our veterans, and support women veterans' healthcare—all longtime priorities for me.

And, of course, it includes support for American families. And that means protecting investments to address the housing crisis—something important to my home State of Washington—programs that the House Republicans wanted to hollow out. But we together were able to protect and strengthen essential rental assistance, boost investments to reduce homelessness, and increase our Nation's affordable housing supply.

And it means full funding for food assistance programs families rely on, like SNAP, the Summer EBT Program I helped establish, which will help half a million kids in Washington State alone, and WIC.

As someone whose family relied on food stamps after my dad was diagnosed with multiple sclerosis, I know firsthand that action here can be the difference between families having food on the table for dinner or kids going to bed hungry.

So when I saw that the House Republicans proposed devastating cuts that would have forced States to deny families with benefits for the first time ever, that was never going to be an acceptable outcome.

I said from the outset I would move mountains to fully fund WIC, and that is exactly what I did. But let's be clear: WIC should never have even been put into question, because ignoring the mountains of evidence that this program works, the long history of bipartisan support for WIC, and the fact that this program actually saves us money in the long term—ignoring all of that, there is still just no ignoring the fact that the basic question with WIC is: Can the richest country in the world afford to feed babies? And the answer is yes. It has to be.

I can't believe I have to say that, but I will say it as many times as it takes. And I am glad that we were able to work together to reach a good outcome and fully fund WIC in this bill.

And here is the thing about our appropriations bills. They reflect the input and priorities of nearly every Senator. As a voice for Washington State, I am proud of the ways these bills invest in the communities that I know from every part of my State, with funding for researchers, salmon recovery, infrastructure projects, fixes to make sure that our ferries and harbors are getting their fair share, a historic amount of funding for Hanford Cleanup, and more.

I will have a lot more to say about these efforts and other Washington State projects I fought hard to include in these bills, but I am so excited to see this funding make progress and make a difference for folks back home.

We said from day one that partisan poison pills were nonstarters. We said that together. Getting a result in divided government means putting aside that partisanship and working to find common ground. That is how we managed to put together these six strong, bipartisan, bicameral bills. And it is the only way we will wrap up the next six as well, which, you should all know, we are working very hard on right now.

I think we all recognize that some far-right House Republicans have been trying to derail this entire process from the start. But as we saw today in the House, an overwhelming 300-plus Members voted to pass this bill. The vast majority from both sides want to get this done. By passing these bills, we can turn the page and show America that the vast majority of Congress is still focused on doing its job, working through tough negotiations so we can help people and solve problems.

Again, I want to thank my partner, Senator COLLINS, who has been just tremendous in working with us, and all of our staffs, who have been working on this 24/7 for so long. They are exhausted, and they still have six more bills to go.

I want to thank our chairs of the Appropriations subcommittees that are in this bill: Senators SCHATZ, HEINRICH, SHAHEEN, and MERKLEY for their tremendous work, and their Republican counterparts as well, who having really put in a lot of time and energy and have had to say ''yes'' and ''no'' way too many times. But we got this done.

So I hope all of our colleagues tonight will join us in sending that message by voting on the motion to proceed this evening—voting yes—and then working together to make sure we get this to the President's desk before the deadline on Friday.

VOTE ON HARRIS NOMINATION

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

Mrs. MURRAY. 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. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT).

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 73 Ex.]

YEAS—51

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Sanders
Booker	Kaine	Schatz
Brown	Kelly	Schumer
Butler	King	Shaheen
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cardin	Luján	Smith
Carper	Manchin	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Fetterman	Ossoff	Welch
Gillibrand	Padilla	Whitehouse
Hassan	Peters	Wyden

NAYS—48

Barrasso	Graham	Paul
Blackburn	Grassley	Ricketts
Boozman	Hagerty	Risch
Braun	Hawley	Romney
Budd	Hoeven	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Schmitt
Collins	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cramer	Lummis	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Vance
Ernst	Mullin	Wicker
Fischer	Murkowski	Young

NOT VOTING—1

Britt

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from Washington.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 4366.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 4366, which the clerk will report for the information of the Senate.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the message as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the House of Representatives (H.R. 4366) entitled ''An Act making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.'', do pass with an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. SCHUMER. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to 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 motion to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 4366, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Brian Schatz, Tammy Duckworth, Jack Reed, Tim Kaine, Christopher A. Coons, Benjamin L. Cardin, Margaret Wood Hassan, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeanne Shaheen, Richard Blumenthal, Angus S. King, Jr., John W. Hickenlooper, Tina Smith, Alex Padilla.

MOTION TO CONCUR WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1618

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to concur in the House amendment with an amendment numbered 1618, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] moves to concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment with an amendment numbered 1618.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 1 day after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading be dispensed with.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to concur with the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1619 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1618

Mr. SCHUMER. I have an amendment to amendment No. 1618, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 1619 to amendment No. 1618.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

On page 1, line 3, strike ''1 day'' and insert ''2 days''.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading be dispensed with.

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

MOTION TO REFER WITH AMENDMENT NO. 1620

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to refer the House message to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 1620.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] moves to refer the bill H.R. 4366 to the Committee on Appropriations with the instructions to report back forthwith an amendment numbered 1620.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

At the end add the following:

SEC. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that is 3 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading be waived.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1621

Mr. SCHUMER. I have an amendment to the instructions, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 1621 to the instructions of the motion to refer H.R. 4366 to the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

On page 1, line 3, strike ''3 days'' and insert ''4 days''.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading be waived.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 1622 TO AMENDMENT NO. 1621

Mr. SCHUMER. I have an amendment to amendment No. 1621, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New York [Mr. SCHUMER] proposes an amendment numbered 1622 to amendment No. 1621.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To add an effective date)

On page 1, line 1, strike ''4 days'' and insert ''5 days''.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask that further reading of the amendment be waived.

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am back today for the 29th time on my ''scheme'' series to explain to the American people how the rightwing managed to capture the Supreme Court. Today, I would like to discuss the scheme's deliverables—how the Court rewarded its big donors with favorable outcomes that benefited partisan Republican or corporate interests and, particularly today, how the Roberts Court used false facts to produce decisions like Shelby County and Citizens United.

This speech is the short form. For the full analysis or the long form, you can read my recently published law review article in the Ohio State Law Journal, 84 Ohio St. L.J. 837 (2023).

False factfinding is the trick that has enabled the Court to do a lot of damage in recent years. Let's start with some basic principles about how factfinding is supposed to work in the American judicial system.

Facts are an important part of every case, and it matters to get them right, and it also matters that courts stay within their constitutional boundaries. To achieve those two purposes, the American system has facts ascertained at the trial court level—the trial court level.

First, the trial judge is closest to the facts on the ground. That is where the evidence comes in. That is where each party can challenge each other's facts, where facts receive robust adversarial scrutiny. That is where the judge can evaluate credibility and dedicate the time to compiling a robust factual record.

In all of this, one key point is that the judge relies on the parties to bring the facts to the court. With only limited exceptions, a court isn't supposed to venture off looking for its own facts.

Once the trial court makes its decision and assembles its record of the facts, that record travels with the case when a party appeals to a higher court.

As to facts, an appellate court is not supposed to find its own; it is supposed to give the lower court a lot of deference.

A lower court's factfinding can usually be overturned only if there was what is called clear error—a very hard standard to meet, as any lawyer will tell you. Even after a clear error finding, the ordinary rule is that the case is remanded back to the trial court for whatever further factfinding is required to comply with the appellate court's edict.

These rules make our system honest and efficient. They allow robust challenge to the facts at trial but deference to the judge's findings on appeal. They do not set appellate courts up as factfinders. Appellate courts focus on questions of law using the record established by the trial court.

These factfinding rules also protect our American separation of powers. Under the Constitution, courts are limited to deciding only what the Constitution calls ''cases or controversies.'' By obvious implication, that means actual cases or controversies with their actual facts. Without that,

judges could make decisions based on hypothetical facts—in effect, offer unconstitutional advisory opinions.

A court can't honor the Constitution's case or controversy requirement without cabining its decision to the actual facts of the case or controversy and to this established factfinding process. If that limitation did not exist, appellate judges could become, as one famous judge warned, ''a knight-errant, roaming at will in pursuit of his own ideal of beauty or of goodness.''

One other factfinding body needs to be mentioned, and that is Congress. Congress is the Constitution's policymaking body—that is our job—not because we are geniuses but because if our ideals of beauty or of goodness don't match the public's, the public can throw us out. That is democracy. The democratic process provides the public protection.

Congress has its own factfinding authority under the Constitution. We often find facts ourselves, creating a legislative record—not the trial record of a trial court, a legislative record of the proceedings leading to a bill. This factfinding authority merits deference from courts—again, not because we are smarter, but because we are correctible through democratic process.

Which brings us to the mischief at the Roberts Court. For more than a decade now, the Roberts Court has violated these basic principles, replacing facts found by Congress and facts found by lower courts with fake facts that they made up on their own—fake facts that over and over just happen to suit the big donors who put so many Republican-appointed Justices on the Supreme Court.

Shelby County and Citizens United—both of those decisions—stood upon falsehoods presented as facts. These weren't just drive-by errors in passing, of no moment; these were false factual findings that were essential to prop up the logic of the Court's holdings. No false facts; no desired outcome.

Tellingly, even after events thoroughly disproved the false facts, the Republican Supreme Court refused to correct its mistakes, and so these faulty decisions founded on false facts live on like zombies plaguing our democracy.

Let me talk about those two cases because they are probably the worst examples.

In Shelby County, the Supreme Court said that the most important part of the Voting Rights Act—the part that required States with a history of racist voter suppression to get clearance before new voting laws went into effect—was no longer justified. That part of the law was just no longer justified because ''things had changed.''

According to Chief Justice Roberts, conditions in those States had improved so much that Congress should no longer screen their laws for racist voter suppression. That false fact was key to the analysis overturning this part of the Voting Rights Act, but there was no record support for that false fact. It just popped out of the heads of the Justices who wrote that decision.

In actuality, in Shelby County, Congress had compiled thousands of pages of evidence, a record of facts collected through extensive hearings and research regarding the danger of minority voter suppression in those so-called preclearance States. The Court ignored that.

Worse still, preclearance States, no longer subject to these Voting Rights Act protections, immediately proved that the dangers that the Court said weren't there were, in fact, there, that these dangers were true, moving immediately to enact laws that targeted minority voters ''with almost surgical precision,'' as one court put it. Despite the evidence before and after disproving the Court's so-called finding in Shelby County that everything was OK now, the Roberts Court has refused to budge, leaving that zombie decision in place.

The trick was even clearer in Citizens United. The bipartisan campaign finance law at issue was supported again by a robust congressional, factual record. Congress had held hearings, gathered firsthand accounts, and wrote lengthy reports on the problems plaguing our campaign finance system. Lower courts had also assembled similar records with evidence of these problems, many of which suggested corruption. All of that was ignored.

The Republican-appointed Justices in Citizens United had a problem. Congress gets to legislate to protect the integrity of elections. We get to legislate to protect elections from either corruption or the appearance of corruption. So to get around that—to keep Congress out of protecting the integrity of our elections—the Justices had to come up with a way of arguing that unlimited political spending in politics wouldn't and, indeed, couldn't harm election integrity. They had to manufacture that finding to subvert Congress' power, and to get there, they had to make two factual findings.

First, they argued that there was no risk of corruption or even the appearance of corruption because all this new spending they were going to unleash would be independent—independent—from the campaigns the spending was supporting. Well, that has been proven abundantly false.

Even more obviously, they said that all this new political spending they were unleashing would be transparent—not just independent but also transparent. The voters would know who was behind the big, unlimited political spending and could make their decisions accordingly; and therefore, the danger of corruption was lifted by the fact that the voters would know whose money was behind the ads.

Well, folks, it is nondebatable that that fact is false. Partisan billionaires and corporate special interests have spent billions in dark money. This is so widely reported and incontestable that an honest court could probably even take judicial notice of the billions in nontransparent and, therefore, corrupting political spending. A lot of this money is supposedly independent, but in reality, the groups that spend it use all sorts of well-documented loopholes to coordinate with candidates and campaigns right in broad daylight. The tsunami of dark money that Citizens United unleashed has, as predicted, corrupted our democracy.

The Court didn't have to wait for the newspaper to know that the facts it found were false. Shortly after Citizens United, a State campaign finance case came to the Supreme Court from Montana. The Montana Supreme Court upheld a 100-year old State campaign finance law on the basis of an extensive factual record about the history of campaign corruption specific to Montana. John McCain and I submitted a bipartisan brief to the Supreme Court in that case. Our brief pointed out the factual falsity of the Citizens United decision—that the spending was not independent; that the spending was not transparent; and, therefore, those factual predicates of Citizens United failed, and the decision should fall.

Not only did the Republican-appointed Justices summarily reverse the Montana Supreme Court, not even allowing oral argument where, perhaps, this false factfinding might have been pointed out, the Court did so on the grounds that the Montana decision was inconsistent with Citizens United—no mention of the problem that Citizens United was inconsistent with the truth. Talk about a zombie decision. Since then, the Court has stubbornly refused to reexamine its false facts despite several billion instances of disproof of the transparency of the funding.

Worse, a couple of terms ago, these Federalist Society Justices started paving the way even for a constitutional right to spend dark money. The billionaire rightwing donors who packed the Court did very well by these two decisions—by Shelby County and Citizens United. The suppression of minority voters across the South post-Shelby County likely flipped some elections to the Republican Party. The flood of dark money by billionaires and corporate interests was, for years, essentially entirely dedicated to funding Republicans in elections.

If you want a specific example of corruption, look at how fossil fuel industry dark money has, since Citizens United, stopped Congress from passing any serious bipartisan climate legislation. I was here in 2007, 2008, and 2009 when climate legislation was very current in the Senate and very bipartisan—three or four major bills being worked on, strong bills, that would have helped solve the climate problem. Then came January of 2010, that date of infamy when Citizens United was decided. Since then, that is it—no serious bipartisan climate bill.

These cases happened because the Court disregarded rules about proper factfinding, ignored mountains of evidence that Congress and that lower courts had assembled, and made up facts—just made up their own facts—that helped them strike down the laws, delivering those big wins for Republican donor political interests.

This free-range factfinding problem at the Court is going to get worse after the Court's recent move in cases like Dobbs and Bruen to base constitutional decisions under their new theory of history and tradition. This new theory opens whole new fields to judicial factfinding knight-errantry, cherry-picking historical facts to get the outcomes that they want to reach.

Dobbs, the case that overruled Roe v. Wade, stood on dubious historical sources—like a 1600s treatise by someone who sentenced accused witches to death and defended marital rape—to subject women's reproductive autonomy to the whims of State legislatures.

Bruen, the guns case, stood on an NRA-funded version of history that one historian called an ''ideological fantasy'' to put the proliferation of guns on our streets behind constitutional protection.

When the Supreme Court goes on these last-minute, no-argument, ''made it up in our chambers,'' ''no chance of correction'' factfinding expeditions, there is no one to tell them: Hey, you got some stuff wrong. There is no one else the parties can appeal to. The factual errors slipped in at the end are protected from correction, and then the zombie cases march on.

I wrote my law review article because this factfinding trickery hasn't gotten the attention it deserves either here in Congress or by professors and judges. There is no shortage of mess to clean up at the Supreme Court, whether it is the Court's ethics crisis or the phony front group amici curiae, who often show up to offer those false facts to the Court without any transparency or vetting themselves. My Supreme Court Ethics, Recusal, and Transparency Act would clean up a lot of the mess. But even if we passed that law and it helped clean up the ethics mess and even if we managed to unpack the Court that dark money built, these zombie decisions standing on false facts would remain effectual unless—unless—we have the legal theory to address them. My article proposes one way to scrub away these tainted decisions—by returning to the historic, basic, well-established factfinding principles of the American system of justice.

Why should we in Congress not confront the false facts of this stubbornly wrong Court? Why should lower court judges be expected to blindly adopt false facts that never went through proper factfinding procedures? Why should Congress honor decisions that are, on their face, founded on false facts?

Remember in Marbury v. Madison that the Supreme Court famously gets to say what the law is, but it is not the last word on what the facts are. Nothing in the Constitution says: We in Congress have to pretend that we really live in the alternative bizarro world of the Supreme Court's false facts. Congress need not be an idiot and accept rulings that we plainly see could not stand without indisputably false facts propping them up. The fact that the Supreme Court won't go back and clean up its false facts mess should not disable us from addressing the zombie decisions. If this requires circumscribing the Court's authority, as far as I am concerned, too bad. Better that than to have citizens have to obey flawed decisions founded on false facts just because the Court liked who the winners were.

This should not even be an issue. These factfinding rules have stood for centuries. It is only this politically driven Court that has stepped outside the bounds of history and tradition to go on these false factfinding galivants that have no proper role in judicial factfinding and that violate the boundaries of separation of powers. Reining it back in, in that circumstance, is a proper response, and if the Court doesn't like this, I would say: Heal thyself; quit breaking the historic process of factfinding, and quit finding obviously false facts, and go back and clean up those false-fact decisions.

That is one option. They could do it, but, of course, the Federalist Society Justices won't because this is a captured Court, and the false fact outcomes are the outcomes the billionaires who pack the Court want.

To be continued.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. HASSAN). The Senator from Rhode Island.

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO OFFICER MATT DAVIS

● Mr. PAUL. Madam President, today I rise to honor Officer Matt Davis from the Bowling Green Police Department. On July 6, 2023, Officer Davis responded to a call of a disturbance at a used car dealership in Bowling Green, unknowingly stepping into an incredibly volatile and dangerous situation.

Upon entering the establishment, Officer Davis encountered an armed suspect. Without hesitation, he raised his voice, alerting and instructing others to take cover. The assailant fired at Officer Davis, resulting in multiple gunshot wounds and severe, life-threatening injuries. Despite his injuries, Officer Davis was able to neutralize the assailant, and no one else was injured.

Thankfully, Officer Davis survived the shooting. However, he has had to endure a long road of surgeries and rehabilitation. He plans to one day make it back to the force, and I look forward to the day that he returns to work.

Despite the grave risks, Officer Davis put his life on the line and likely saved the lives of many of the patrons in the car dealership that day. His bravery exemplifies the dedication and sacrifice of those who serve and protect our communities. Officer Davis' actions that day are a testament to the resilience and valor exhibited by members of law enforcement and first responders across Kentucky and our Nation.●

TRIBUTE TO OFFICER ANTHONY ROACH AND OFFICER RICHARD ISAACS

● Mr. PAUL. Madam President, today I rise to honor Officers Anthony Roach and Richard Isaacs of the Louisville Metro Police Department. On August 16, 2023, Officers Roach and Isaacs responded to a call of a woman screaming for help from a home in West Louisville. Upon arriving at the scene, the officers saw a woman in distress on the second floor but discovered that all the windows and doors on the first floor were barricaded. Fortunately, neighbors lent a ladder to the officers, and they were able to enter a window on the second floor that had been shattered.

Once inside the house, Officers Roach and Isaacs found the woman with a chain around her neck that was bolted to the floor. The officers sprang into action with a hatchet found in the room, and they freed her from the floor. Once outside, first responders used bolt cutters to remove the chain and finally free the victim. Within 2 days, Louisville Metro police officers were able to make an arrest in the case.

Officers Roach and Isaacs are to be commended for their heroic and life-saving actions. Despite the potential risk to themselves, the officers put the life of victim before their own. Louisville is fortunate to have these brave men serving our communities and protecting Kentuckians. May the actions of each of these officers be forever remembered as a clear display of heroism in action.●

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL BRUCE ''ORVILLE'' WRIGHT, USAF (RET.)

● Mr. WICKER. Madam President, today I congratulate Lt. Gen. Bruce ''Orville'' Wright, USAF (Ret.), upon his retirement as president and chief executive officer of the Air and Space Forces Association, or AFA.

Not satisfied with serving only 34 years in the Air Force, General Wright continued his service to our airmen, guardians, their families, and our Nation's veterans by leading the AFA and