

[Rollcall Vote No. 194 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Baldwin	Fetterman	Ossoff
Barrasso	Fischer	Padilla
Bennet	Gillibrand	Paul
Blackburn	Graham	Peters
Blumenthal	Grassley	Ricketts
Booker	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hassan	Romney
Braun	Heinrich	Rosen
Britt	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Budd	Hoeben	Rubio
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Capito	Johnson	Schumer
Cardin	Kelly	Scott (FL)
Carper	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Casey	King	Shaheen
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Lee	Tester
Cornyn	Lujan	Thune
Cortez Masto	Lummis	Tillis
Cotton	Manchin	Tuberville
Cramer	Marshall	Vance
Crapo	McConnell	Warner
Cruz	Moran	Warnock
Daines	Mullin	Wicker
Duckworth	Murkowski	Wyden
Durbin	Murphy	Young
Ernst	Murray	

NAYS—12

Hawley	Merkley	Van Hollen
Hirono	Reed	Warren
Kaine	Sanders	Welch
Markey	Schmitt	Whitehouse

NOT VOTING—5

Brown	Menendez	Sullivan
Butler	Sinema	

The nomination was confirmed.
(Mr. FETTERMAN assumed the Chair.)

(Ms. KLOBUCHAR assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from Delaware.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. COONS. Madam President, I ask that the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motion be waived.

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

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The 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 nomination of Executive Calendar No. 668, Judy W. Chang, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2029.

Charles E. Schumer, Joe Manchin III, Sheldon Whitehouse, Martin Heinrich, Jeanne Shaheen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Alex Padilla, Mazie Hirono, Ben Ray Lujan, Maria Cantwell, Peter Welch, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard Blumenthal, Mark Kelly, John W. Hickenlooper.

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

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Judy W. Chang, of Massachusetts, to

be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2029, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 63, nays 31, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 195 Ex.]

YEAS—63

Baldwin	Hassan	Reed
Barrasso	Heinrich	Risch
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Romney
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Booker	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cantwell	Kaine	Schatz
Cardin	Kelly	Schumer
Carper	King	Shaheen
Casey	Klobuchar	Smith
Cassidy	Lujan	Stabenow
Collins	Lummis	Tester
Coons	Manchin	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Markey	Van Hollen
Cramer	McConnell	Warner
Crapo	Merkley	Warnock
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warren
Durbin	Murphy	Welch
Fetterman	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wicker
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Grassley	Peters	Young

NAYS—31

Blackburn	Fischer	Paul
Boozman	Hagerty	Ricketts
Braun	Hawley	Rubio
Britt	Hoeben	Schmitt
Budd	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tuberville
Cruz	Marshall	Vance
Daines	Moran	
Ernst	Mullin	

NOT VOTING—6

Brown	Menendez	Sinema
Butler	Sanders	Sullivan

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNET). On this vote, the yeas are 63, the nays are 31, and the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Judy W. Chang, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2029.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4368

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, today I rise to speak on an issue that is incredibly personal and vital to millions of Americans—the protection of in vitro fertilization.

IVF is a medical miracle that has brought the joy of parenthood to millions of families who might otherwise have never experienced it. I am a strong supporter of IVF, and I am incredibly grateful for the technology that has enabled parents, moms and dads desperate to bring into the world little boys and little girls, to finally hold a child in their arms.

It is astounding to note that over 2 percent of all births in America each and every year come from IVF. That translates to millions of parents who have been given the chance to bring new life into the world. To date, more than 8 million babies have been born through IVF.

However, recent developments have caused some confusion and concern among parents and among those who wish to be parents. The Alabama Supreme Court's decision to recognize embryos created through IVF as children under the law has left many prospective parents worried—understandably worried—about the future legality of IVF.

Now, the Alabama Legislature acted quickly to make clear that IVF is fully protected in the State of Alabama, but nonetheless confusion persists.

To the best of my knowledge, all 100 Senators in this body support IVF. Seeing this confusion—confusion that, unfortunately, has been fueled by Democrat partisans—I reached out to Senator KATIE BRITT from Alabama, and I asked Senator BRITT if she would join together in drafting legislation, Federal legislation, that would be a clear, straightforward, ironclad protection for IVF.

I believe we should put into Federal law a clear and unambiguous protection to make clear that no State in the Union can ban IVF, that no local government in this country can ban IVF.

Senator BRITT and I drafted this together. This bill is simple. It is straightforward. It is clear.

IVF is profoundly pro-family. It is an avenue of hope for millions struggling with infertility.

To every mom and every dad at home and to every woman and man desperately hoping to be a parent, know that our bill will ensure that IVF remains 100 percent protected by law. And this should not just be a policy or a general affirmation; this should be a clear and unmistakable Federal law.

We invite our colleagues in the Senate from both sides of the aisle to join together in supporting this crucial legislation. This should be a measure that transcends political divides.

A recent poll showed that 86 percent of Americans believe IVF should be legal and protected. This is an opportunity for us to put partisan divisions aside and to come together and unite on a shared commitment to protecting IVF.

That is why in just a moment I am going to ask unanimous consent to pass this legislation, but before I do so, I want to yield to the Senator from Alabama, Senator BRITT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mrs. BRITT. Mr. President, I was proud to join my colleague from Texas in introducing the IVF Protection Act. I am grateful for his leadership on this important topic.

As a mom, I know firsthand that there is no greater joy in this life than that of being a mother. IVF helps aspiring parents across our Nation experience the miracle of life and start and grow a family. That is why I strongly support continued nationwide IVF access. IVF access is fundamentally pro-family. For the millions of Americans who face infertility every year, IVF provides the hope of a pathway to parenthood.

We all have loved ones, whether they are family members or friends, who have become parents or grandparents through IVF. Across America, about 2 percent of babies born are born because of IVF; that is about 200 babies per day. So think about the magnitude of that number and the faces and the stories and the dreams it represents. In recent decades, millions of people have been born with the help of IVF. Along with my colleague Senator CRUZ, I was honored to lead Senate Republican colleagues in a joint statement emphasizing our shared support in continued nationwide access to IVF.

IVF is legal and available in every single State across America. That includes my home State, where Governor Ivey and the Alabama Legislature acted quickly and overwhelmingly earlier this year to protect IVF access for our State's families.

Today, the Senate has an opportunity to act quickly and overwhelmingly to protect IVF access for our Nation's families. That is what the IVF Protection Act would do. It is straightforward, just as Senator CRUZ has said. The bill would give aspiring parents nationwide the certainty and peace of mind that IVF will remain legal and available in every single State.

Now, I want to break this down as directly as possible. First, there is only one bill that would protect IVF access and not stray outside those parameters; that is our IVF Protection Act. There is only one bill that would protect IVF access while safeguarding religious liberties; that is our IVF Protection Act. And there is only one bill to protect IVF access that could get 60 votes in the Senate, and once again that is our IVF Protection Act.

However, that is not the bill that Democrats are going to be putting on the floor this week. Sadly, they aren't interested in a bill to actually protect IVF access and figuring out how we could get that to become law. That wouldn't advance their true goal, which is about partisan electoral politics. If Democrats allowed the IVF Protection Act to pass today, they would lose a key scare tactic they believe helps them in November, and that, ultimately, is what this is all about.

They are in week two of their summer of scare tactics, and eventually

they are going to transition to a fall of fearmongering.

At the end of the day, the American people want secure borders; they support safe streets; they want stable prices; and they want strong families. My colleagues across the aisle know that they can't sell the Biden administration's record on any of these topics. It has been failure after failure yet again.

So instead, they have to rely on distorting and misrepresenting Republicans' positions on issues, including our support for IVF access. The bottom line is, the American people deserve better, and there is no better path out there than our bill, the path of common-ground solutions, not show votes or scare tactics.

Again, I want to applaud the leadership of my colleague from Texas. Senator CRUZ has been a champion as we work to make sure that the world knows that we are going to protect access to IVF. While Democrats prioritize scaring families, Republicans will continue to fight.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, sometimes the folks at home can find what happens in parliamentary procedure on this floor confusing, so I want to explain what is about to happen. In just a moment, I am going to ask unanimous consent to pass the IVF protection bill into law. One of two things will happen in response: One, the Democrats in this Chamber can decide that IVF should be protected by Federal law, in which case this bill will pass the Senate 100 to nothing; the other thing that might happen is Senate Democrats will utter two words, "I object."

So I want you to listen very carefully to the Senate Democrats. And whatever else is included in the speech, understand if the remarks end with the words "I object," then Senate Democrats will have made the cynical political decision that Democrats don't want IVF protected in Federal law. They don't want to provide reassurance and comfort to millions of parents in America because, instead, they want to spend millions of dollars running campaign ads suggesting the big bad Republicans want to take away IVF. I get why that could be good politics, but I hope Senate Democrats are not that cynical.

Understand, again, if you hear the words "I object," Senate Democrats are saying: No, we will not protect IVF in Federal law because we want to play politics.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 4368 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to re-

consider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I am not going to mince words here. It is ridiculous to claim that this bill protects IVF when it does nothing of the sort. In fact, it explicitly allows States to restrict IVF in all sorts of ways. It is literally in the bill text.

Remember, it did not take State lawmakers in Alabama passing a ban on IVF for clinics in the State to suspend services.

Under this bill, there are a million ways Republican-led States could enact burdensome and unnecessary requirements and create the kind of legal uncertainty and risk that would force clinics to once again close their doors.

Also, even though it is an inherent part of the IVF process that families will make more embryos than they need, this bill does absolutely nothing—not a single thing—to ensure families who use IVF can have their clinics dispose of unused embryos without facing legal threats for a standard medical procedure. Instead, this bill completely ignores the matter of what happens to frozen embryos in order to appease Republicans' extreme anti-abortion allies.

This was intentional, and it leaves the door open to a lot of chaos. So this Republican bill really is a PR tool, plain and simple. It is just another way for Republicans to pretend they are not the extremists that they keep proving they are.

Meanwhile, there are bills some Republicans are pushing for right now that would enshrine, as a matter of law, that life begins at conception and that discarding unused embryos is essentially murder.

Senator CRUZ himself supported a personhood amendment to the U.S. Constitution. No way around that. The junior Senator from Texas wanted to change the U.S. Constitution to give embryos the same rights as living, breathing human beings. Look, the stone-cold reality is that you cannot protect IVF and champion fetal personhood.

So I would like to ask my colleagues who are offering this enormously inadequate bill—and I hope they do answer it directly—do you support letting parents have clinics dispose of unused embryos, which is a typical part of the IVF process, or do you support fetal personhood, which by its very nature will throw IVF access into chaos? Because until they clearly answer that question—and it is a couple simple ones—all the claims of supporting IVF will fall obviously short, just like this bill does. That is why I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington suggested that this bill does not protect IVF. Let me

read you the clear statutory language that unambiguously protects IVF:

A State shall not prohibit in vitro fertilization as defined in section 4(B) of the IVF Protection Act services and shall ensure that no unit of local government in the State prohibits such services.

That is clear. That is unambiguous. That is explicit. And that is ironclad.

Had the Democrats not cynically said “I object,” that language would have just passed the U.S. Senate 100 to nothing, a strong Federal protection of IVF.

Now, Democrats know that out of 50 States, not a single State is seeking to ban IVF. They know that the threat that they plan to spend millions of dollars trying to convince the voters is real, no State is currently pursuing. They know that Alabama—whose Supreme Court started this issue—the legislature promptly came into session and acted to make clear that IVF is protected.

And the Senator from Washington asked a question. I do find it interesting. She asked a question and wanted me to answer it, but she is no longer on the Senate floor to hear my answer to the question, but I will answer it anyway. The Senator from Washington suggests that those States that pursue personhood amendments, that that is somehow inconsistent with IVF. The one problem she has is facts and reality because there are three States—Alabama, Georgia, and Missouri—all of which have adopted personhood amendments, and all of which protect IVF. So IVF is legal in Alabama. It is legal in Georgia. It is legal in Missouri.

So the Democrats maintain that IVF is in jeopardy, and yet the facts are precisely contrary. Understand why the Democrats just did what they did. Every Democrat on the ballot is going to tell the voters: If you don't vote for me, a Democrat, mean Republicans are going to come take away IVF. And I will tell you the reason they are going to say that is because the Democrats' record on abortion is extreme and out of the mainstream. Every Democrat Senator in this body has voted for legislation that would legalize abortion literally up until the moment of birth, up to and including the 39th and 40th week of pregnancy. That is radical. Only 9 percent of Americans support the extreme policy position of Senate Democrats on abortion. Ninety-one percent of Americans look at that and say: That goes too far.

Even among those Americans who call themselves pro-choice, a majority of pro-choice Americans look at the position of the Democrats, and they say: Wow. Abortion up until the moment of delivery in the ninth month of pregnancy, that is too much.

So what is the Democrats' political strategy? Don't talk about their actual record on abortion; instead, try to change the topic to, last week, contraception and this week IVF.

And they know that no State in the Union is trying to ban contraception and that no State in the Union is try-

ing to ban IVF. Every single Senator in this body supports the right to contraception. Every single Senator in this body supports IVF being protected.

But the Democrats are counting on docile media to pick up their message and carry their message. They know that the bills we are voting on tomorrow will fail. That is not a bug; it is a feature. They want the bills tomorrow to fail. Why? Because this is all about running TV ads claiming Republicans are opposed to IVF. They know it is false.

And, by the way, one of the reasons the bills will fail tomorrow is they deliberately trample on religious liberty. You know there used to be a time when there was a bipartisan commitment to religious liberty but no longer. The Democrats have decided that the First Amendment to the Constitution no longer matters.

And so the Democrats' bill would, among other things, force a Catholic hospital to provide IVF procedures, even if it was contrary to the faith of Catholic doctors performing the procedure. Now, our bill does not seek to force anyone to do anything. We all have a right to live according to our faith. So if your faith teaches you not to use IVF, as a doctor, you should have the right not to say: I am not going to participate in that.

But understand the Cruz-Britt legislation that the Democrats just cynically objected to would protect IVF for every parent in the country, and it would become Federal law, except for one thing: The Democrats do not want it to because if we pass clear, strong Federal protections for IVF, the issue that they are planning to campaign on would go away.

What we have just seen is one of the most cynical displays of partisan politics to ever occur on the Senate floor. It is designed deliberately to deceive the American voters. It is unfortunate that Democrats put politics above protecting parents and above protecting IVF.

But just remember the next time you hear a Democrat saying—and they are going to spend millions of dollars saying it—we are the ones who want to protect IVF, understand we could have passed strong Federal legislation today, but Senate Democrats don't want a protection of IVF. They want a campaign issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I thank the leadership of the Senators from Texas and Alabama on this issue that is important to literally millions of Americans, as the Senators talked about.

First of all, let the record show that, today, the Democrats objected to the Republican-led IVF Protection Act. The Democrats objected to protecting IVF.

This is personal to so many people up here, and it is personal to many Repub-

lican Senators. I would suppose a half a dozen of us so far have a family member—maybe a child or a grandchild—because of IVF or staff, thanks to IVF. Maybe it is as personal to me as to anybody up here. For some 30 years of my life, I had the opportunity and the privilege of delivering a baby most every day. Certainly, I have just nothing but fond, fond memories in each one of those opportunities to give a baby to a new mom and dad and just see the smiles on their faces and see their lives change forever.

But not everybody was that fortunate, and not everybody is that fortunate, as 10 to 15 percent of Americans have an infertility problem. There are 10 to 15 percent of married couples who struggle to have children, and that is why I worked so hard to have an infertility clinic—a place where people could travel from hundreds of miles to get help with their infertility treatments. Certainly, there were many basic things we could do. We helped thousands of women and have helped them have a baby, but if we weren't successful, the next step was in vitro fertilization. Personally, I am proud that I participated in hundreds of IVF cycles—successful cycles—and delivered many, many, many babies from in vitro fertilization.

The country needs to know that Republicans believe in IVF, that we support it. I have never heard one Republican Senator up here say anything else. I have not heard anyone try to take this down. So I am proud to stand up here today and support Senator BRITT's and Senator CRUZ's bill to protect in vitro fertilization.

We are going to have an opportunity tomorrow on a show bill—we will have a show vote on a show bill. Senator DUCKWORTH's bill on IVF has poison pills that not many Republicans can tolerate.

The first poison pill is it denies freedom of religion, as Senator CRUZ talked about—freedom of religion. The bill we will be voting on tomorrow, as far as I am concerned, is unconstitutional. As a physician—as a Christian physician, as a God-fearing Christian—there are certain things that I will not participate in, but I happen to believe that in vitro fertilization is a gift from God, that God has given us this technology to do good with. And I want to make sure that we apply that. There will be certain hospitals and physicians who don't want to participate in IVF, but the Democrats' bill tomorrow forces that physician and that hospital to participate against their consciences. I think that is a violation of religious freedom.

The second poison pill in that legislation is that the bill's definitions are too broad. They create an unlimited, unfettered right to all reproductive technologies. You would have to assume that that includes cloning and gene editing. Are we ready to go out there and force hospitals and doctors

to participate in cloning and gene editing? I just don't think America is ready for that.

And here is the third issue, the third poison pill that is being ignored: This legislation by Senator DUCKWORTH requires infertility clinics to go right to IVF; that they skip—they can skip all the other easier steps, if you will. I won't bore the rest of the Senate with some of those easier things we could do, but there are many things that you could do for infertility before jumping to IVF. I just don't think that that is good legislation to overregulate that patient-physician relationship.

It is a great honor to come here today. Today, 200 babies were born from in vitro fertilization—200. Let's celebrate those babies. We are the party of pro-family and pro-life. We support protecting in vitro fertilization. I ask this Chamber to come together and celebrate the blessings of in vitro fertilization as opposed to mounting political disinformation campaigns that are disingenuous to the beliefs of so many in our conference.

As I said before, the Republican Party stands as the pro-family party, and nothing embodies this more than welcoming a new baby into loving arms. Standing with these families means offering them encouragement and support in their journeys toward safe and secure in vitro fertilization treatment. Our commitment to protecting life ensures that every family has the chance to experience that joy of parenthood through in vitro fertilization.

Our priority is always to make it easier for families to have babies, not harder. We must understand that there are over 8 million families now for whom IVF has answered their prayers. That is why I am, again, so honored to stand here beside Senators CRUZ and BRITT to champion this pro-family legislation and guarantee access to in vitro fertilization to all Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, here we go again. I rise today in this Chamber as President Biden and his administration enter yet another summer of executive overreach as the administration adds layer after layer of bureaucracy that spells negative consequences for nearly every aspect of American life. Actually, I just had the homebuilders in my office today making this very point—the West Virginia Home Builders Association.

Throughout the President's time in the White House, we haven't really seen much consistency except when it comes to his desire to grow the influence of unelected government bureaucrats or to defy congressional intent or to impose unnecessary rules, regulations, and redtape. These things will forever define his administration, and as of June 7 of this year, the 946 final rules imposed by President Biden have cost the American taxpayer over \$1.6 trillion.

So, for President Biden and his administration, I would recommend a brief refresher on the history of the United States and the intent that inspired the Framers of our Constitution.

Our Founding Fathers were quick to recognize that power and authority vested in one body would create devastating costs for the future of our Nation. That was the motivation behind establishing separated powers, of creating a system of checks and balances across three equal branches of government. However, President Biden's advocacy for the growth of the administrative state has put this separation into question. It kind of goes against article I of the Constitution, which states:

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Let's just take a few examples that we have seen recently of what I would consider to be outrageous overreach.

No. 1, first—something I have been very vocal about—is the EPA's Clean Power Plan 2.0, which will eliminate coal-powered generation completely, but it will also block new natural gas plants from coming online in the future. Don't ask me how we are going to power the Nation.

This rule from the EPA is meant to put coal and natural gas employees out of work and shutter those baseload power plants once and for all.

Next, we have the final rule from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services that imposes burdensome Federal staffing mandates on long-term care facilities.

This is something that could be incredibly harmful to rural States like mine. Now, safety is first in a long-term care facility, but unattainable employee requirements like this one would force many of our rural nursing homes to shut their doors, especially as rural health facilities are facing staffing challenges all across the country.

Then there is the Biden HHS rule that endangers the safety and well-being of unaccompanied migrant children.

Currently, migrant children who enter into the country illegally without an adult are detained and placed in the Unaccompanied Children Program. The HHS rule that I am referring to includes many harmful practices like optional sponsor-vetting. That is the refusal to consider a sponsor's criminal record. So we are going to put children into the care and sponsorship of people, and we are refusing to see if they have

criminal records. Think about somebody who has a history of abuse or neglect or somebody who has a drug problem. We wouldn't know. And there are weak standards for post-release home studies to determine a child's status or safety once the child is in the custody of that sponsor.

There are many heartbreaking stories we see with the border crisis, but this exploitation of children is one of the most devastating. I would add we have seen article after article about child labor and child trafficking that is occurring, and the administration is changing a rule to make it less protective of those children.

Over at the Department of Commerce's Bureau of Industry and Security, they have an interim final rule that targets U.S. businesses that support America's use of their Second Amendment rights. Specifically, it restricts the ability of American firearm—ammunition—and related component manufacturers to obtain a license to export their products for sale.

Aside from the fact that it is unlawful, the interim rule will have a negative impact again on these American manufacturers, their suppliers, and the jobs that they support.

Additionally at the EPA, we saw the coal combustion residuals final rule, also known as coal ash, that imposes retroactive and costly regulations on coal ash management at inactive coal-fired powerplants.

This highlights, yet again, another anti-energy rule from the Biden administration that would throw our power grid into even more uncertainty. The volume of these efforts truly goes to show the broken rulemaking process of this administration. It underscores the President's bureaucratic blunders and his administration's ineffective style of governing.

While each rule may seem unrelated to one another, they strike a common cord. President Biden's administrative state is out of control. They would rather impose harmful regulations—remember, I said 900 of them—that would restrict America's rights and make life more difficult for our families than work with this Congress on pragmatic solutions, and they further escalate the hidden tax generated by these regulations—a tax that often receives too little attention.

The growth of the administrative state has distorted the way that policy and policymaking and lawmaking works right here in Washington, DC. This shifts away from letting Congress legislate; it openly defies the basis on which our country was built; and it takes the power away from the people. When you take the power away from the Representatives, you are taking power away from the people. Remember, the Constitution starts with "We the People." It does not start with "We the Administration" or "Me the President."

I encourage President Biden and my colleagues in Congress to recognize that.