

protegee, Vice President HARRIS, has fully embraced them. She made it clear that if she is elected in November, the assault on the independent judiciary—the Supreme Court—will not go away; it will accelerate. A potential Harris administration would stage a full-blown coup to overtake the Supreme Court and eviscerate judicial independence. She basically would disregard the Constitution itself and attempt to turn the Court into an institution that serves at the pleasure of a political party—hers.

We need to call it what it is. The Biden-Harris proposal is not about protecting democracy or ensuring accountability; it is about consolidating power and undermining institutions that stand in the way of their agenda.

If these radical ideas were to become a reality, they would dangerously shift the balance of power and erode the independence of the Supreme Court—again, the crown jewels of our form of government. They would ultimately politicize the one branch of government that was designed to be insulated from partisanship.

Our Founders deliberately designed a Federal Government with three distinct but equal branches. They established a set of checks and balances to prevent any one branch from forcing another to bend to its will, but unfortunately, that is exactly what President Biden and his party are trying to do today—to blur the lines between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches to secure partisan political wins and accrue more power.

But here in the U.S. Senate—an institution created for this purpose—cooler heads must prevail. We cannot stoop to the level of the mob. We have to stand up for an independent judiciary and the Supreme Court as an essential institution in our form of government regardless of how we feel about the decisions.

Many decisions by the Supreme Court I have disagreed with in the past, and I am sure I will in the future, but as one Justice said, “The Supreme Court is not final because it is right; it is right because it is final.”

That is the only way to preserve the integrity of the judiciary and our invaluable checks and balances, is with an independent judiciary—one that isn’t politicized and doesn’t bend to the will of a political party.

Republicans will continue to fight to protect the integrity of America’s judicial system, and we will not allow this President or any President or any political party to hijack the Federal judiciary for their own partisan benefit.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 15 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

TRIBUTE TO ALEV KELTER AND THE U.S.
OLYMPICS WOMEN’S RUGBY TEAM

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I have a resolution that I am looking forward to passing here on the Senate floor. I am pretty sure no one is going to object to it, but we will see in a minute.

Before I begin, I want to do a huge shout-out and congratulations to Alaska’s own Alev Kelter and the U.S. women’s rugby team. Thanks to Alev’s score late in the first half, the Americans beat the vaunted Australians in rugby to deliver the women’s rugby team’s first Olympic medal in rugby sevens.

So great job, Alev. Great job to the American women’s rugby team in getting some medals there for our great Nation.

ACKNOWLEDGING THE COURAGE
AND SACRIFICE OF VETERANS
OF THE VIETNAM WAR AND EX-
PRESSING REGRET FOR THE
MISTREATMENT OF VETERANS
RETURNING HOME FROM THE
WAR

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I am here on the floor today to ask unanimous consent for a long, long overdue resolution. It is a resolution that I guarantee most Americans are going to be like: What? Wait. What? We haven’t done that yet? The Senate, the Congress, hasn’t done that yet?

It is a resolution on this: recognizing the heroic service of our Vietnam veterans and finally issuing an apology—yes—for the way in which tens of thousands of them were treated when they came home after serving their Nation.

So that is what I am going to do right here. I was told a couple of minutes ago that someone was going to object, and I was like: Whoa. Really? Let’s have that debate. Let’s have that debate.

But good news: no objection. So what I wanted to do briefly is just explain the reasoning behind this resolution.

I think, as a country, when you look at the broad sweep of American history, we have always rightfully respected, lionized, and celebrated America’s veterans—think about it—in the last several decades.

The World War II generation—we even have a name for them: the “greatest generation”—sacrificed over 400,000 Americans killed in action, saving the world from dictatorships in Europe and in the Pacific. The “greatest generation” literally defended freedom all over the world. When they came home—and to this day—we celebrated them, and we lionized them with ticker-tape parades, as it should be. At that moment in our history, the respect for our veterans was sky-high.

Then you had the Korean war, and unfortunately, in my view—I am a Korean war history buff, and I have studied this a lot—you had kind of an attitude of benign neglect. Even the phrase the “forgotten war,” which I don’t

like—it should be called the noble war, actually—kind of indicates this benign neglect. The veterans came home. People didn’t really celebrate what they did. It wasn’t really like World War II. It was just kind of, OK, get on with your life; you did your duty. They sacrificed, of course, but there wasn’t a lot—it was kind of benign neglect, as I mentioned.

Then the Vietnam war happened, and we all know what happened, but to this day, I think most Americans maybe don’t even understand what happened, but there is no doubt our country went off-kilter, and the respect given to our servicemembers—World War II was certainly at the high level, even the Korean war with its benign neglect—this respect hit rock bottom. It hit rock bottom.

You know, it is just really sad. We all have heard stories of veterans coming home—corporals, enlisted guys, young officers. They did their duty. Some of them were drafted and said: It is my turn to go. For whatever reason—Vietnam was, of course, very contentious, but for whatever reason, when they came home, a lot of people in the American public took it out on them—slandered, spit upon, all kinds of horrible epitaphs.

I remember one of my first mess nights as a Marine officer—I was a brandnew second lieutenant, and we had a mess night with a lot of these old retired marines—a very formal, sacred setting in many ways. One of the officers there talked about how he came home from Vietnam. His dad was a World War II vet. He had been in 12 months of combat. He came home to see his father. He hugged his dad. They were walking outside of the airport, and somebody threw red paint on him and his dad. Could you imagine that? You just sacrificed for your country. You are in uniform with your father, who is a World War II vet. What did we do that for? I don’t know if there is ever going to be an answer. But this happened literally to tens of thousands of Vietnam veterans. It shouldn’t have happened, but it did.

So what we can do here in the Senate is just say: Hey, we recognize your great service. It wasn’t easy. You were doing your duty. And if you were treated horribly—which a lot of them were when they came home—again, maybe you go attack President Johnson or President Nixon—not attack but criticize them—but why take it out on the lance corporal? That is what happened, and it shouldn’t have happened.

So what we can do here—and we are going to do it in a second. I am really glad no one is objecting. I hope no one is objecting. My resolution, S. Res. 778, has a lot of Senators supporting it. It is simply acknowledging the courage and sacrifice of our veterans from the Vietnam war and apologizing for the treatment that so many of them received when they came home—pretty simple—and welcoming them home, finally, from the U.S. Senate.

This resolution lays out their heroic service. It talks about the sacrifice. Mr. President, 58,000 members of the Armed Forces lost their lives. More than 300,000 Americans were wounded in Vietnam. Yet many who served bravely and faithfully to the United States during the Vietnam war were repeatedly targeted with shameful attacks when they came home. Why? I don't know. That never really happened in our history before, and it should never happen again.

Here is the beautiful thing about our Vietnam vets: Instead of being wracked and incapacitated by bitterness or anger, our Vietnam veterans—and I have seen it throughout my career in the military—when they came home, they said: Here is what we are going to do. We were treated really poorly. We are going to work really hard to make sure that the next generations of veterans who serve overseas aren't treated poorly, that we get back to this level of World War II treatment.

Guess what. The Vietnam vets succeeded in that. The vast majority of Americans look at our veterans—whether they agreed with the war in Iraq or Afghanistan or anywhere else, when they see the vets, they say: Thank you for your heroic service. We may not have liked the war, but we are certainly not going to take it out on you, lieutenant or corporal.

That group—our Vietnam vets—had a lot to do with us getting back to that level.

I saw this throughout my entire military career. I just retired out of the Marine Corps a few months ago after 30 years. I will give you one example. I had a sergeant from one of my Marine Recon units who was killed by an avalanche in Alaska—a great guy. So we were having a service to bury him. It was very somber. I was just a captain, but I was the lead officer overseeing this service. These guys pulled up on motorcycles—Vietnam vets. There were like five of them at this service, just sitting there.

After the service, they came up to me.

I said: Hey, thank you, guys, for coming to the service of my sergeant.

I said: Did you know him?

No, we didn't know him. We just saw that he was killed, and we wanted to come here to honor him.

Think about that. Those are Vietnam veterans in my great State of Alaska who probably didn't get treated well but who said: We are going to go to the funeral of this Marine sergeant to make sure he gets the respect that everybody should have gotten and certainly that the Vietnam vet generation should have gotten, but so many didn't.

So this resolution does that. It recognizes the extraordinary sacrifice of our Vietnam vets. It commends them for their courage and sacrifice. It urges the President and on behalf of the Congress to formally acknowledge the widespread mistreatment of veterans of the

Vietnam war when they came back home. It offers, on behalf of the Congress, a long overdue apology, and it encourages and expresses support for increased education in the schools of the United States to reflect on and learn about the courage and sacrifice of this group of veterans and, unfortunately, sometimes the lack of support when they came home. So that is what the resolution does.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 778, which is at the desk.

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

The senior assistant executive clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 778) acknowledging the courage and sacrifice of veterans of the Vietnam war and expressing regret for the mistreatment of veterans returning home from the war.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SULLIVAN. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 778) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, with that, given that there is no objection, that Senate resolution has now passed in the United States. It unanimously is on record finally, in 2024, thanking our Vietnam veterans for their service, for their sacrifice; acknowledging the mistreatment they got when they came home; welcoming them home; and saying, on behalf of the Congress of the United States, we do apologize for the mistreatment that you received, and we know that you are the key to making sure future generations of veterans are honored.

So to our Vietnam vets, welcome home.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

NOMINATION OF STACEY D. NEUMANN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote to confirm Stacey Neumann to the U.S. District Court for the District of Maine.

Ms. Neumann earned her B.A. from James Madison University (2000) and her J.D. from Cornell Law School (2005). Following law school, she clerked for Judge John A. Dooley on the Vermont Supreme Court and Judge Peter W. Hall on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

Ms. Neumann began her legal career with the Chittenden County Public Defender Office in Vermont. In 2009, she joined the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Maine as a special assistant U.S. attorney and became an assistant U.S. attorney in 2010. At the U.S. Attorney's Office, she served as the Project Safe Childhood Coordinator. In this role, she was responsible for investigating and prosecuting crimes involving the possession, transportation, and production of child sexual abuse material.

Since 2013, Ms. Neumann has been a litigator with Murray Plumb & Murray, where she maintains a diverse practice that consists of criminal, civil, and administrative matters. She has focused her civil practice on representing employees in workplace discrimination cases while also serving as a member of the Criminal Justice Act panel, accepting appointed indigent clients.

Over the course of her legal career, Ms. Neumann has handled 15 trials or adjudicated matters that proceeded to verdict or judgment.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Ms. Neumann as "well qualified," and she has the support of her home State Senators, Ms. COLLINS and Mr. KING.

Ms. Neumann's diverse experience as a litigator and commitment to service make her well-prepared to serve on the bench with distinction. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

VOTE ON NEUMANN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Neumann nomination?

Ms. ROSEN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 223 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Carper	Graham
Bennet	Casey	Hassan
Blumenthal	Collins	Heinrich
Booker	Coons	Hickenlooper
Brown	Cortez Masto	Hirono
Butler	Duckworth	Kaine
Cantwell	Durbin	Kelly
Cardin	Gillibrand	King