks that the mob was on its way to attack this building and the people inside. What did he do? What did Donald Trump do for 3 hours 7 minutes? He sat in his private dining room next to the Oval Office watching the violence

on TV. He refused to contact his national security leaders to defend the Capitol of the United States of America. He refused pleas from congressional leaders of both parties, from his own staff and family, from his allies in the media at FOX News to call off the mob. He refused to walk less than 60 seconds to the White House briefing room to make a simple statement asking for the violence to stop. He was silent, and he watched FOX News every second of that 3 hours 7 minutes.

We learned that members of Vice President Pence's Secret Service detail actually thought that they might die as they confronted this mob. As some of those agents made what they feared might be their last calls to their families to tell them that they loved them, President Donald Trump sent out a tweet telling the mob Vice President Pence had betrayed them. Instead of calming the riot, Donald Trump poured gasoline on the fire.

Illinois Representative ADAM KINZINGER, a Republican member of the January 6 Committee, summed it up well. He said:

Trump didn't fail to act . . . he chose not to act.

Only when it was clear that his coup had failed did Donald Trump reluctantly record a video telling his supporters to leave the Capitol and go home. And he carefully chose his words—we can tell from the outtakes—not to concede the Big Lie. There was not a word of condemnation about the violence, not a word of concern for the police officers who battled that mob to protect our safety and our democracy. More than 140 police officers—Capitol Police, DC Metropolitan Police—suffered serious injuries on January 6. Where is this President who loved law and order? Silently watching on FOX.

Over the next few days and weeks, sadly, several officers who defended the Capitol died. Not a word from former President Trump.

In the committee's earlier hearings, we learned how the President had ignored his own aides and advisers and relentlessly pressed false claims of voter fraud, listening to his "gifted" legal counsel, Rudy Giuliani, even when he was told repeatedly that these claims were wrong.

We learned how he pressured Vice President Pence to go along with the plan to overturn his loss even after he was told by the experts around him: President Trump, it would be illegal.

We learned how President Trump pressed elected leaders in key States to change the vote totals in their States. When that failed, he pressed allies to send false slates of electors that would make him the winner.

He learned how to summon a mob to Washington and turned them loose on this building, even after being told the mob was carrying weapons. And even after all the harm his Big Lie has done to our democracy, he is still relentlessly peddling it.

Outtakes aired by the House committee last week showed on the day of

insurrection, he still refused to say the election is over. This little man just can't bring himself to accept reality.

Wisconsin's Assembly Speaker, who happens to be a Republican, said Donald Trump called him to urge him to overturn the State's vote in the 2020 election. When did he call him? Two weeks ago. He is still on a rampage.

The Senate will soon consider a bipartisan Electoral Count Reform Act to make it plain that a Presidential election cannot be overturned by wrongful partisan interference by a Vice President or any State or congressional officials. I support this effort. Senators KLOBUCHAR, KING, and I offered our own ideas several months ago on this anticipated Electoral Count Act reform. I hope that this bipartisan effort can get 60 votes in the Senate.

I hope that 10 Republicans will join us in modernizing this law so it works for today. It was written in haste in the middle of political controversy in the 19th century. Some of the sections of that law are almost unintelligible. Let's clarify it. Let's give the American people an assurance that we learned a lesson on January 6, 2021, and in the election that preceded it. And in that lesson, we learned that the American people want their votes to count accurately, honestly, and fairly.

Ultimately, however, the only way we can protect our elections and our democracy is by respecting the rule of law and the will of the American people and telling them the truth. By laying out the truth clearly for the American people and for history, the January 6 Committee is performing an invaluable public service. They deserve our respect.

One closing comment. There wasn't supposed to be a committee in the House. Madam President, you remember and I do, too, the proposal was for a bipartisan Commission to be created to investigate this travesty on January 6 as they investigated 9/11—take politics out of it, take elected officials out of it, bring together people who are respected from across the political spectrum, and get to the bottom of it. That proposal for a bipartisan Commission was stopped by Republican leadership in the House and the Senate. After all of the statements they made expressing outrage over January 6, when it came time to appoint the Commission—bipartisan Commission—they refused. There is only one conclusion you can draw: They don't want to face the truth. They don't want the truth to be on the record from a bipartisan Commission. Luckily, in the House of Representatives, the January 6 Committee has achieved that, and there is more to come.

I might add, people say: Why didn't the Senate Judiciary Committee take this on? That is a very valid question. The difference is this. In order to issue a subpoena from the Senate Judiciary Committee in such a committee hearing, we need to have agreement from at least one Republican member of the

committee. We had no assurance that that agreement would be offered. So I supported the January 6 Committee in the House, and I am glad that they moved forward as they have.

ABORTION

Madam President, it was a month ago the Dobbs decision was handed down. One of the most controversial issues in American politics is the issue of abortion and reproductive health.

We know that Justice Alito's opinion, a 6-to-3 decision, overturned *Roe v. Wade*. Since then, we have been trying to sort out the impact of that decision on America. There are many things that have happened which have been shocking—the fact that they have called into question some of the things that we had accepted for 50 years as constitutionally guaranteed rights.

Yes, there was a 10-year-old girl who was viciously raped and turned up pregnant in the State of Ohio. And, yes, under the law in the State of Ohio because she was 6 weeks 3 days pregnant, she couldn't qualify for a procedure to terminate her pregnancy in the State of Ohio. She had to go to Indiana, the neighboring State. There were those who disputed that it ever happened and denied that such a thing could occur. As it turned out, they were wrong. It did happen. I was saddened to read that one of the leaders in the right to life movement said she should carry that baby to term—a 10-year-old girl.

Madam President, I am sure you have seen a lot of 10-year-old young people. I have seen them, too, even in my household, one of my grandchildren. At that age, you are still questioning whether they can cross a busy street without help. And to think someone would say she should carry that baby to term ignores her own health and ignores the reality of that situation. That is the kind of rhetoric we are hearing from people who are proposing a national ban on abortions.

I was reading this morning an article in the *New York Times*.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have this *New York Times* article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER ROE, URGENT QUESTIONS ABOUT CANCER CARE

(By Gina Kolata)

In April of last year, Rachel Brown's oncologist called with bad news—at age 36, she had an aggressive form of breast cancer. The very next day, she found out she was pregnant after nearly a year of trying with her fiancé to have a baby.

She had always said she would never have an abortion. But the choices she faced were wrenching. If she had the chemotherapy that she needed to prevent the spread of her cancer, she could harm her baby. If she didn't have it, the cancer could spread and kill her. She had two children, ages 2 and 11, who could lose their mother.

For Ms. Brown and others in the unlucky sorority of women who receive a cancer diagnosis when they are pregnant, the Supreme

Court decision in June, ending the constitutional right to an abortion, can seem like a slap in the face. If the life of a fetus is paramount, a pregnancy can mean a woman cannot get effective treatment for her cancer. One in a thousand women who gets pregnant each year is diagnosed with cancer, meaning thousands of women are facing a serious and possibly fatal disease while they are expecting a baby.

Before the Supreme Court decision, a pregnant woman with cancer was already “entering a world with tremendous unknowns,” said Dr. Clifford Hudis, the chief executive officer at the American Society of Clinical Oncology. Now, not only the women but also the doctors and hospitals that treat them, are caught up in the added complications of abortion bans.

“If a doctor can’t give a drug without fear of damaging a fetus, is that going to compromise outcomes?” Dr. Hudis asked. “It’s a whole new world.”

Cancer drugs are dangerous for fetuses in the first trimester. Although older chemotherapy drugs are safe in the second and third trimesters, the safety of the newer and more effective drugs is unknown and doctors are reluctant to give them to pregnant women.

About 40 percent of women who are pregnant and have cancer have breast cancer. But other cancers also occur in pregnant women, including blood cancers, cervical and ovarian cancer, gastrointestinal cancer, melanoma, brain cancer, thyroid cancer and pancreatic cancer.

Women with some types of cancer, like acute leukemia, often can’t continue with a pregnancy if the cancer is diagnosed in the first trimester. They need to be treated immediately, within days, and the necessary drugs are toxic to a fetus.

“In my view, the only medically acceptable option is termination of the pregnancy so that lifesaving treatment can be administered to the mother,” said Dr. Eric Winer, the director of the Yale Cancer Center.

Some oncologists say they are not sure what is allowed if a woman lives in a state like Michigan, which has a law that criminalized most abortions but permits them to save the life of the mother. Does leukemia qualify as a reason for an abortion to save her life?

“It’s so early we don’t know the answer,” said Dr. N. Lynn Henry, an oncologist at the University of Michigan. “We can’t prove that the drugs caused a problem for the baby, and we can’t prove that withholding the drugs would have a negative outcome.”

In other words, doctors say, complications from a pregnancy—a miscarriage, a premature birth, birth defects or death—can occur whether or not a woman with cancer takes the drugs. If she is not treated and her cancer gallops into a malignancy that kills her, that too might have happened even if she had been given the cancer drugs.

Administrators of the University of Michigan’s medical system are not intervening in cancer treatment decisions about how to treat cancers in pregnant women, saying “medical decision making and management is between doctors and patients.”

I. Glenn Cohen, a law professor and bioethicist at Harvard, is gravely concerned.

“We are putting physicians in a terrible position,” Mr. Cohen said. “I don’t think signing up to be a physician should mean signing up to do jail time,” he added.

Oncologists usually are part of a hospital system, Mr. Cohen said, which adds a further complication for doctors who treat cancers in states that ban abortions. “Whatever their personal feelings,” he asked, “what are the risks the hospital system is going to face?”

“I don’t think oncologists ever thought this day was coming for them,” Mr. Cohen said.

Behind the confusion and concern from doctors are the stories of women like Ms. Brown.

She had a large tumor in her left breast and cancer cells in her underarm lymph nodes. The cancer was HER2 positive. Such cancers can spread quickly without treatment. About 15 years ago, the prognosis for women with HER2 positive cancers was among the worst breast cancer prognosis. Then a targeted treatment, trastuzumab, or Herceptin, completely changed the picture. Now women with HER2 tumors have among the best prognoses compared with other breast cancers.

But trastuzumab cannot be given during pregnancy.

Ms. Brown’s first visit was with a surgical oncologist who, she said, “made it clear that my life would be in danger if I kept my pregnancy because I wouldn’t be able to be treated until the second trimester.” He told her that if she waited for those months her cancer could spread to distant organs and would become fatal.

Her treatment in the second trimester would be a mastectomy with removal of all of the lymph nodes in her left armpit, which would have raised her risk of lymphedema, an incurable fluid buildup in her arm. She could start chemotherapy in her second trimester but could not have trastuzumab or radiation treatment.

Her next consult was with Dr. Lisa Carey, a breast cancer specialist at the University of North Carolina, who told her that while she could have a mastectomy in the first trimester, before chemotherapy, it was not optimal. Ordinarily, oncologists would give cancer drugs before a mastectomy to shrink the tumor, allowing for a less invasive surgery. If the treatment did not eradicate the tumor, oncologists would try a more aggressive drug treatment after the operation.

But if she had a mastectomy before having chemotherapy, it would be impossible to know if the treatment was helping. And what if the drugs were not working? She worried that her cancer could become fatal without her knowing it.

She feared that if she tried to keep her pregnancy, she might sacrifice her own life and destroy the lives of her children. And if she delayed making her decision and then had an abortion later in the pregnancy, she feared that the fetus might feel pain.

She and her fiancé discussed her options. This pregnancy would be his first biological child.

With enormous sadness, they made their decision—she would have a medication abortion. She took the pills one morning when she was six weeks and one day pregnant, and cried all day. She wrote a eulogy for the baby who might have been. She was convinced the baby was going to be a girl, and had named her Hope. She saved the ultrasound of Hope’s heartbeat.

“I don’t take that little life lightly,” Ms. Brown said.

After she terminated her pregnancy, Ms. Brown was able to start treatment with trastuzumab, along with a cocktail of chemotherapy drugs and radiation. She had a mastectomy, and there was no evidence of cancer at the time of her surgery—a great prognostic sign, Dr. Carey said. She did not need to have all of her lymph nodes removed and did not develop lymphedema.

“I feel like it has taken a lot of courage to do what I did,” Ms. Brown said. “As a mother your first instinct is to protect the baby.”

But having gone through that grueling treatment, she also wondered how she could ever have handled having a newborn baby and her two other children to care for.

“My bones ached. I couldn’t walk more than a few steps without being out of breath. It was hard to get nutrients because of the nausea and vomiting,” she said.

The Supreme Court decision hit her hard. “I felt like the reason I did what I did didn’t matter,” she said. “My life didn’t matter, and my children’s lives didn’t matter.”

“It didn’t matter if I lost my life because I was being forced to be pregnant,” she said.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to read this because it tells you the complications that have been created by what seemed like a very simple decision overturning a previous Supreme Court case. This writer, Gina Kolata, wrote an article entitled “After Roe, Urgent Questions About Cancer Care.” It was in Sunday’s New York Times, July 24, 2022. I was struck by this article because it suggests the complexity of this issue and the real-world impact of this decision:

In April of last year, Rachel Brown’s oncologist called with bad news—at age 36, she had an aggressive form of breast cancer. The very next day, she found out she was pregnant after nearly a year of trying with her fiancé to have a baby.

She had always said she would never have an abortion. But the choices she faced were wrenching. If she had the chemotherapy that she needed to prevent the spread of her cancer, she could harm the baby. If she didn’t have it, the cancer could spread and kill her. She had two children, ages 2 and 11, who would lose their mother.

For Ms. Brown and others in the unlucky sorority of women who receive a cancer diagnosis when they are pregnant, the Supreme Court decision in [Dobbs], ending the constitutional right to an abortion, can seem like a slap in the face. If the life of a fetus is paramount, a pregnancy can mean a woman cannot get effective treatment for her cancer. One in a thousand women who gets pregnant each year is diagnosed with cancer, meaning thousands of women are facing a serious and possibly fatal disease while they are expecting a baby.

Before the Supreme Court decision, a pregnant woman with cancer was already “entering a world with tremendous unknowns,” said Dr. Clifford Hudis, the chief executive officer at the American Society of Clinical Oncology. Now, not only the women but also the doctors and hospitals that treat them, are caught up in the added complications of abortion bans.

“If a doctor can’t give a drug without fear of damaging a fetus, is that going to compromise outcomes?” Dr. Hudis asked. “It’s a whole new world.”

Cancer drugs are dangerous for fetuses in the first trimester. Although older chemotherapy drugs are safe in the second and third trimesters, the safety of the newer and more effective drugs is unknown and doctors are reluctant to give them to [a] pregnant [woman].

This woman decided to terminate her pregnancy, take the cancer therapy, and save her life. She closes with the following statements:

But having gone through that grueling treatment, she also wondered how she could ever have handled having a newborn baby and her two other children to care for.

“My bones ached. I couldn’t walk more than a few steps without being out of breath. It was hard to get nutrients because of nausea and vomiting,” she said.

The Supreme Court decision hit her hard. “I felt like the reason I did what I did didn’t matter,” she said. “My life didn’t

matter, and my children's lives didn't matter.

"It didn't matter if I lost my life because I was being forced to be pregnant," she said.

That is the reality today. I hear my colleagues come to the floor with absolute certain moral clarity on this issue. I have learned during the course of my life and my public life that there is not that element of certainty when it comes down to real life. And to jeopardize the health and safety, even the life of the mother in this circumstance, to leave doctors wondering if they have criminal liability for professional medical care is something this Nation should never see. But we face it now, and it is up to us to show leadership and come together, I hope, and bring back the constitutional protections that have been the case for 50 years in this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). The Senator from Texas.

CHIPS ACT OF 2022

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as I was preparing to come to the floor, I was going to say we are going to have a vote tonight to proceed to fill a major gap in our national security, although it looks like Mother Nature and the weather may prevent a vote tonight, and it may be tomorrow. But, still, I expect in the next couple of days for us to address a major gap in our national security.

More than a year and a half after the original CHIPS Act became law, we are finally approaching the finish line in the race to fund it.

You may recall that it was June of 2020 that Senator WARNER, the senior Senator, a Democrat from Virginia, and I introduced the CHIPS for America Act to address a frightening supply chain vulnerability when it comes to the most advanced semiconductors in the world, 90 percent of which come from Asia, and 60 percent come from Taiwan.

Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin recently wrote a letter to congressional leaders saying that "funding the CHIPS Act is critical to our national defense," and last week, former Secretary of State and CIA Director Mike Pompeo also urged Congress to pass this funding, saying:

The cost of compromise on this bill pales in comparison to the costs we will suffer if we allow the Chinese Communist Party to one day own and control access to our most critical technologies.

I agree with both of these statements, one by a Democrat appointee, another by a Republican appointee.

Chips underpin virtually all the technology that we use that keeps us safe at home and protects our troops around the world. And for those not conversant with the role semiconductors play, these microprocessors underpin literally everything that has an off-and-on switch, and obviously our dependency on that kind of technology will do nothing but increase in the days and months and years ahead.

From our major military assets, like the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, to everyday technologies that keep our troops safe, like advanced body armor, semiconductors are key. Keeping a ready and dependable supply chain of these defense assets requires a lot of semiconductors, and right now, we are mainly looking to other countries to manufacture them.

As a matter of fact, the United States of America makes zero percent of the most advanced semiconductors in the world. We depend on outsourcing virtually all of the manufacturing to other countries and produce none of them here. Roughly 75 percent of the semiconductor manufacturing globally is concentrated in China and East Asia, and 100 percent of the world's most advanced chipmaking capacity is located in only two places—Taiwan and South Korea. As I said, Taiwan commands 92 percent of the world's advanced chipmaking, and the United States makes zero.

You might wonder, How did we find ourselves in this situation? Well, I think it was probably the supply chain vulnerabilities that we saw from COVID-19 that called into question this assumption that just because something could be made cheaper somewhere else in the world, that that necessarily checked all the boxes. Well, it does if all you are depending on is China to make toys for our children or other nonessential items, but when you are talking about the very brains behind the technology we need, ranging from our cell phone, as I said, to our most sophisticated military weapons, it does not check all the boxes to say we will just import those from abroad, where they can be made cheaper, because that vulnerable supply chain, if disrupted, could cause not only a severe economic depression in America but also threaten our national security directly.

If access to those chips were cut off or restricted, we would be up a creek without a paddle. We couldn't produce a stockpile of Javelin missiles to supply Ukraine or produce the radios and communications devices that keep our troops and our allies connected. That is why shoring up this domestic supply, this manufacturing capacity, is a key national security priority, and this is the best way to protect one of our most critical supply chains and ensure our military readiness will not be compromised by the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party, which has threatened, by the way, to invade Taiwan, where the vast majority of these advanced semiconductors are made. But it wouldn't necessarily require a military intervention. It could be another pandemic, it could be a natural disaster—anything that might block our access to these advanced semiconductors.

While closing that national security gap is the top priority here, we can't ignore major economic consequences that this legislation will deliver as well.

When I introduced this legislation with Senator WARNER from Virginia, who is chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee, on which I also serve, our focus was on national security. Obviously, many of our States will be winners when it comes to the economic consequences of this legislation as well. Texas has been, for example, a longstanding leader in the semiconductor industry and is home to more than 200 chip manufacturing facilities that employ 29,000 Texans. For years, our State has reaped the benefits of semiconductor manufacturing. Most of these are what are called legacy chips. They are the older chips where you are not as concerned about miniaturization or compactness or power—things that, for example, run our refrigerators or TV sets or other consumer electronics or maybe even our cars.

We are already seeing the types of investments that this chips bill will finally bring. Earlier this summer, Texas Instruments, in the metroplex in Dallas-Fort Worth, broke ground on the first of four new fabs in Sherman, TX, about an hour north of Dallas. This is part of a \$30 billion investment that is expected to create some 3,000 more jobs. The mayor of Sherman, where this is located in Northeast Texas, described it as "a watershed day," noting that "it's hard to have a frame of reference for a \$30 billion investment in a town of 50,000 people."

Sherman isn't the only town in Texas preparing for a major chips boom. Last fall, I joined leaders from Samsung—a South Korean company with a large facility already in Austin, TX—when they announced a \$17 billion additional investment in a new chip fab in Taylor, TX, just outside of Austin. That facility is expected to directly create more than 2,000 high-tech jobs, as well as thousands of other related jobs, once it is operational because these fabs, or manufacturing facilities, are not stand-alone; they are part of what ultimately will become an ecosystem of suppliers and other affiliated industries that will be built up around them, creating thousands more jobs.

But we also learned from Samsung that they are not likely to stop there if we pass this CHIPS for America funding this week. Samsung is currently considering whether to expand its investment to include 11 new chipmaking facilities in Central Texas.

If it moves forward with this plan, which, again, depends on our passage of this legislation this week, it could lead to nearly \$200 billion in additional investments and create 10,000 jobs.

I know that is tough to comprehend—the economic growth and sweeping benefits that would come with a \$200 billion investment and 10,000 new jobs; but as exciting as these potential investments are, there is something even better. This is just the beginning.

Companies around the world are eyeing Texas and the United States for new investments in chipmaking. Applied Materials, NXP Semiconductors,

Infineon, GlobalWafers, GlobiTech, and a number of other companies are looking at building or expanding their facilities in Texas or other parts of the country.

GlobalFoundries, for example, is investing \$1 billion to boost production in New York. Intel plans to build a \$20-billion facility of two fabs in Ohio. And Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Company—TSMC, as it is called—is building a \$12-billion plant in Arizona. They have already broken ground on that plant, but they made it clear that their willingness to make that investment and complete that fab will depend on our passage of the CHIPS for America Act.

And once this legislation passes, I expect more good news to follow. This is not just good news for our individual States, but also for our national economy and our global competitiveness.

We are not used to providing these kinds of financial incentives to businesses, but when it costs 30 percent less to build these manufacturing facilities across the seas in Asia and our access to that supply chain is potentially jeopardized by very real threats, it is a necessary investment for us to make. And we are seeing other places around the world providing similar incentives, for example, in the European Union. But that doesn't necessarily solve our supply chain problem. We need the jobs and that investment here in America for us to be truly safe and secure and to reap the economic benefits of this investment.

On the economic front, this funding has the support of many groups on the outside, including the bipartisan support that I mentioned earlier; in my State, the Texas Association of Business; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, for example; and we have heard from the National Governors Association, which is a bipartisan organization of U.S. Governors; as well as the U.S. Conference of Mayors, which represent State and local leaders across the country.

My Governor, Governor Abbott, called this bill "an opportunity to lock even greater economic potential."

So I am proud to support this legislation. After all this time, I will be especially glad when the finish line is in sight and we cross it successfully later this week.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam President, like the Senator from Texas, I wish to speak about the so-called chips bill, but my perspective is, to say the least, a little bit different.

To my mind, what the chips bill represents is the question of whether or not we will have priorities in this country that represent the needs of working families and the middle class or whether this institution, the entire Congress, is totally beholden to wealthy and powerful corporate interests.

I do not argue with anyone who makes the point that there is a global

shortage in microchips and semiconductors, which is making it harder for manufacturers to produce the cars, the cell phones, the household appliances, and the electronic equipment that we need. This shortage is, in fact, costing American workers good-paying jobs and raising prices for families. And that is why I personally strongly support the need to expand U.S. microchip production.

But the question that we should be asking is this: Should American taxpayers provide the microchip industry with a blank check—blank check—of over \$76 billion at the same exact time when semiconductor companies are making tens of billions of dollars in profits and paying their CEOs exorbitant compensation packages?

That really is one of the questions that we should be asking, and I think the answer to that is a resounding no. This is an enormously profitable industry.

According to an Associated Press article that I read today, Senator ROMNEY, reflecting the views, I think, of many—I think Senator CORNYN made the same point—but Senator ROMNEY was quoted as saying that when other countries subsidize the manufacturing of high technology chips, the United States must join the club—must join the club.

"If you don't play like they play, then you are not going to be manufacturing high technology chips, and they are essential for our national defense as well as our economy," Senator ROMNEY said.

Now, I find the position of Senator ROMNEY and others to be really quite interesting because I personally have been on this floor many, many times urging the Senate to look to other countries around the world and learn from those countries. And what I have said is that it is a bit absurd that here in the United States we are the only major country on Earth not to guarantee healthcare to all of their people. And Senator ROMNEY says "join the club," and I agree. Let's join the club and not spend twice as much per capita on healthcare as the Canadians, as the British, as the French. Let's join that club and guarantee healthcare to all people, rather than making the insurance companies billions in profits every single year.

Senator ROMNEY says "join the club," and I agree. We should join the club in terms of higher education. Germany today, and other countries around the world, make sure that their young people can go to their colleges and universities tuition-free so that they don't have to leave school 40, 50, or \$100,000 in debt. Let's join the club. Let's do what Germany and other countries are doing, which makes eminent sense in every sense of the word. Let's guarantee the right of all of our kids, regardless of their income, to get a higher education. Let's join the club.

And there is another club that I think we might want to join, among

many others. We are the only major country—virtually the only country on Earth—that does not guarantee paid family and medical leave. There are women today in the United States of America having a baby, and they will be back at work in a week because they need the income—no guaranteed paid family medical leave. There are people getting fired today because their kids are sick. They have to make the choice whether they hang on to their jobs or take care of their sick kids.

Let's join the club. Let's do what not only every major country on Earth does in terms of guaranteed paid family and medical, but what virtually all countries, including some of the poorest, in the world do.

But I gather the problem is that to join those clubs in terms of universal healthcare, in terms of paid family and medical leave, in terms of free tuition and public colleges and universities, we are going to have to take on powerful special interests, and they make campaign contributions. And that is not what the Senate does.

When it comes to joining the club with other countries giving blank checks to large corporations, that is a club that, unfortunately, many of my colleagues here feel comfortable in joining.

So, apparently, when corporate America needs a blank check of \$76 billion, we do what other countries are doing.

There is a lot of talk about the microchip crisis facing this country but, amazingly enough, very little discussion about how we got to where we are today. One might ask: OK, if there is a crisis, how did it happen? Well, let's review some recent history. This is really quite amazing.

Over the last 20 years, the microchip industry has shut down over 780 manufacturing plants and other establishments in the United States and eliminated 150,000 American jobs while moving most of its production overseas. And, by the way, they did that after they received a Federal grant and loans much smaller than what we are talking about today.

So here is the absurd situation that we are in. The crisis is caused by the industry shutting down in America and moving abroad. And today, what we are doing is saying: We are going to give you a blank check to undo the damage that you did.

Let me just give you a few examples. We don't have a whole lot of information on this. Between 2010 and 2014, Intel laid off approximately 1,400 workers from the Rio Rancho, NM, chip facility and offshored 1,000 jobs to Israel. According to the Oregon Bureau of Labor and Industry, Intel laid off more than 1,000 workers in Oregon between 2015 and 2016. Texas Instruments outsourced 400 jobs from their Houston manufacturing facility to the Philippines in 2013. Micron Technology has repeatedly cut jobs in Boise, ID, including 1,100 in 2003 and another 1,100 in

2007; 1,500 in 2008; and in 2009, the company stopped manufacturing some types of chips entirely and laid off 2,000 workers.

In other words, in order to make more profits, these companies took government money and used it to ship good-paying jobs abroad. Now as their reward for causing the crisis that we are in, these same companies are in line to receive a massive taxpayer handout to undo the damage they did.

Wow, that is a heck of a policy. You bribe companies to undo the damage that they caused.

It is estimated in total that five major semiconductor companies will receive the lion's share of this taxpayer handout: Intel, Texas Instruments, Micron Technology, Global Boundaries, and Samsung. These five companies alone made \$70 billion in profits.

You know, I find it interesting. I have heard Senators here on the floor talk about entitlements. When we help working people, when we help poor people, there are all kinds of requirements—work requirements, reporting requirements, drug testing requirements, you name the requirements when the Federal Government helps working people or low-income people.

Well, what are the requirements attached to this handout for large profitable corporations? The answer is zero.

The company that will likely benefit the most from this taxpayer assistance is Intel. In 2021, last year, Intel made nearly \$20 billion in profits.

You know, it just does astound me. You have heard people come to the floor and say: We can't help working parents with their kids. We don't believe in those entitlement programs. We can't guarantee healthcare to all people. We are not an "entitlement society." But a company that, last year, made \$20 billion in profits, they are entitled to what we estimate will be between \$20 and \$30 billion in Federal funding. During the pandemic and during the last several years, Intel had enough money to spend \$16.6 billion not on research and development, not on building new plants in America but on buying back its own stock to reward its executives and wealthy shareholders. So here is the absurd moment that we are in. As I mentioned a moment ago, it is estimated that Intel will receive between \$20 and \$30 billion in Federal funding. Yet, within the last several years, the same company spent over \$16 billion on stock buybacks, and there is no guarantee in this bill that they and other companies that receive these grants will not continue to do stock buybacks.

This is the way a corrupt political system works, and I hope everybody understands it.

Over the past 20 years, Intel has spent over \$100 million on lobbying and campaign contributions. That is a lot of money, \$100 million, but this is what a corrupt political system is about. For \$100 million in lobbying and campaign contributions, they are going to get at

least \$20 billion in corporate welfare. That, I would argue, is a pretty good investment. That is what goes on here not only with the microchip industry but with the pharmaceutical industry, the fossil fuel industry, the insurance industry—huge amounts of money in lobbying and campaign contributions. The pharmaceutical industry has 1,500 paid lobbyists right now, right here in Washington, DC, which is why we pay the highest prices in the world for prescription drugs.

I find this extraordinary. Maybe I am the only person here who does, but, to me, it is rather amazing.

A little over a week ago, the CEO of Intel, a gentleman named Pat Gelsinger, who earns something like \$179 million a year in compensation—not a bad salary—did an interview on CNBC's "Squawk Box" program. I think to listen to that interview tells us everything we need to know about oligarchy and arrogance and the state of American politics.

This is what Mr. Gelsinger said on TV. I love this.

My message—

Mr. Gelsinger's message—

to congressional leaders is "Hey, if I'm not done with the job, I don't get to go home. Neither should you. Do not go home for August recess until you have passed the CHIPS Act. Because—

Now listen to this—

"I and others in the industry will make investment decisions. And do you want those investments in the U.S. or are we simply not competitive enough to do them here and we?"—

The industry—

"need to go to Europe or Asia for those? Get the job done. Do not go home for August recess without getting these bills passed."

In other words, what he is telling you is, point blank, who is the puppet and who is the puppeteer. Don't go home this August until you give us \$76 billion because, if you don't do that, we are going to go to Asia, and we are going to go to Europe.

That is the state of American politics—and not only of American politics, I would say. It is equally true in other countries that are also held hostage by large, multinational corporations.

Let us be clear. The CEO of Intel is saying, if you don't give his industry a \$76 billion blank check and his particular company up to \$30 billion, that despite, no doubt, their profound love for America—I am sure they have got big American flags all over the place and their patriotism and their concern for the needs of the military and the healthcare industry, which, in fact, need these sophisticated chips. If we do not give them this bribe despite their love of America and their concern about our national defense—you heard Senator CORNYN talking about national defense, and he is right in that this is a national defense issue. Despite all of that and all of their love for America, they are willing to go to Asia and go to Europe in order to make even more money.

As I said last week, I am, thankfully, not a lawyer, but that sure sounds like extortion to me. Mr. Gelsinger's words sure sound like extortion. What he is saying is, if you don't give his industry \$76 billion, they are out. They are not going to build in the United States, and they are going to go abroad.

So I have a few questions for Mr. Gelsinger and the other microchip CEOs.

If Intel and the others receive a corporate welfare check from the taxpayers of America, are they willing to commit today that they will not outsource American jobs overseas? Yes or no?

If this legislation passes, will Intel and the others commit today that they will not spend another penny on stock buybacks to enrich wealthy shareholders but will, instead, spend that money to create jobs in the United States?

If this legislation goes into effect, will Intel and the others commit today that they will stay neutral in any union organizing campaign, like the one being waged at Intel's microchip plant in Hillsboro, OR?

If this legislation goes into effect, will Intel and the others commit today that they are prepared to issue warrants for the Federal Government so that the taxpayers of America get a reasonable return on their investments?

These grants are going to provide a whole lot of profit for these companies. It seems to me the taxpayers should benefit as well.

If Intel and the others were prepared to say yes to any of these questions, I don't think that they would be lobbying against my amendment to impose these very same conditions to this legislation.

Let me simply conclude by saying this: I worry not only about this bill; I worry about the precedent that it states, that it allows. What the precedent is, is that any company that is prepared to go abroad and that has ignored the needs of the American people will then say to the Congress: Hey, if you want us to stay here, you had better give us a handout.

We manufacture virtually all of our laptop computers in China. We manufacture virtually all of our cell phones in China. Pass this legislation, and I expect all of these guys and others will be back here, saying: We want for our industry what you did for the microchip industry.

So the bottom line is here: Yes, we need to rebuild the microchip industry in the United States but not as a handout. Let us sit down and work on intelligent industrial policy. Let us work on a series of agreements that protect the American taxpayer and American workers and not just wealthy stockholders.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CHIPS ACT OF 2022

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, today, the Senate had planned to move

forward to end the debate on the bipartisan chips and innovation bill. Unfortunately, a number of severe thunderstorms on the East Coast have disrupted the travel plans of a significant number of Senators. To give Members a chance to get back into town safely, I am going to delay tonight's vote on the bipartisan chips and innovation bill until tomorrow morning. I remain hopeful that we can remain on track to finish this legislation ASAP.

FACT ACT OF 2022

Madam President, in the meantime, I will now file cloture on another bill that will dramatically improve the lives of millions of American veterans, the PACT Act, which, when signed into law, will be one of the biggest expansions of veterans' healthcare benefits in decades.

As my colleagues already know, because of a technical error, the House of Representatives was unable to take up our version of this bill that we passed in the spring. The House has now fixed their error and has returned the PACT Act back to the Senate. By filing cloture, we should be able to pass this bipartisan piece of legislation before the week is done.

Our nation's veterans have waited long enough to get the benefits they need to treat complications from toxic exposure in the line of duty. So we have every reason in the world to get this bill done with the same bipartisan support as the first time around.

Again, I want to thank particularly Senators TESTER and MORAN, who led the way to pass this bill earlier this year, thank all of our colleagues and our veterans and veterans service organizations for helping push this bill through Congress.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 4346

Madam President, now I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote with respect to H.R. 4346 occur at a time to be determined by the majority leader, following consultation with the Republican leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. For the information of the Senate, we expect the cloture vote with respect to the CHIPS and science legislation to occur around 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday, July 26.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Now, Madam President, I have a cloture motion to the motion to concur at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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 mo-

tion to concur in the House amendment to S. 3373, a bill to improve the Iraq and Afghanistan Service Grant and the Children of Fallen Heroes Grant.

Charles E. Schumer, Jon Tester, Ben Ray Lujan, 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, Mark Kelly.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion filed today, July 25, be waived.

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

HOMICIDE VICTIMS' FAMILIES' RIGHTS ACT OF 2021

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3359 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3359) to provide for a system for reviewing the case files of cold case murders at the instance of certain persons, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3359) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

PACT ACT OF 2022—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

CHIPS ACT OF 2022

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I was in the Chamber and heard Senator SANDERS' speech. I appreciate his passion about globalization and what he and I—it brought back—and I spoke to him after he spoke. It brought back to me the memories of standing shoulder to shoulder—he in his second term, I in my first—against the North American Free Trade Agreement and then a few years later standing shoulder to shoulder with him in opposition to PNTR, Permanent Normal Trade Relations, with China.

And we know what that meant, especially in my State and especially in the industrial Midwest, especially in places that the Presiding Officer represents and places like East St. Louis and downstate Illinois and so much of the industrial plants that were steel, especially east of Chicago and Indiana and Illinois.

We are on the verge of a big win for Ohio, a win that will create jobs, will bring down prices, and bring home supply chains.

As a kid growing up in Ohio, I walked the halls of Johnny Appleseed Junior High School with the sons and daughters of union workers: electricians, electrical workers at Westinghouse, sons and daughters of autoworkers from General Motors and machinists from Ohio Brass and carpenters and pipefitters and electricians who built our city and service these large companies.

But by the time I graduated from Mansfield Senior High School, those plants were shutting down one after another. Why? Because corporate America wanted cheap labor.

First, they went to anti-union States in the South. A plant might shut down in Mansfield or Barberton, OH, and move to Alabama; a plant might shut down in Shelby, OH, or Springfield, OH, and move to Georgia; a plant might shut down in Toledo or in Wadsworth, OH, and move to North Carolina or Arkansas or Virginia. They went to anti-union States. They went to anti-union States with low wages. But do you know what? Then those CEOs, all paying themselves a really, really good income, raising—you could see already, then, the average pay for a worker. In those days, when I was, I guess, in junior high school, a CEO made about—the plant manager made about 25 times what the worker made or even a smaller proportion of that. Now it is hundreds of times what workers make because 25 times what workers made just wasn't enough for a lot of these companies.

So then they shut down a lot of these factories in the anti-union, right-to-work South, and they moved to Mexico. They wanted NAFTA to pass—the North American Free Trade Agreement—so they could do it. They wanted PNTR—the Permanent Normal Trade Relations with China—to pass so they could go to China; always in the name of efficiency, always in the name of efficiency, always in the name of efficiency. As you know, Madam President, "efficiency" is business school speak for "pay our workers less."

Those CEOs—and some of you remember these nicknames. These CEOs earned the names of "Chainsaw Al" and "John the Cutter" and "Larry the Knife" and "Neutron Jack." To the CEOs themselves, they may kind of like those names, but they were not bestowed on them out of respect; they were given those nicknames because they were willing always to cut the pay of workers in Mansfield, OH, and hurt those families and partially destroy those communities. They were always willing to do that. So their companies made more money, and they got bigger paychecks, and all the executives in the corporate suites all did much, much better. The workers didn't, the communities didn't, but who really cared.