United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2024 *No. 46*

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Friday, March 15, 2024, at 11 a.m.

Senate

THURSDAY, MARCH 14, 2024

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Eternal God, who sustains those who obey You, You have been good to us beyond our deserving. You have surrounded us with the beauties of the Earth and the glories of the skies. Today, make us alert to Your providential movements. If our minds are closed to Your truth, open them. If our hearts are hardened, soften them. If our ears are deaf to the cries of the oppressed, unstop them.

Lord, revive our Senators. Give them a desire to establish new thresholds of hope, peace, and freedom in our Nation and world. Be near to our lawmakers all their days. May they rest in the green pastures of your peace and thrive beside the still waters of Your wisdom.

We pray in Your mighty 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 (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, March 14, 2024.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WARNOCK 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Dennis B. Hankins, of Minnesota, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Haiti.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

ISRAEL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about what I believe can and should be the path forward to secure mutual peace and lasting prosperity for Israelis and Palestinians. I speak for myself, but I also speak for so many mainstream Jewish Americans, a silent majority whose nuanced views on the matter have never been well-represented in this country's discussions about the war in Gaza.

My last name is SCHUMER, which derives from the Hebrew word ''shomer'' or guardian. Of course, my first responsibility is to America and to New York. But as the first Jewish majority leader of the U.S. Senate and the highest ranking Jewish elected official in America ever, I also feel very keenly my responsibility as a ''Shomer Yisreol''—a guardian of the people of Israel.

Throughout Jewish history, there have been many shomrim and plenty who are far greater than I claim to be. But, nonetheless, this is the position in which I find myself now—at a time of

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

great difficulty for the State of Israel, for the Jewish people, and for non-Jewish friends of Israel. So I feel an immense obligation to speak and to act.

I speak as a member of a community of Jewish Americans that I know very well. They are my family, my friends. Many of them are my constituents. Many of them are Democrats, and many are deeply concerned about the pursuit of justice, both in New York and around the globe. From the Talmud—''Tikkun Olam,'' the call to ''repair the world''—has driven Jews around the globe to do what is right.

We love Israel in our bones. What Israel has meant to my generation within living memory of the Holocaust is impossible to measure. The flowering of the Jewish people in the desert, from the ashes of the Holocaust and the fulfillment of the dream of a Jewish homeland after nearly 2,000 years of praying and waiting represents one of the most heartfelt causes of my life. And unlike some younger Americans, I remember how hard it was to achieve that dream. I remember clutching my transistor radio to my ear in James Madison High School, 1967, during the Six-Day War, wondering if Israel would be pushed into the sea.

If the events of the last few months have made anything clear, it is that Israel is surrounded by vicious enemies, and there are many people around the world who excuse and even support their aims to expel and kill Jews living in their hard-won land of refuge.

I will never underestimate the grave threats Israel faces and has faced for the entirety of its existence, nor will I ever underestimate the oppression the Jewish people have endured for millennia.

It is precisely out of that longstanding connection to and concern for the state of the people of Israel that I speak today about what I view are the most pressing existential threats to Israel's long-term peace and prosperity.

After 5 months of suffering on both sides of this conflict, our thinking must turn urgently to how we can achieve lasting peace and ensure prosperity and security for both the Jewish people and the Palestinian people in the Middle East.

I believe that to achieve that lasting peace, which we so long for, Israel must make some significant course corrections, which I will outline in this speech.

But, first, let's not forget how we arrived at this critical moment. What Hamas did on October 7 was brutal beyond imagination. I have sat with the families of those killed in the assault. I have seen the footage and heard the stories of innocents murdered and raped and of heartless cruelty. And as long as I live, I will never forget these images—this pure and premeditated evil.

Many of my family members were killed by Nazis in the Holocaust. October 7 and the shameless response to support that terrorist attack by some in America and around the globe have awakened the deepest fears of the Jewish people: that our annihilation remains a possibility. Today, over 130 hostages remain captive in Gaza. I am anguished by the plight of so many hostages still being trapped deep inside Hamas's network of tunnels. I pray for them and for their families who have inspired me with their tenacious advocacy to ensure their loved ones are not forgotten. Many of them are Americans: Jonathan Dekel-Chen, Hersh Goldberg-Polin; and some are my constituents in New York: Omer Neutra, Keith Siegel, and Itay Chen, who we tragically learned this week was brutally killed on October 7 while serving near the Gaza border. Hamas still holds his body. His father gave me this pin, which I am wearing in remembrance of him. As well as those of Americans Judi Weinstein and Gad Haggai.

I have sat with many of these families. I have wept with them. Each day that their loved ones don't come home carries enough anguish and grief to last a lifetime.

I am working in every way I can to support the Biden administration's negotiations to continue to free every last one of the hostages. I urge every actor at the table—the Israelis, the Biden administration, the Qataris, the Egyptians, and anybody else at the table—to continue doing everything possible to get a deal. Hamas has been given a deal already. They should say yes. It is no time to waste.

My heart also breaks at the loss of so many civilian lives in Gaza. I am anguished that the Israeli war campaign has killed so many innocent Palestinians. I know that my fellow Jewish Americans feel the same anguish when they see the images of dead and starving children and destroyed homes.

Gaza is experiencing a humanitarian catastrophe—entire families wiped out, whole neighborhoods reduced to rubble, mass displacement, children suffering.

We should not let the complexities of this conflict stop us from stating the plain truth: Palestinian civilians do not deserve to suffer for the sins of Hamas, and Israel has a moral obligation to do better. The United States has an obligation to do better. I believe the United States must provide robust humanitarian aid to Gaza and pressure the Israelis to let more of it get through to the people who need it.

Jewish people throughout the centuries have empathized with those who are suffering and who are oppressed because we have known so much of that ourselves. As the Torah teaches us, every human life is precious; every single innocent life lost, whether Israeli or Palestinian, is a tragedy that, as the Scripture says, ''destroys an entire world.''

What horrifies so many Jews especially is our sense that Israel is falling short of upholding these distinctly Jewish values that we hold so dear. We must be better than our enemies, lest we become them.

Israel has a fundamental right to defend itself, but as I have said from the beginning of this war, how it exercises that right matters. Israel must prioritize the protection of civilian casualties when identifying military targets. I have repeatedly called upon the Israeli government to do so.

But it also must be said that Israel is, by no means, the only one responsible for the immense civilian toll. To blame only Israel for the deaths of Palestinians is unfair, one-sided, and often deliberately manipulative. And it ignores Hamas's role in this conflict.

Hamas has knowingly invited an immense civilian toll during this war. Their goal on October 7 was to provoke a tough response from Israel by killing as many Jews as possible in the most vicious manner possible—by raping women, executing babies, desecrating bodies, brutalizing whole communities.

Since then, Hamas has heartlessly hidden behind their fellow Palestinians by turning hospitals into command centers and refugee camps into missile-launching sites. It is well documented that Hamas soldiers use innocent Gazans as human shields. The leaders of Hamas, many of whom live lives of luxury in places far away from the poverty and misfortune of Gaza, do not care one iota about the Palestinians for whom they claim to nobly fight.

It bothers me deeply that most media outlets covering this war and many protesters opposing it have placed the blame for civilian casualties entirely on Israel. All too often in the media and at protests, it is never noted that Hamas has gone to great lengths to make themselves inseparable from the civilian population of Gaza by using Palestinians as human shields. Too many news agencies, television stations, and newspapers give Hamas a pass by hardly ever discovering the shameful practice that is central to their fighting strategy.

And this has led to an inaccurate perception of the harsh realities of this war. I believe stories that justifiably mention loss of innocent Palestinian life should also note how Hamas uses civilians as human shields. It almost never happens.

And I believe that every protest that justifiably decries the loss of innocent Palestinian women, men, children should also denounce Hamas for their central role in the bloodshed. When protesters decry the loss of Palestinian life but never condemn this perfidy, or the loss of Israeli lives, it confounds and deeply troubles the vast majority of Jewish and non-Jewish Americans alike who support the State of Israel.

Given that Hamas launched their attacks on October 7 to provoke Israel, given that Hamas sought the ensuing civilian toll in Gaza, given that Hamas wanted both Israelis and Arabs to be at each others' throats, tensions on both sides have dramatically intensified.

And, now, as a result of those inflamed tensions in both Israeli and Palestinian communities, people on all sides of this war are turning away from a two-state solution, including Israel's Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, who in recent weeks has said out loud repeatedly what many have long suspected by outright rejecting the idea of Palestinian statehood and sovereignty.

As the highest ranking Jewish elected official in our government and as a staunch defender of Israel, I rise today to say unequivocally: This is a grave mistake for Israel, for Palestinians, for the region, and for the world.

The only real and sustainable solution to this decades-old conflict is a negotiated two-state solution, a demilitarized Palestinian State living side by side with Israel in equal measures of peace, security, prosperity, dignity, and mutual recognition.

Both Jews and Palestinians have long historic claims to this land. Contrary to the unfounded, absurd, and offensive claims by some that the Jewish people are ''colonizers'' in their ancestral homeland, Jewish people have lived in the Holy Land continuously for more than three millennia—3,000 years.

For centuries, Jews have made aliyah and gone to the land of Israel to live and settle. For centuries, at Passover, Jews at every corner of the globe have prayed: ''Next year in Jerusalem.''

A Jewish homeland in Israel is no 20th-century contrivance. Israel is our historic home, a home for people oppressed for centuries.

Now, the Palestinians too have lived on the land for generations, and, in past centuries, they have formed their own distinct culture, identity, cuisine, and literature. The idea espoused by some that ''there is no such thing as Palestinians'' is inaccurate, offensive, unhelpful.

The only just solution to this predicament is one in which each people can flourish in their own state, side by side. But for a two-state solution to work over the long term, it has to include real and meaningful compromises by both sides.

For example, too many Israelis who say they want a two-state solution don't acknowledge how the amount and extent of expanding settlements renders that a virtual impossibility. And too many Palestinians who say they want a two-state solution don't acknowledge how their insistence on an unequivocal ''right of return'' is a fatal impediment to progress. Both ways of thinking are impeding the peace process.

And there are others on the left who view a two-state solution with skepticism as an ideal that will never happen, a far-off goal that allows for the continuation of the status quo in Gaza and the West Bank, where Palestinians face unique obstacles compared to their Israeli counterparts. As a result, they reject a two-state solution in favor of one state, where Palestinians and Israelis would supposedly live in democratic peace, side by side.

I can understand the idealism that inspires so many young people, in particular, to support a one-state solution. Why can't we all live side by side and house by house in peace? I count at least two reasons why this wouldn't work and why it is unacceptable to most Jewish people.

First, this combined state could take an extreme turn politically, putting Jewish Israelis in peril. This state would be majority Palestinian, and, in the past, some Palestinians have voted to empower groups like Hamas, which seeks to eradicate the Jewish people.

It is longstanding American policy to support democracy overseas, but in this hypothetical single state, democracy could cost Israeli Jews their safety if extremists were to take control of this new state of affairs to ultimately achieve their true aim: the violent expulsion of Jews from the Holy Land.

Now, this is no abstract fear. Thousands of years of Jewish history show that when things go badly, the people of the country in which Jews live, even in a democracy, all too often turn on them as convenient scapegoats.

There is no guarantee this wouldn't happen again in a single Israeli-Palestinian state. To have Palestinian voters be the protectors of Israeli Jews would be a bridge too far to accept.

Second, and even more important, the Jewish people have a right to their own state. It is so troubling to me that many people, especially on the left, seem to acknowledge and even celebrate this right to statehood for every group but the Jews.

If a national homeland for all peoples of the world has been the driving goal of the anticolonial movement of the last century, then why are only Jews seemingly penalized for this aspiration?

Jews have a human right to their own state, just as any other people do, Palestinians included.

As I have said, there are also some Israelis who oppose even a two-state solution, with a demilitarized Palestinian State, because they fear that it might tolerate or be a harbor for further terrorism against a Jewish State.

I understand these fears, but the bitter reality is that a single state, controlled by Israel, which they advocate, guarantees certain war forever and further isolation of the Jewish community in the world, to the extent that its future would be jeopardized.

Let me elaborate. They say the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over and expecting a different result. If Israel were to not only maintain the status quo but to go beyond that and tighten its control over Gaza and the West Bank, as some in the current Netanyahu administration have suggested—in effect, creating a de facto single state—then what reasonable expectation can we have that Hamas and their allies will lay down their arms? It would mean constant war.

On top of that, Israel moving closer to a single state entirely under its control would further rupture its relationship with the rest of the world, including the United States. Support for Israel has declined worldwide in the last few months, and this trend will only get worse if the Israeli Government continues to follow its current path.

I appreciate that so many Israelis cannot contemplate the possibility of two states right now because they remain so traumatized and so angry by what Hamas did on October 7—the brutality, the viciousness, the sexual assault, the imprisonment, and the abuse of hundreds of hostages. I am, of course, sympathetic to this point of view. I am upset; I am angry, too.

We will never forget what happened on October 7. But even while we carry that anguish in our hearts, we have to think ahead to the future—the medium, the long term—how we can ensure that something like October 7 never happens again. We cannot let anger or trauma determine our actions or cloud our judgment.

A two-state solution may feel daunting, especially now, but I believe it is the only realistic and sustainable solution—on the basis of security, on the basis of prosperity, on the basis of fundamental human rights and dignity.

But in order to achieve a two-state solution, the reality is that things must change. Right now, there are four—four—major obstacles standing in the way of two states, and until they are removed from the equation, there will never be peace in Israel and Gaza and the West Bank.

The four major obstacles are Hamas and the Palestinians who support and tolerate their evil ways, radical right-wing Israelis in government and society, Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas, and Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu. I will explain each in detail.

The first major obstacle to peace is Hamas and the Palestinians who support and tolerate their evil ways. Hamas is for the destruction of Israel, and, in past decades, it undermined any hope for peace at every turn.

It was Hamas who began its vicious campaign of suicide bombings against innocent Israelis to derail the nascent peace process in Oslo. It was Hamas who assassinated more moderate Palestinian political representatives in Gaza in 2007. It is Hamas who has held Gaza under repressive, undemocratic rule for close to two decades. And it is Hamas who targeted those brave Gazans who have spoken out against its actions or tried to bridge the divide between Israelis and Palestinians.

Jewish Americans and Israelis alike have been appalled and hurt at efforts to rebrand Hamas, which is designated by the United States as a terrorist organization, as noble resistance or freedom fighters. Attempts to excuse their horrific actions against both Israelis and Palestinians are morally repugnant.

A permanent ceasefire, effective immediately, would only allow Hamas to

regroup and launch further attacks on Israeli civilians. There can never be a two-state solution if Hamas has any significant power.

However, a temporary ceasefire, such as President Biden has proposed, which would allow for the return of hostages and humanitarian relief for suffering Palestinians, is quite different and is something I support.

But any proposal that leaves Hamas with meaningful power is unacceptable to me and most Israelis. So it goes without saying that Hamas cannot have any role in a future Gaza, if we are to achieve peace.

The same goes for the minority of Palestinians who support Hamas and those who demonstrate other forms of extremism, even if they are not card-carrying members—the Gazans who ventured into Israeli territory on October 7 to loot and pillage, the people in the West Bank who flooded the streets and cheered from afar the cold-blooded killing of mothers and children.

This is appalling behavior, and while it may fall short of terrorism, it has no place in a peaceful future for Israel and Palestinians, and it ought to be denounced by the Palestinian public and their leaders who believe in a more sustainable future beyond the cycle of revenge.

The second major obstacle to peace is radical, rightwing Israelis in government and society. The worst examples of this radicalism are Finance Minister Bezalel Smotrich and Ministry of National Security Itamar Ben Gvir.

Minister Smotrich has in the past openly called for the subjugation and forced displacement of all Palestinians in the West Bank. In the current crisis, he has used inflammatory rhetoric and called for punitive restrictions on Palestinian farmers in the West Bank during the olive harvest. He has prevented the transfer of funds to the Palestinian Authority, and he has opposed the provision of any humanitarian assistance to Gaza, going so far as to stop agreed-upon shipments of flour.

Minister Ben Gvir is no better. When he was a young man, he was barred from the Israeli military service for his extremist views. Last year, in a move only intended to antagonize the Muslim population, he visited the Temple Mount with his supporters, as a brazen show of force toward Palestinians. And during this current conflict, he has facilitated the mass distribution of guns to far-right settlers, exacerbating instability, fueling violence.

There is a nastiness to what Ministers Smotrich and Ben Gvir believe and how they use their positions of authority and influence, an eagerness to inflame and provoke that is profoundly irresponsible and self-destructive.

In my conversations with Israeli leaders, I have urged them to do more, to clamp down on the unacceptable vigilante settler violence in the West Bank. And I have supported the Biden administration's efforts to impose consequences for extremist settler violence.

But the unfortunate reality is that this violence is openly supported by Ministers Smotrich and Ben Gvir, and as long as they hold their positions of power, no true progress will be made.

While not equivalent, extremist Palestinians and extremist Israelis seek the same goal, from the Jordan River to the Mediterranean Sea, they aim to push the other from the land. Ministers Smotrich and Ben Gvir may not say they want to kill all Palestinians outright, but they are clear in their desire to displace them from their homes and replace them with Israeli settlers. This is also abhorrent. As long as these two hold their positions of power, peace will be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve.

The third major obstacle to peace is the President of the Palestinian Authority, Mahmoud Abbas, who is beholden to his narrow political interests, to the detriment of both the West Bank and Gaza. Over the years, President Abbas has evaded the democratic process, declining to hold future elections for over a decade and failing to empower future leadership. Despite his long tenure leading the Palestinian Authority, he has achieved few of his self-proclaimed goals.

The Palestinian Authority remains corrupt and continues to incite instability through the martyr payment system. Palestinians are no more prosperous, no safer, no freer than they were when Abbas first took power. As a result, President Abbas has lost the trust of the Palestinian people.

Furthermore, he is a terrible role model and spiritual leader. In the past, he has participated in outright Holocaust denial, attempting to justify Nazi actions. This embrace of anti-Semitism extended to his refusal for weeks to condemn the loss of Israeli civilian life on October 7.

Should Abbas remain, Palestinian people can have no assurance that a Palestinian State would be able to ensure their safety or prosperity, nor can they have any belief that the government would be free of corruption.

For there to be any hope of peace in the future, Abbas must step down and be replaced by a new generation of Palestinian leaders who will work towards attaining peace with the Jewish State. Otherwise, the West Bank will continue to suffer, and Hamas or some similarly extreme organization will continue to maintain a foothold in Gaza.

The Palestinian Authority, under new leadership, must undertake a reform process and emerge as a revitalized PA that can viably serve as the basis for a Palestinian State with the trust of the Palestinian people.

The fourth major obstacle to peace is Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu, who has all too frequently bowed to the demands of extremists like Minister Smotrich and Ben Gvir and the settlers in the West Bank.

I have known Prime Minister Netanyahu for a very long time. While we have vehemently disagreed on many occasions, I will always respect his extraordinary bravery for Israel on the battlefield as a younger man. I believe in his heart he has as his highest priority the security of Israel.

However, I also believe Prime Minister Netanyahu has lost his way by allowing his political survival to take precedence over the best interests of Israel. He has put himself in coalition with far-right extremists like Ministers Smotrich and Ben Gvir, and as a result, he has been too willing to tolerate the civilian toll in Gaza, which is pushing support for Israel worldwide to historic lows. Israel cannot survive if it becomes a pariah.

Prime Minister Netanyahu has also weakened Israel's political and moral fabric through his attempt to co-op the judiciary, and he has shown zero interest in doing the courageous and visionary work required to pave the way for peace, even before this present conflict.

As a lifelong supporter of Israel, it has become clear to me that the Netanyahu coalition no longer fits the needs of Israel after October 7. The world has changed radically since then, and the Israeli people are being stifled right now by a governing vision that is stuck in the past.

Nobody expects Prime Minister Netanyahu to do the things that must be done to break the cycle of violence, to preserve Israel's credibility on the world stage, and to work towards a two-state solution. If he were to disavow Ministers Smotrich and Ben Gvir and kick them out of his governing coalition, that would be a real meaningful step forward, but regrettably there is no reason to believe Prime Minister Netanyahu would do that. He won't disavow Ministers Smotrich and Ben Gvir in their calls for Israelis to drive Palestinians out of Gaza and the West Bank. He won't commit to a military operation in Rafah that prioritizes protecting civilian life. He won't engage responsibly in discussions about a day-after plan for Gaza and a longer term pathway to peace.

Hamas and the Palestinians who support and tolerate their evil ways; radical, rightwing Israelis in government and society; President Abbas; Prime Minister Netanyahu—these are the four obstacles to peace. If we fail to overcome them, then Israel and the West Bank and Gaza will be trapped in the same violent state of affairs they have experienced for the last 75 years.

These obstacles are not the same in their culpability for the present state of affairs, but arguing over which is the worst stymies our ability to achieve peace. Given the complexity and gravity of this undertaking, many different groups—many different groups—have a responsibility to see it through.

The Palestinian people must reject Hamas and the extremism in their midst. They know better than anybody how Hamas has used them as pawns, how Hamas has tortured and punished Palestinians who seek peace.

Quite frankly, I haven't heard enough Palestinian leaders express anguish about Hamas and other extreme elements of Palestinian society. I implore them to speak up now, even when it may be hardest, because that is the only true way to honor the lives of all those lost—by transcending the enmity and bloodshed and working together in good faith for a better future.

Once Hamas is deprived of power, the Palestinians will be much freer to choose a government they want and deserve. With the prospect of a real two-state solution on the table and, for the first time, genuine statehood for the Palestinian people, I believe they will be far more likely to support more mainstream leaders committed to peace.

I think the same is true for the Israeli people. Call me an optimist, but I believe that if the Israeli public is presented with a path to a two-state solution that offers a chance at lasting peace and coexistence, then most mainstream Israelis will moderate their views and support it.

Part of that moderation must include rejecting rightwing zealots like Ministers Smotrich and Ben Gvir and the extremist Israeli settlers in the West Bank. These people do not represent a majority of the Israeli public. Yet, under Prime Minister Netanyahu's watch, they have had far too much influence.

All sides must reject ''from the river to the sea'' thinking, and I believe they will if the prospects for peace and a two-state solution are real.

Beyond the Israeli and Palestinian people and their leaders, there are others who bear a serious responsibility to work towards a two-state solution. Without them, it cannot succeed.

Middle Eastern powers like Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, Egypt, Jordan, and other mainstream Arab states can have immense power and influence with the Palestinians. Working with the United States, they must responsibly deploy their clout, their money, and their diplomacy to support a new, demilitarized Palestinian State that rejects terror and violence. I believe they have the leverage to do this with the support of the majority of the Palestinian people, who want what any other people want: peace, security, prosperity.

I believe there is enough strength in the Arab world to get President Abbas to step down and to support a gradual succession plan for responsible Palestinian leaders to take his place.

Hamas has so wrecked society in Gaza that it will take outside involvement of Arab countries to help rebuild something better and more sustainable. It may take some time to identify such leaders, but with the considerable resources of the Arab world backing them, I believe these leaders can and will emerge, knowing that they have support.

The outlines of a deal between Saudi Arabia and Israel that were reported before October 7 still make a great deal of sense and can be the catalyst for the creation of a viable Palestinian State. Saudi Arabia and other Arab nations should continue to pursue normalization with Israel, and this should be the foundation of a grand bargain in the Middle East that will finally make meaningful Palestinian statehood a reality.

For our part, the United States—the world's superpower—must work together with our allies to bring our immense diplomatic and financial power to bear on this situation. We can be a partner to a grand bargain in the Middle East by deepening our relationship with the Saudis and other Arab nations to induce them to make a deal—but only if they actively guide Palestinians to a more peaceful future.

On the Israeli side, the U.S. Government should demand that Israel conduct itself with a future two-state solution in mind. We should not be forced into a position of unequivocally supporting the actions of an Israeli Government that include bigots who reject the idea of a Palestinian State.

Israel is a democracy. Five months into this conflict, it is clear that Israelis need to take stock of the situation and ask: Must we change course?

At this critical juncture, I believe a new election is the only way to allow for a healthy and open decision-making process about the future of Israel, at a time when so many Israelis have lost their confidence in the vision and direction of their government. I also believe a majority of the Israeli public will recognize the need for change, and I believe that holding a new election once the war starts to wind down would give Israelis an opportunity to express their vision for the postwar future.

Of course, the United States cannot dictate the outcome of an election, nor should we try. That is for the Israeli public to decide—a public that I believe understands better than anybody that Israel cannot hope to succeed as a pariah opposed by the rest of the world. As a democracy, Israel has the right to choose its own leaders, and we should let the chips fall where they may. But the important thing is that Israelis are given a choice.

There needs to be a fresh debate about the future of Israel after October 7. In my opinion, that is best accomplished by holding an election.

If Prime Minister Netanyahu's current coalition remains in power after the war begins to wind down and continues to pursue dangerous and inflammatory policies that test existing U.S. standards for assistance, then the United States will have no choice but to play a more active role in shaping Israeli policy by using our leverage to change the present course.

The United States' bond with Israel is unbreakable, but if extremists continue to unduly influence Israeli policy, then the administration should use the tools at its disposal to make sure our support for Israel is aligned with our broader goal of achieving long-term peace and stability in the region. I believe this would make a lasting two-state solution more likely.

Now, I know that there are many on both sides who question how we can discuss peace at a moment like this. So many Gazans are displaced from their homes and struggling to meet their most basic needs. Many are still burying and mourning their dead. Entire families have been wiped out. In Israel, everyone knows someone who was killed on October 7. So many Israelis feel that people around the world have no respect for the grief and rage unleashed by Hamas's vicious attack.

So is there real hope for peace and a two-state solution? In the face of this atrocity, who could blame even the most hopeful among us for hardening their hearts, for giving up on the possibility of peace, for giving in to the hate?

I seek my inspiration in the example of leaders who have come before us and worked for peace in the face of extreme circumstances. Some of Israel's greatest warriors and security experts have been staunch advocates for peace because they understand better than anybody that it is essential to Israel's security. David Ben-Gurion, Yitzhak Rabin, Ehud Barak—all of them sought peace with the Palestinians.

On the Palestinian side, we don't have to look very far back to see a model of responsible leadership: Salam Fayyad, the former Prime Minister of the Palestinian Authority, who was clear in his condemnation of violence against the Israelis.

For the Arab leaders of today, may they find inspiration in Anwar el-Sadat of Egypt and King Hussein of Jordan, who had the courage and vision to seek peace with Israel.

Before October 7, things were moving in the right direction. The United Arab Emirates and Saudi Arabia both were on the path to normalization with Israel and with conditions that would greatly benefit the lives of the Palestinian people. Many believe that Iran motivated Hamas to disrupt this process, and indeed there have been setbacks since October 7, but recent talks between Arab and American leaders suggest the desire is stronger than ever now to find a path forward.

Arab leaders cannot lose their stomachs for peace now at this critical inflection point. They must continue to pursue the path to normalization of relations with Israel. The United States should use all of its power and influence to bring them to the table and make them cooperate constructively.

If my speaking out today has any effect, it will probably have greater influence on the Israeli and Jewish side of things. But if this conflict is to be resolved, we need comparable Palestinian and Arab leaders to also speak responsibly to their people about the path forward to peace. Now is the time for courageous leadership.

After Israelis and Palestinians have experienced so much horror and loss of

life, to not have something meaningful come out of this war would be doubly tragic.

History will look back on what we do here. Are we prepared together to have the courage to make an all-out push to bring about peace once and for all, to bring to this conflict what Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., called the ''fierce urgency of now'' to end the cycles of tragedy and pain?

I have always said that when horrific things happen, some turn inwards and let their grief consume them, while others light a candle and turn their grief into power. They are able to see hope in the darkness.

In Scripture, we read about how God created the world from an infinite void, that out of the greatest darkness can come the greatest light. I hope and pray that from the brutal slaying of Israelis by Hamas and the harrowing civilian toll in Gaza, that a two-state solution where Jews and Palestinians can live in peace will prevail.

I know I am not alone in this prayer. There are right now Palestinians in Gaza, some of whom are still pulling dead family members from the rubble, who are defying Hamas and their murderous ideology and calling for a pathway to peace. There are right now some families of the victims of October 7 in Israel who have been calling for peace, asking their government to transcend this cycle of bloodshed and revenge. If they can find in their hearts a path to peace, then surely we can also.

From the ashes, may we light the candles that lead to a better future for all.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). The Republican leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Jewish State of Israel deserves an ally that acts like one. The people of Israel, at home and in captivity, deserve America's support; and Israel's unity government and security cabinet deserve the deference befitting a sovereign democratic country.

The primary obstacles to peace in Israel's region are genocidal terrorists, like Hamas and Palestinian Islamic Jihad, who slaughter innocent people and corrupt leaders of the Palestinian Authority, who have repeatedly—repeatedly—rejected peace deals from multiple Israeli Governments.

And foreign observers who cannot keep these clear distinctions straight ought to refrain from weighing in. It is grotesque and hypocritical for Americans who hyperventilate about foreign interference in our own democracy to call for the removal of a democratically elected leader of Israel. This is unprecedented. We should not treat fellow democracies this way at all.

Things that upset leftwing activists are not a Prime Minister's policies; they are Israel's policies. Make no mistake, the Democratic Party doesn't have an anti-Bibi problem; it has an anti-Israel problem. Israel is not a colony of America whose leaders serve at the pleasure of the party in power in Washington. Only Israel's citizens should have a say in who runs their government. This is the very definition of democracy and sovereignty. Either we respect their decisions or we disrespect their democracy.

UKRAINE

Now, Mr. President, on another entirely different matter, this week, Vladimir Putin himself responded to reports of weakening Western resolve to stand with Ukraine and of ammunition shortages on the frontlines.

Here is what Putin had to say:

It would be ridiculous for us to start negotiating with Ukraine just because it's running out of ammunition.

The chilling reality here is abundantly clear: Withholding critical weapons has not helped manage Putin's escalation—it has only emboldened him.

The administration that hesitated and wrung its hands through the early days of Russian escalation actually emboldened Putin, and it ought to be a lesson to those who insist—without firm footing in its strategy or logic—that withholding lethal assistance would somehow hasten an acceptable negotiated settlement to the conflict.

I have said too many times to count that America's adversaries only speak the language of power. But our colleagues don't have to take my word for it. Just take it straight from the dictator's mouth. Vladimir Putin is not playing for a tie. He is not headed for the negotiating table. He will not stop at Ukraine. He has told us, and he has shown us many times.

Whether or not you are willing to take the architect of the neo-Soviet Empire at his word, the facts remain the same: Equipping Ukraine for battlefield success is the surest way to help our friends resolve this war from a position of strength.

Backing Ukraine as it degrades our common adversary's military also strengthens America's interests, and investing in our own military and our own defense industrial capacity at the same time just makes common sense. It is time for the House to take up the Senate-passed national security supplemental and finish the job.

(The remarks of Mr. MCCONNELL pertaining to the introduction of S.J. Res. 65 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

NATIONWIDE INJUNCTIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, I would like to speak briefly on a practice in our Nation's courts that has confounded administrations of both parties with increasing frequency over the past decade. It is the issuance of nationwide injunctions.

Time after time, district judges will respond to a case challenging a Federal law by preventing its application not just to the parties before them or within their jurisdictions but nationwide.

During the last administration, Attorneys General Sessions and Barr issued policy and litigation guidance on the issue to try and pare it back. Senator COTTON introduced a bill to eliminate the practice by statute; and Chairman GRAHAM was eager to move the Cotton bill, but Senate Democrats were not. In fact, their star witness in support of nationwide injunctions is now a Federal judge in the District of Columbia.

Rather than working with Republicans to eliminate a practice that gores the oxen of both parties, it turns out our colleagues prefer to preserve it just for themselves.

Now that nationwide injunctions are being used against the Biden administration, liberal allies in the academy and in the media have started to ''target single judge divisions,'' where they think conservative plaintiffs are likely to get favorable ratings from sympathetic judges.

The Democratic leader even wrote to the Judicial Conference demanding action against the scourge of judges who don't rule in favor of the Biden administration. In other words, he urged the Conference to keep the injunctions and just restrict the access to conservative judges.

It seems the Judicial Conference took the bait. On Tuesday, they instructed district courts to assign all cases seeking to invalidate State or Federal law randomly across the district in which they were brought. This will have no practical effect in the venues favored by liberal activists, but Democrats are salivating at the possibility of shutting down access to justice in the venues favored by conservatives.

What will this do in practice? It means the young woman challenging Texas abortion laws in Austin can now be forced, for no good reason, to have her case heard in El Paso. A veteran defending his Second Amendment rights in Youngstown can be sent to Toledo to have his day in court. In Kentucky, a coal miner challenging labor regulations in London could find his case handed to a judge in Covington—all to prevent so-called judge shopping.

But didn't Chief Justice Roberts say, ''There are not Obama judges or Trump judges''? What exactly is the problem that demands such a drastic solution?

Here is what this policy won't do: It won't solve the issues caused by nationwide injunctions. If Democrats are right about the practical effects of this policy, any remaining incentive they have to work with Republicans on this issue will vanish—''Nationwide injunctions for me, but not for thee.''

Needless to say, if Republicans see a Federal judiciary that is using its procedural independence to wade into political disputes, any incentive we may have to defend the procedural independence will vanish as well.

This was an unforced error by the Judicial Conference. I hope they will reconsider, and I hope district courts throughout the country will instead weigh what is best for their jurisdictions, not half-baked ''guidance'' that just does Washington Democrats' bidding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

(The remarks of Mr. DURBIN pertaining to the submission of S. 3961 are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

PRESIDENT BIDEN'S BUDGET

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, President Biden released his budget on Monday, and, predictably, it was filled with the same old, tired, tax-and-spending proposals—so much spending and so many taxes.

All told, the President's budget raises taxes by a staggering $5 trillion. You heard that right—$5 trillion. His corporate tax hike and capital gains tax proposals would both raise rates higher than those in communist China.

Many small businesses would see a hefty tax hike under the President's proposal, and most Americans would see an income tax hike, as his budget would allow current income tax rates to expire after 2025—so much for the President's commitment to not raising taxes for anyone making under $400,000.

Something President Biden and Democrats never seem to understand is that raising taxes has consequences. The corporate tax hike that President Biden would like you to believe will be borne by CEOs and CFOs—in fact, that tax hike would hit working Americans hard.

Studies have shown that workers bear a huge percentage of the burden of corporate income taxes. Impacts aren't just limited to workers employed by corporations. Corporate tax hikes can hit all Americans in the form of higher prices for goods and services.

Or take President Biden's proposed tax hike on gas and oil, which would be on top—on top—of the energy tax hikes he has already imposed. Taxing energy can drive up the cost of Americans' energy bills and make it more expensive every time Americans have to fill up their cars—not exactly a desirable outcome when Americans have already seen huge increases in energy prices under President Biden.

As I said, all of those tax hikes are accompanied by a lot of new spending proposals as President Biden continues his mission to increase the size—and the intrusiveness—of the Federal Government. His budget includes massive new spending programs and big increases for government departments and Agencies like the IRS.

Yet even as the President uses budget gimmicks and accounting tricks to blow through the nondefense spending cap for 2025, he makes no attempt to use any of his budgeting sleight of hand to address the serious readiness problems facing our military.

The President spent ample time in his State of the Union Address talking about the dangerous world in which we live, and he is right. Yet his budget makes little attempt to ensure that our military is equipped to meet that dangerous world. We have military services well below their recruitment targets. We are behind on shipbuilding and ship maintenance. There is a persistent pilot shortage. In a number of cases, we have too few mission-capable aircraft. And we are not doing an adequate job of maintaining the kind of supply we need of munitions. Yet President Biden is happy to blow through the nondefense spending cap but can't find an extra dollar in his budget for our military. It says a lot about the President's priorities.

It is also worth noting that the President's budget makes absolutely no attempt to ensure that Social Security is protected for current and future retirees. With Social Security on track to run out of money to pay full benefits in 2033, you would think that the President would be focused on safeguarding this program rather than creating new government programs that have to be funded. But, clearly, you would be wrong.

This year, the interest on our national debt is projected to cost more than any government expenditure except Social Security. Let me just repeat that. This year, the interest on our national debt is projected to cost more than any government expenditure except Social Security. That is just the interest on our debt. When the interest alone on your national debt is the second highest line item in your budget, you know you are on an unsustainable fiscal path. And it is the height of fiscal irresponsibility for the President to be proposing massive new government programs when we are going into debt just to afford the ones we already have.

I could go on. I could talk about the President's request for $8 billion to hire an additional 50,000 Americans for his Climate Corps, like so-called ''climate resilience workers,'' or I could talk about the President's attempt to force American taxpayers to pay for abortions or the eye-wateringly large funding increase the President wants for the IRS.

But I will stop here. And I hope—I hope—my colleagues will agree that, for the sake of the American people, the President's budget should be dead on arrival here in the Congress.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 7511

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, there have been more than 9 million illegal alien border crossings on President Biden's watch. At the same time, there has been a 57-percent decrease in arrests of criminal illegal aliens and a 67-percent decrease in deportation of criminal aliens.

This complete lack of enforcement of existing law has caused unimaginable human suffering across our country. One such tragedy occurred last month in Athens, GA. An illegal alien from Venezuela brutally murdered 22-year-old nursing student Laken Riley on the campus of the University of Georgia. What makes this story all the more devastating was that the killer could have been stopped but wasn't.

So how on Earth was this tragedy even allowed to take place? Well, here is the timeline. The killer illegally entered the United States in September of 2022 in El Paso, TX. He was caught, but then he was paroled into the country. He then made his way to New York City, where he was arrested for child endangerment in 2023, but then he was released. He then fled to Georgia, where he committed several petty crimes like theft and shoplifting. He was not detained by ICE. Then came the tragedy of February 22, where he preyed on an innocent young woman jogging around a university campus.

This was allowed to take place because of the open border policies of President Biden. It took place because executive Agencies are given discretion to determine what crimes trigger a detainer to be issued to take an illegal alien into custody. The ''discretion loophole'' has got to be closed. And that is why we are here today: to make sure these tragedies never happen again.

In Laken's honor, Senator KATIE BRITT of Alabama and I have teamed up to introduce the Laken Riley Act. This bill would require ICE to issue detainers and take into custody illegal aliens who commit crimes like theft and shoplifting. The legislation also empowers state attorneys general to sue the Secretary of Homeland Security for taking actions on immigration that harm their States or their citizens.

The bottom line: If this bill were in place before February 22, Laken Riley would be alive today.

The House of Representatives passed this bill last week in a bipartisan—again, a bipartisan—vote of 251 to 70, including 37 Democrats. In a time of division and polarization, the Laken Riley Act brought both sides together.

It is our hope that we can learn from this horrific situation and make some positive change. So let's pass the Laken Riley Act today.

Mr. President, I would like to yield to my colleague from Indiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, on February 22, a 22-year-old nursing student

named Laken Riley went for a morning run on a popular trail. Despite doing everything right—informing her friends of her expected return time and sharing her location with them—Laken never made it home. Her life was stolen by an illegal alien who should have never been in the country.

The President's open border policies are solely behind it. Remember, before he came in, we were at record lows. Now, we are at record highs. We are even talking about categories we didn't have before, like ''got-aways.'' It is a national security risk that has come into this country when, currently, monthly, 50,000 to 60,000 people never confront the Border Patrol—not to mention the 200,000 to 300,000 who do.

This individual had been arrested in New York for a felony. The loss of Laken Riley was an avoidable tragedy inflicted by President Biden and his policies. These policies allow illegal aliens like Laken Riley's killer to roam free even after committing crimes.

The Laken Riley Act demands the immediate deportation of illegal aliens when they are arrested for a crime. It makes sense.

For those with concerns about due process, remember, we are talking about individuals with zero legal right to be in the United States in the first place. Retainers for ICE deportation should already be issued in these cases but aren't, in many cases, due to sanctuary city status.

We should honor Laken Riley's memory by assuring that no other family ever has to endure this heartache.

Pass the Laken Riley Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I would like to further yield to my colleague from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I would like to start by thanking Senator BUDD for leading this very important issue to the Senate floor.

We rise today to honor and pay our respects to the late Laken Riley and her family and to mourn with her family.

Today, we call on this Chamber to come together to ensure this never happens again.

Laken Hope Riley. Laken Hope Riley was a beautiful young woman in the prime of her life. She was brutally murdered in broad daylight while jogging on the University of Georgia's campus.

Her alleged murderer, a Venezuelan illegal alien, was one of 2 million people paroled by Joe Biden—one of 2 million. Ironically, he was welcomed here on United States soil by this President and his egregious open border policies.

He was stopped by the U.S. Border Patrol in 2022 when he crossed into Texas illegally, but because of the Biden administration's unlawful mass parole of illegal aliens, he was permitted into our country. From Texas, he moved to New York, where he was arrested by the New York Police Department last year for acting in a manner to injure a child and for a motor vehicle violation. But he was quickly released and never turned over to ICE for deportation. Instead, he was released by police before a detainer could ever be issued by DHS, and he was allowed to roam freely.

Then he journeyed on to Athens, GA. And now we understand that the alleged assailant was a member of a violent Venezuelan gang.

How can we ever identify who those people are when 10,000 people are crossing our border every day? How can the Border Patrol possibly vet these people in a proper manner?

Just like so many other unvetted migrants living in the country right now, this man was handed the American dream—the American dream that Laken Riley should be living right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, it is for the reasons articulated by my friend and colleague from Kansas and my friend and colleague from Indiana that, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 341, H.R. 7511; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the death of Laken Riley was a horrible crime—horrible crime—and a heartbreaking loss. This 22-year-old American nursing student at Augusta University in Georgia, I am certain, would have made America a better place with her life and contribution to our country. But, instead, she was taken from us on February 22, 2024.

A suspect has been arrested and may, ultimately, be tried for this crime. That is as it should be. That is how we follow the law in the United States.

But when you look at the request before us, it gives me pause. We can all agree that noncitizens who are convicted of violent crimes should be detained and removed from the United States. Sadly, the measure before us does nothing to address this issue.

Under current law in the United States of America, noncitizens who enter the country illegally, violate the terms of their status, or have their visas revoked can be detained by officials from Immigration and Customs Enforcement—better known as ICE—as they should be. Current law also requires the detention of individuals with serious criminal convictions and those who have committed murder, rape, or any—any—crime of violence or theft offense with a term of imprisonment of at least 1 year, as they should be.

The law also gives ICE the discretion to detain or release a noncitizen in any case where a noncitizen has been charged with a crime, as they should be. To make this decision, ICE must assess the individual circumstances of the case and ensure the Agency's limited resources are used effectively to focus on protecting our national security and public safety, as they should be.

Remember, the vast majority of Republicans, including the sponsors of this measure, recently blocked a national security supplemental bill that would have given ICE more funding to detain undocumented immigrants who might pose a threat to our country.

The sweeping approach in the bill before us would eliminate the Agency's discretion to prioritize the most dangerous individuals and require ICE to treat those arrested for shoplifting the same as those convicted of violent crimes. Let me repeat that—require ICE to treat those arrested for shoplifting the same as those convicted of violent crimes. This would overwhelm ICE's capacity and facilities and make our Nation less, not more, safe.

For example, this proposal before us would require ICE to detain every immigrant who is arrested for shoplifting, even if the charges are ultimately dropped and don't lead to a conviction. Remember, this bill does not require a charge or a conviction. Tell me, does it make sense to treat a noncitizen arrested for shoplifting the same as someone convicted of murder? I think we all know the answer to that question.

This bill goes into another area which hasn't been discussed much—which is hard to imagine—but this bill would grant State attorneys general the standing to sue Federal immigration authorities if a State disagrees with immigration enforcement decisions made by the Federal Government. I think, on its face, it is unconstitutional.

For example, this bill would give a State attorney general the standing to challenge the use of parole authority—for example, like Uniting for Ukraine, which allowed Ukrainians to flee Putin's war to come to the United States—if a State can prove it had an impact of $100 for the Federal Government to make that decision.

Laken Riley's murder was a tragedy. We must do everything we can to prevent crimes like this from happening. But this legislation would make our system less safe.

The reality is that most immigrants in the United States are law-abiding individuals who are seeking a better life in this country. Many studies have shown that immigrants are less likely to commit crimes than U.S. citizens.

Mr. President, you know personally from your own experience in Congress that it has been more than 30 years

since we have seriously considered an immigration reform bill. We had a chance, didn't we, just a few weeks ago? There was a bipartisan group—and the White House was part of it—that wanted to sit down and change the immigration and border security laws of the United States.

The Republican effort in this regard was led by JAMES LANKFORD, a conservative, respected Republican from Oklahoma, and on our side, Senators MURPHY and SINEMA, who negotiated for weeks, week after week, to come up with a proposal. The notion was to finally address the border security of the United States in a comprehensive, bipartisan, realistic way. It was controversial. There were some parts of it that I didn't care for at all. But I thought this was a good-faith, bipartisan effort.

We were assured that because the Republican Senators had chosen Senator LANKFORD as their negotiator, that it at least would entertain some support on the Republican side. We called the measure on the floor, and it failed because the Republicans would not join the Democrats in engaging in this bipartisan effort.

The issues raised this morning by Senator BUDD could have been resolved, perhaps, if we would have had that kind of bipartisan negotiation, but it didn't happen.

I had my concerns about the deal, but it certainly should have moved forward.

When it came to a vote, the vast majority of Republicans opposed it at the request of former President Donald Trump, who urged a ''no'' vote, who wanted the measure to stop and not be considered and moved forward and said:

Go ahead and blame me for it.

Well, I am blaming you for it, and I am blaming those who stepped away from this bipartisan opportunity.

Donald Trump has made clear that he does not want a solution to our challenges at the border; he wants an issue for the November election. So we stepped away from it—the only realistic chance to have a bipartisan solution.

I urge my colleagues to reject Donald Trump's advice. Let's get back to the table. Let's consider the issues raised by the Senator this morning and other issues that are important and make a bipartisan decision to move forward to solve this problem.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. President, I am deeply disappointed in my Democratic colleagues for objecting to a bill that, had it been in place, Laken Riley's life would have been spared. The Democratic Party's commitment to open borders is causing otherwise preventable tragedies to occur again and again and again.

But while we are here, let me address some of the counterarguments that we have heard.

One contention is that this bill would apply to individuals merely accused of a crime, robbing them of due process. Well, the fact that illegal aliens are freely roaming around the country in and of itself is illegal. If they then commit another crime, authorities are well within their rights to detain them.

The law that this bill would strengthen already requires detention for those who have been involved in various acts, such as drug trafficking, prostitution, and other vices, regardless of whether or not they have been convicted.

Opponents of this bill don't just have a problem with this bill; they have a problem with well-established laws on the books.

Another argument that I have heard is that this bill would violate the Constitution's standing requirements to file lawsuits.

The Supreme Court in the United States v. Texas provided a clear roadmap for Congress to authorize lawsuits against the executive branch for failing to enforce the law. The bill follows that roadmap and upholds the Constitution's separation of powers.

The bill authorizes a state attorney general or other authorized officer to bring a lawsuit against executive branch officials for failure to enforce immigration laws in a manner that harms such State or its residents. The bill authorizes a Federal court to grant appropriate injunctive relief. This bill does not prejudge the result of any case or tie a judge's hands. The bill simply ensures that States are given their day in court to protect their citizens against the harmful, lawless, open border policies of the Biden administration.

I simply don't believe that another American family needs to experience a tragedy like the one that befell the Riley family. I am going to continue to work with my colleague from Alabama, Senator BRITT, and all my colleagues to push this legislation until it passes this Chamber.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

NOMINATION OF DENNIS HANKINS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, it has been almost a year since President Biden nominated Dennis Hankins to be the U.S. Ambassador to Haiti. In that time, Haiti has gone from a tenuous political situation into a security and humanitarian catastrophe.

Vicious gangs, armed largely with weapons trafficked from the United States, have plunged the country into chaos. They have burned government buildings. They have attacked police stations. While the Prime Minister was out of the country to facilitate an international peacekeeping mission, gangs led a massive jailbreak, releasing nearly 4,000 prisoners. Mr. President, 15,000 Haitians have been forced to flee their homes. Almost half of the population is facing a food insecurity crisis. And this is within a very short distance of the United States of America. Thousands have been murdered, hundreds kidnapped. According to U.N. officials, gangs have used collective rapes to instill fear, punish, subjugate, and inflict pain.

We are on the verge of having a failed state roughly 800 miles from our shores.

Secretary Blinken was in Kingston this week to help broker a political agreement with other partners in the region—an agreement for a political path forward that includes the creation of a transitional Presidential council following the resignation of the Prime Minister.

I am pleased that we are finally voting on Ambassador Hankins' nomination so he can start doing the job he was nominated for, but it has taken us way too long to get to this point. I am pleased that we are voting on his nomination. It should have been done well before now.

I mentioned this week my meeting with General Richardson, our SOUTHCOM commander, as to how critical it is in our hemisphere and around the world to have confirmed Ambassadors to speak on behalf of America.

We want to have a strong voice on what is happening in Haiti, but how can we have that if we don't take advantage of having a confirmed Ambassador? I am glad we are correcting that today. This nomination has been held up for reasons that have nothing to do with Haiti and nothing to do with the qualifications or experience of the nominee.

U.S. leadership matters, especially in a country so close to our border. We need Senate-confirmed Ambassadors on the ground who can work with Haitian leaders and diplomats in the region to lay the groundwork for a transitional unity government.

We need someone who understands the depths of the humanitarian suffering, which, if not addressed, will lead to thousands of Haitians seeking refuge at our southern border.

Most importantly, we need someone who can help coordinate once the Kenyan-led Multinational Security Support Mission is in place, which will be critical to restoring security. We need that multinational security force in place, but we need our voice to make sure they can be successful.

In Haiti—in this region and throughout the world—we need to have confirmed Ambassadors. Ambassador Hankins has more than two decades of Foreign Service experience. He has served in some of the most complex, crisis-prone situations in the world, including in Haiti.

In 2015, he was confirmed as Ambassador to Guinea by unanimous consent—unanimous consent. He was previously confirmed. He has the experience and the vision to guide this process forward and advance U.S. national interests.

I want to call on my colleagues to support the administration's outstanding funding request for Haiti. Not

only do we need to get the Ambassador confirmed, but we need to have our contributions available so that the multinational force that Kenya is leading can be deployed and we can start to restore order in Haiti so that a transitional government has a possibility of restoring the order necessary to avoid the current crisis and be able to address the humanitarian needs and stability that the people of Haiti so badly need. But it starts with us confirming the Ambassador, and we have a chance to do that with this next vote.

I am pleased that we have this opportunity today, and I urge my colleagues to support this nomination.

VOTE ON HANKINS NOMINATION

With that, I ask unanimous consent that the vote that was supposed to start at 12 noon start immediately.

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

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

Mr. CARDIN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN).

The result was announced—yeas 89, nays 1, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 92 Ex.]

YEAS—89

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Barrasso	Graham	Ossoff
Bennet	Grassley	Padilla
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Blumenthal	Hassan	Peters
Booker	Hawley	Reed
Braun	Heinrich	Ricketts
Britt	Hickenlooper	Risch
Brown	Hirono	Romney
Budd	Hoeven	Rosen
Butler	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Cantwell	Johnson	Sanders
Capito	Kaine	Schatz
Cardin	Kelly	Schmitt
Carper	King	Schumer
Casey	Klobuchar	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Lankford	Sinema
Collins	Lee	Smith
Coons	Luján	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Crapo	Marshall	Tillis
Cruz	McConnell	Tuberville
Duckworth	Menendez	Van Hollen
Durbin	Merkley	Vance
Ernst	Moran	Warner
Fetterman	Murkowski	Warnock
Fischer	Murphy	Warren
Welch	Whitehouse	Wyden
	Wicker	Young

NAYS—1

Kennedy

NOT VOTING—10

Boozman	Markey	Shaheen
Cotton	Mullin	Sullivan
Cramer	Rubio	
Daines	Scott (SC)	

The nomination was confirmed.

(Mr. KING assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Nicole G. Berner, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

TRIBUTE TO DALLAS SEAVEY

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I am here today for a really fun update. Some of you have been here before when I have had occasion to speak about the Last Great Race. The Last Great Race in Alaska is really all about the Iditarod.

I note the presence of my friend from Vermont, who was sitting where the Presiding Officer is last year, and he was so captivated by the story of the Iditarod. He said: Lisa, when you come back and you give the great announcement, let me know.

So I am pleased to be able to regale you with yet another Iditarod.

This is an extraordinary tradition—51 years in Alaska—where dogs and mushers have left the starting in the Willow, Wasilla area to head north on an almost 1,000-mile—and in some years, an over 1,000-mile race—test of a musher and K–9 against all of the elements.

And it is always a bit exciting, but this year, I am really excited to be able to announce that we have made history yet again with the Iditarod Trail Sled Dog Race. Dallas Seavey has won for the sixth time in a row. This is the first time any musher has ever won more than five Iditarods. This extraordinary young man from an extraordinary mushing family has made history in a way that is absolutely worth celebrating.

Again, for those who are not familiar with the Iditarod, it is about a 1,000-mile sled dog race. It goes from the Anchorage area, where we host the ceremonial start—I was there a couple of weeks ago—and then they begin their actual race the following day, on Sunday.

They proceed all the way up to Nome, and this is not easy terrain. You are going over mountains. You are going over ice on the ocean. You are going over rivers. The terrain is challenging, and, certainly, the temperatures are challenging. This year has been a test for all of our mushers. On certain parts of the trail, they were seeing temperatures down in the negative 40 degrees. When you get yourself moving behind a dog team and get that wind in your face, it is no pleasant journey by any stretch of the imagination. It is tough. It tests the mushers. It tests the canine athletes. But it is an extraordinary, extraordinary race that was based off of a relay effort to get diphtheria serum to Nome during an outbreak in the 1920s. We no longer carry the diphtheria serum, but we carry strong messages about, again, the role of working dogs, the role that mushers and their teams have had in a State like Alaska.

I want to speak a little bit about the Seavey family because, as we are celebrating and recognizing Dallas's extraordinary achievements, having won now six Iditarods, it is important to know that he comes to this race with the Iditarod literally in his veins.

The family tradition started back in 1973. This was the very first Iditarod, and Dallas's grandfather participated in that race. Dan Seavey ran the very first Iditarod. He ended up placing third—pretty respectable, absolutely—but he stayed with it. He stayed with the Iditarod, and he raced in four additional Iditarod races.

Then there is Dan's son, Mitch Seavey, who took the reins from his dad. He started his own racing kennel, and Mitch went on to win three Iditarods himself. He raced in a total of 28 different Iditarods. That is a lot of racing. That is a commitment to the race.

Mitch had four sons, three of which have taken on the Iditarod themselves. The oldest, Danny Seavey, raced three times in the Iditarod; Tyrell Seavey, he has raced twice; and then, of course, Dallas, who has competed in a total of 14 Iditarods. I think it is also worth noting that Dallas's wife, Jen, has also herself competed in the Iditarod. So this is a family, again, who is extraordinarily committed and dedicated to dog racing and, particularly, with the Iditarod.

I think it is somewhat unique to know that it was just a couple of years ago that Dallas and Mitch—his dad—were competing in the same race. How many different sports activities, competitions—intense competitions—do you see a father and a son as competitors? It is really quite remarkable how the Seaveys came to this race and how they have committed to it.

When Dallas started racing in the Iditarod, he was the youngest competitor when he entered the race. It was just 2 weeks before his 18th birthday. So he started pretty young and has stayed in it since 2005.

At 25, he became the youngest competitor to win the Iditarod. He also

holds the record for the fastest Iditarod ran. This was set back in 2021. In that race—the fastest race ever—he completed that race in 7 days, 14 hours, and 51 seconds—7 days to race 1,000 miles. So, now, with his sixth win, he has overtaken another five-time champion, Rick Swenson, for the most Iditarod championships of all.

Dallas is going to be inducted into the Alaska Sports Hall of Fame this year, which, again, is certainly appropriate, given all of his accomplishments.

One of the things that is so great about the Iditarod, one of the things that is so great about these mushers, is they will tell you: It is not about me. I am the individual who is standing on the sled. I am making sure that they are getting the water, the food, the rest that they need. But this is about the mushers. This is about the canine athletes.

Dallas gives due credit to the lead dogs that got him through the race: Arrow, Sebastian, and occasionally, one of his older dogs, Prophet. He kind of joked. He says: You know, just about every dog on my team could be that leader—except one. Frank, apparently, is the name of the one. Dallas says: Not that he won't do it. He will run right up there. I just don't trust him. He would rather pee on things. That is Frank. He runs in the back.

So we all have different challenges with friends and people who we work with. And sometimes the people who we work with are not people, but they are dogs. Frank is exactly in the place that he needs to be.

There is never an Iditarod where there isn't a story that captivates—captivates—the news. The weather was significant. I mentioned the 45 below. You come to a place on the ocean where they are going across ice. There is an area where it is so windy they call it the blow hole. There are accounts of several of the mushers not being able to see their hands in front of their face, much less the dogs in front of them. The markers on the trail are gone. The winds are so intense that it blows the sleds and the mushers off the trail. This is not easy stuff. That is toward the later end of the trail.

One of the incidents that got everyone's attention was just about at the first 100 miles. Our champion, Dallas Seavey, is coming down the trail, and there is a blind spot, a blind corner, that he comes around. And right there, in front of him, in the middle of the trail, is a moose. Moose and sled dogs and teams do not get along well. The moose are ornery and cranky. The dogs are looking at them and barking at the moose. It is not a good combo. Dallas knows that this is not good. But the moose kind of gives the first half of the team—he has 16 dogs in harness. The moose kind of gives the first half of the team the go-ahead but then turns around and starts charging the latter half of his team.

We have had dogs that have been severely injured and have died on the trail because of moose attacks. They are just ferocious and cranky, particularly this time of year when the snow has been so deep and it is just hard for the moose to walk. So Dallas does what he needs to do. He dispatches the moose. He has a revolver, and he takes it out of the sled.

There are actually rules of the Iditarod that tell you what you have to do if you encounter an animal that you need to take out that is threatening yourself or your team. The rules require that if it is an edible animal, you have to gut it properly and notify the authorities at the next checkpoint.

Remember, this guy has won five Iditarods. He wants to win the sixth. He has got a mission, and gutting a moose was not necessarily part of his travel plan. But he gets out his knife, and he guts the moose. In his own words, he doesn't do the best job that he could, but he does an acceptable job. He then moves on.

Keep in mind, he is one man with 16 dogs that are in a bit of a tizzy because you've got a moose on the trail; you have heard a gun; you now have blood. They are in the middle of a race. They want to go. Dallas Seavey is not going to be able to haul that moose off the trail. So he leaves the moose on the trail. He goes up to the checkpoint ahead and notifies them that there is a moose on the trail.

Three mushers come behind, the same blind corner. They come around the corner. The dogs see this thing in the trail and leap over it like horses going over a jump. The sleds are flying. The stories of the mushers about it being almost surreal to be using this moose like a speed bump.

Anyway, the story ends that the moose was taken to the village and shared with the villagers. So it was good use of the moose. But it is one of those things that you think: Wow, only in Alaska.

What has not been shared as much as the dispatch of the moose, however, was the very first musher to come around that same blind corner and see the moose in the trail. He was able to stop his team quick enough—Jessie Holmes. Jessie sees the moose. He needs to get the moose off the trail. He punches the moose in the nose.

Now, I don't know whether that is bravado; I don't know whether the moose just looked like he needed a punch in the nose. But, anyway, Jessie was able to move past the moose safely with his team.

These are some of the things that make the stories interesting and amazing. A lot of people swear like that is the craziest thing ever. Why would you do it?

I think it is important to note that Dallas not only won in 9 days, 2 hours, 16 minutes, and 8 seconds, he did so—he finished ahead of Matt Hall, who came in in 9 days, 6 hours, and 57 minutes. So Dallas was 4-hours-plus ahead, and he did that with a 2-hour penalty that he received from the Iditarod for not properly gutting the moose. So the Seavey stories continue.

Dallas's time—again, think about it. Think about it, my friends. We do some things around here where we say this is a long slog. When you are standing behind a sled, when you are running next to your team, when you are guiding them through not only extreme, bitter temperatures but howling winds, to be on your feet for about 9 days, 2 hours, 16 minutes, and 8 seconds—Dallas finished with a total of 10 dogs in harness. Their average speed was 4.42 miles, so they are clipping along. It is a tough, tough, tough endeavor.

There are some stories from other mushers that you hear. A rooky musher, Josi Thyr—she is still on the trail right now. But she was having trouble staying awake going across the frozen Yukon, so she switched her sled up to a version where she could kind of sit down. She is on the flat of the river, and you are literally falling asleep behind your dogs. That is trust. That is trust, when you know your animals can take you, guide you, while you get a few minutes catnap. But it is tough when you are doing that.

I mentioned Josi as a woman there. I think another history-making fact for this year's Iditarod is that four women finished in the top 10 of the Iditarod. This was the most ever women in the race's history to finish in the top 10. We had Paige Drobny, who came in fourth; Mille Porsild, who finished seventh; Amanda Otto, eighth; and Jessie Royer, who finished tenth. The top 20 for the Iditarod has seven women this year.

A lot of times you think, in order to do this extreme sport, in order to handle a dozen dogs, in order to take all of this on, you have to be some tough, burly guy. Women are doing an extraordinary and exceptional job.

One of my dear friends and a longtime musher, DeeDee Jonrowe, mushed 33 separate Iditarods. DeeDee is about 5 foot 2 and maybe 100 pounds, blonde hair, and blue eyes—a great, beautiful woman, 70 years old. She didn't mush the Iditarod this year, but she did the snowmachine trail all the way up. Just go out for a 1,000-mile snowmachine ride. Tough women, let me tell you.

There were 16 rookies in the race this year. Four of those rookies have dropped out, 2 have finished, 10 are still racing. So right now, as we speak, there are 11 mushers still out on the trail. Seven mushers total have dropped out, and 20 mushers have finished the race so far. So it is an extraordinary endeavor.

As the rest of the teams finish up, we are praying for their safety, and I am sure they are praying for a little bit of a nap when they come in. But congratulations and commendations to everybody who participates in this. There are no losers. They are all winners. From the mushers to the dogs to the amazing volunteers—very few paid staff, but the volunteers who come, whether it is to put on the banquets,

whether it is to be dog handlers, whether it is to help make sure that there is straw for teams in certain locations, the Iditarod Air Force—which is an all-volunteer Air Force that helps move everything along the way—the veterinarians who come from all around the country to volunteer a week of their time to make sure that the dogs' care is taken care of, those in the communities who come out, who sponsor gourmet meals for the first-place person to come into Cripple, or in Unalakleet, the pizza place that is called Peace on Earth, where if I want to make sure that a particular musher gets a nice, hot pizza when they come into Unalakleet, I can call up. They will write a nice message on the box and give it to the musher when they come in— so it is everybody coming together to make this extraordinary event possible.

Nothing better captures the grit, the determination, the ruggedness, the perseverance, the spirit, or just the sheer audacity of Alaskans. So I am delighted to be able to come and celebrate Dallas Seavey and the Iditarod once again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

AMERICORPS WEEK

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, volunteerism and service have long defined the very heart of the American spirit.

It was Alexis de Tocqueville, in the middle of the 19th century, at really the dawn of the modern American Republic, who observed that it was the willingness to take initiative, to get engaged, to roll up your sleeves and get to work helping to build your community that distinguished the people of this new continent from the Old World. And I will say I have seen it myself.

I am here to celebrate the 30th anniversary of America's national service program, something called AmeriCorps. It was created in a bipartisan effort at the end of the George W. Bush administration and at the beginning of the Bill Clinton administration. There was a concerted bipartisan effort to recognize that models around the country that showed the impact on young Americans of spending a year of their lives in service to others were worth expanding and replicating.

This week, actually, happens to be AmeriCorps Week—March 10 to March 16—and we are celebrating 30 years of service.

I have just introduced a bipartisan and bicameral resolution with Senator CASSIDY, Congresswoman MATSUI, and Congressman GRAVES. And, as I mentioned, AmeriCorps has been bipartisan from the start, and I look forward to continuing its future in a bipartisan way.

I have long had a connection to AmeriCorps, going back to one of the first national direct AmeriCorps programs that I ran with the ''I Have a Dream'' Foundation in the mid-1990s. When I was working for ''I Have a Dream,'' we had 150 AmeriCorps members serving in 10 cities, doing after-school programming and summer programming for children from disadvantaged backgrounds. It is one of many ways in which young Americans participating in AmeriCorps have contributed to their community, have developed their skills, and have earned money for college.

Years later, when I was a county executive, I launched the New Castle County Emergency Services Corps to help strengthen the volunteer fire service in my home community. There are dozens of volunteer fire companies in Delaware, and they have often served as the backbone not just of the first responder community but of every community.

I grew up in a very small town named Hockessin, and that siren going off in the middle of the night from our volunteer fire company was a reminder to me of the call that is at the very foundation of our Nation, to get up in the middle of the night, to jump in your truck, and to drive down to the fire hall and to take on the risk of serving and saving your neighbor.

Recruiting, training, and supporting AmeriCorps members through the ''I Have a Dream'' Program was one of the most rewarding opportunities in my life. I, actually, for many years, served on the commission that directs and oversees AmeriCorps in Delaware, and it was through that service that I met my wife.

Over 1 million Americans have served in AmeriCorps since 1994. Delaware, today, alone has more than 361 traditional AmeriCorps members and more than 900 AmeriCorps seniors, and they do a wide range of things: from tutoring children to responding to disasters, improving and rebuilding housing, helping veterans, and much more.

Let me briefly mention two currently serving members of AmeriCorps in Delaware:

Sharron, an adult literacy instructor who works with Literacy Delaware, teaches English to our newest Americans. She spoke of the joy an immigrant mother felt when the school administrator called to tell her about her son—and to communicate something positive about his progress in school—and she could understand everything for the first time, as she was coming to master English without an interpreter.

Shristi, an academic coach at TeenSHARP, a college access program for underrepresented high school students, spoke of how fulfilling it was to help young men and women in Delaware, just as she herself had benefited from similar mentoring and tutoring.

These two examples are a reminder of what more than 1 million AmeriCorps members over 30 years have experienced—that service brings America together. It helps us bridge our divides.

AmeriCorps has organized, for decades now, an annual 9/11 Day of Service that brings people of all backgrounds together to be reminded of what citizenship means in our Nation: service to others.

As we reflect on 30 years, I think it needs to be a call for all of us to engage in the work of service; to take up the challenge of reauthorizing, strengthening, and expanding AmeriCorps as a program; and to recognize that the best thing we can do for our Nation is to get committed to each other through national service.

Congratulations to all who have served in AmeriCorps over the last 30 years and to the millions more Americans whose future will be enlivened, brightened, and strengthened through the opportunity to serve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled vote: YOUNG for up to 5 minutes, BARRASSO for up to 7 minutes, STABENOW for up to 5 minutes, and CARDIN for up to 3 minutes.

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

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, during his State of the Union Address last week, President Biden spoke about solving the ongoing humanitarian crisis at our southern border, and he mentioned the name of Laken Riley. Laken Riley, as my colleagues know, lost her life—lost her life—because of that humanitarian crisis.

Laken was a 22-year-old college student. She was murdered by an illegal alien last month. The illegal alien had been previously cited for theft and shoplifting but was released.

Those who knew her described Laken as a shining light and kindhearted. Her calling in life was to care for others, and she was on her way to answering that calling, studying nursing at Augusta University, when she was murdered—murdered by a Venezuelan national who crossed our border illegally.

To Laken's family and friends: Your fellow Americans grieve with you. We are saddened by your loss. We pray and we hope that, in time, you will find comfort. We should all find comfort in the example that Laken leaves behind.

But let me not be the first to say—let me add my voice to the chorus of voices in emphasizing that words of condolence are not enough. It is far better for us to honor Laken's life by doing everything—everything—within our power to ensure that no other family endures this or a similar tragedy.

So to President Biden, who said after his speech that he shouldn't have referred to Laken's murderer as an ''illegal,'' and to any of my colleagues who are offended by the use of that term: Let us dispense with misplaced outrage. Let's stop playing political word games. Let's speak as plainly as possible. The man who killed Laken Riley broke the law when he walked across our southern border. He shouldn't have been in our country. He was an illegal

immigrant. Had our border not been broken, had our immigration laws not been continually ignored, he wouldn't have been in Georgia, and Laken Riley would still be alive.

The man who killed Laken Riley was arrested in El Paso. He was then welcomed into the country with little obligation other than to follow the honor system, to show up for an appointment with Immigration and Customs Enforcement, which he failed to do.

This is but one ripple in a wave—a wave—of illegal immigrants drawn toward and allowed into our border by design. In his first 100 days in office, President Biden signed 94 Executive orders to dismantle—dismantle—his predecessor's border policies for the simple reason that those policies actually reduced illegal immigration. He ended the ''Remain in Mexico'' policy. He scaled back border enforcement. He revived catch-and-release. He halted deportations. He allowed title 42 to sunset. He abused our parole system, allowing millions of people into this country without proper vetting, overwhelming not just our law enforcement and communities along the border but also cities far from it, cities in my home State of Indiana. Last December alone, 300,000 people were processed at the southern border—an alltime high.

Mr. President, I would request 2 more minutes.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, 9 million illegal immigrants have crossed our border during President Biden's Presidency. If only those among us would have spent as much time worrying about securing our southern border as they do about finding inoffensive terms to describe the man who illegally crossed it and then murdered Laken Riley.

For over 3 years, I have urged the Biden administration to reverse its border policies. Record levels of illegal crossings are a national security issue. We know that. But they are also a crime and drug use issue in the State of Indiana and across the country, tragically evidenced by Laken Riley's death. The chaos this administration's policies have caused isn't confined to Texas, nor is it confined to Arizona. Every State is a border State.

I appreciate the good-faith efforts of some of my colleagues—Senator LANKFORD most notably but others—to find bipartisan solutions to strengthen our border security. I will remain hopeful that we in Congress can find the path to improving our border security laws and to actually enforcing them. But the occupant of the Oval Office is not powerless to act.

At times, President Biden presents himself as a border hawk, waiting on Republicans to give him the tools to end the crisis he created. We should note: The President has routinely pushed the constitutional limits of his office in pursuit of political and policy goals, but now—now—he claims, when it comes to the border crisis, he is hemmed in from taking action by Congress.

Despite the tough talk, we regular Americans would be forgiven for concluding that this administration wants the crisis on our southern border to continue.

Prove us wrong, Mr. President. Fixing the border begins with you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

ISRAEL

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, every year on this floor, a Senator reads George Washington's Farewell Address. This year, Senator CARDIN, who is retiring from this body, was given the honor of reading the address. It is so that we in the Senate remember the lessons from George Washington.

So let's reflect on what is in George Washington's Farewell Address, and it is this quote:

> Foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government.

Well, the majority leader of the U.S. Senate certainly knows that because 4 years ago, he quoted these very same words. Yet he ignored them totally today in this body, when it comes to our ally Israel.

Hours ago, the senior Senator from New York crossed the line by calling for a new government in Israel. Let's be clear: Israel is a democracy. It makes its own choice about who they want to lead them. It doesn't need to have a Senator from New York's interference.

The Senator also made the outrageous statement that the Prime Minister of Israel—in the words of the Senator from New York—is an ''obstacle to peace.''

This is exactly backward. It is the terrorists, the rapists, the murderers of Hamas who are the obstacles to peace.

Let us be clear: Demonizing our friends is not going to protect them from the brutality of Hamas. It only works to alienate our allies and puts our common goals of peace further out of reach.

Israel deserves an ally that the people of Israel can trust, most especially when they are battling terrorism.

The Senators on both sides of the aisle in this body have affirmed that Israel has every right to defend itself. We must also respect Israel's right as a democracy to choose its own destiny.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. President, now, on a separate matter, I come to the floor to speak about President Biden's State of the Union speech. The speech is likely a preview of his 2024 acceptance speech at the Democrat convention this summer in Chicago.

From start to finish, it was the angriest, most partisan, most divisive, and most vindictive State of the Union that I can recall.

President Biden used his most important speech in 50 years to launch a direct attack on half of America. He shouted, lied about them, belittled their concerns. And if people had the gall to disagree with him, he screamed that they were the enemies of democracy.

President Biden said all of this to hide his disastrous record of failures.

Three years ago, President Biden said:

> Without unity, there is . . . only bitterness and fury.

Last Thursday night, what we saw from President Biden was bitterness and fury.

To me, this was an insult to every American. The President showed no respect for the American people, for our institutions, or for the truth. Instead, we heard an hour of dismissals, denials, distortions, and deceptive spin.

President Biden has only himself to blame. It is his disastrous policies that caused us to be in the mess that we find ourselves.

President Biden said:

> The state of our union is strong and getting stronger.

Well, that may be his opinion, but it is not what the American people believe. Prices are up 18 percent today compared to the day that he took office.

President Biden said he needs new laws to secure the border. That is not true, either. President Biden has the power to secure the border, and he knows it. He simply lacks the backbone.

During his first 100 days, the President took 94 Executive actions that threw our border wide open. He stopped building the wall. He turned ''detain and deport'' into ''catch and release.'' And more than 9 million illegal immigrants have poured across our southern border since Joe Biden became President.

Now, that includes hundreds of terror suspects and thousands of hardened criminals. This is dangerous for our country. Yet Joe Biden can't say that.

Since his speech last Thursday, he has spent more time groveling for using the term ''illegal'' immigrant than apologizing for not knowing the name of Laken Riley. People all across the country remember her as the 24-year-old nursing student who was murdered by an illegal immigrant.

President Biden also claimed our global alliances are stronger than they ever were. That is not true. Since Joe Biden became President, America has lost its standing in the world. Our allies don't trust us. Our enemies don't fear us.

By every metric, we are worse off today than we were the day Joe Biden took office. Seven in 10 Americans say that our Nation is heading in the wrong direction. No amount of scolding or lecturing by the President is going to change that. No amount of yelling will cover up President Biden's endless failures to lower prices.

Yelling by President Biden is not going to restore confidence in the

American dream, which his own inflation eroded. Angry blame-shifting by President Biden is not going to stop the flood or reverse the flood of the 9 million illegal immigrants and illegal border crossings, nor will it protect innocent Americans from the illegal immigrant crime.

Families in my home State of Wyoming and all across America are fed up with the Biden blame game. Americans are not imagining that their grocery bills are higher than they ever were before. The bills actually are higher. Americans aren't imagining that the border is more dangerous than ever before. It is more dangerous.

And watching President Biden's speech, it is clear to the people across Wyoming and to like-minded Americans that the President doesn't listen.

Fortunately, Senate Republicans are listening. You heard it last week from the junior Senator from Alabama. Her response was remarkably positive. Unlike President Biden, she offered a bright vision for the future of our Nation. The Senator said:

Together, we can reawaken the heroic spirit of a great nation.

And she is right.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

PRESIDENT BIDEN'S BUDGET

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I just want to say for the record that it has been 36 days since Republican colleagues voted down the strongest border security bill in decades. So that is a reality.

But what I wanted to speak about was the President's budget. When he was growing up, President Biden's dad used to say this: Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value.

Well, President Biden's budget just came out, and I will tell you what he values. President Biden values investing in the middle class so that families are able to work hard and get ahead and build a better life for their children. He values ensuring that teachers and firefighters aren't paying more taxes than billionaires. And he values Social Security and Medicare, programs that have lifted up millions of older Americans out of poverty—a whole generation—a great American success story.

Meanwhile, we have the Republican nominee, the former President, in a CNBC interview vowing to cut Medicare and Social Security.

Show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value.

The Biden budget invests in growing our middle class, continuing the policies that have made our economy the strongest in the world.

Since President Biden and Vice President HARRIS took office, the economy has added about 15 million new jobs, the most ever in the first term of a President.

The unemployment rate has stayed below 4 percent for 2 years in a row. We haven't seen that in more than 50 years.

Wages are up. The stock market is up. New small businesses are up.

Meanwhile, the Republican agenda slashes investments in our families while cutting taxes for the wealthy.

Republicans like to talk about cutting the deficit. Meanwhile, President Biden is doing it. His budget would reduce the deficit by $3 trillion by making the wealthy pay their fair share and cracking down on tax cheats.

The Biden budget lowers costs for families in a number of ways. It invests in affordable childcare so that working families aren't scrambling to find quality care at a price they can afford. It increases affordable housing and helps American families buy their first home and achieve their dream. Meanwhile, it makes higher education more affordable and cuts the burden of student debt, and it continues to lower prescription drug costs, helping people afford the medications they need.

And, best of all, it restores the expanded child tax credit, which was enacted as part of the American Rescue Plan. The expanded child tax credit helped cut child poverty in half in 2021. And President Biden's budget brings it back, giving families some breathing room.

We also know that families are concerned about our national security. The Biden budget invests in a secure border through technology that detects fentanyl, more Border Patrol officers, more immigration judges, and more asylum officers so decisions can be made quickly on who should be allowed to remain in the country.

And, finally, the Biden budget protects and strengthens Social Security and Medicare. These aren't just government programs. They are a promise that, after a lifetime of hard work, you will be able to retire in dignity.

Meanwhile, Republicans continue, through their Presidential nominee, to focus on cutting programs that break that promise.

Show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value. A thriving middle class, safe communities, security for our seniors, and ensuring that the wealthy pay their fair share—that is what the President values.

We have come a long way. It is time to build on our progress.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion to invoke cloture.

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. 461, Nicole G. Berner, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Mazie K. Hirono, Tina Smith, Gary C. Peters, Amy Klobuchar, Raphael G. Warnock, Catherine Cortez Masto, Alex Padilla, Mark R. Warner, Tim Kaine, Sheldon Whitehouse, Martin Heinrich, Christopher A. Coons, Margaret Wood Hassan, Peter Welch.

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 Nicole G. Berner, of Maryland, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fourth Circuit, 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 Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 93 Ex.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—40

Barrasso	Grassley	Murkowski
Blackburn	Hagerty	Paul
Braun	Hawley	Ricketts
Britt	Hoeven	Risch
Budd	Hyde-Smith	Rounds
Capito	Johnson	Schmitt
Cassidy	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Collins	Lankford	Thune
Cornyn	Lee	Tillis
Crapo	Lummis	Tuberville
Cruz	Manchin	Vance
Ernst	Marshall	Young
Fischer	McConnell	
Graham	Moran	

NOT VOTING—12

Boozman	Markey	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Mullin	Shaheen
Cramer	Romney	Sullivan
Daines	Rubio	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 40.

The motion is agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that all time be considered expired and the confirmation vote be at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday, March 19.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 465.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward Sunyol Kiel, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 nomination of Executive Calendar No. 465, Edward Sunyol Kiel, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, Mazie K. Hirono, Tina Smith, Gary C. Peters, Amy Klobuchar, Raphael G. Warnock, Catherine Cortez Masto, Alex Padilla, Mark R. Warner, Tim Kaine, Sheldon Whitehouse, Martin Heinrich, Christopher A. Coons, Margaret Wood Hassan, Peter Welch.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to legislative session.

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

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 463.

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

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Eumi K. Lee, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 nomination of Executive Calendar No. 463, Eumi K. Lee, of California, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of California.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Mazie K. Hirono, Alex Padilla, Margaret Wood Hassan, Tim Kaine, Tammy Duckworth, Thomas R. Carper, Tina Smith, Jeff Merkley, Catherine Cortez Masto, Martin Heinrich, Christopher Murphy, Debbie Stabenow, Brian Schatz, Chris Van Hollen.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, March 14, be waived.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

ISRAEL

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, during his State of the Union Address last week, President Biden once again rightly pointed out that Israel has the right and I would say the duty to defend itself in the aftermath of the brutal Hamas terror attack of October 7 that left approximately 1,200 brutally murdered and 240 taken hostage. There must be no more October 7s.

President Biden also described the ongoing humanitarian disaster taking place in Gaza today. Over 31,000 Palestinians have been killed—over two-thirds of them women and children—and likely thousands more unaccounted for, buried beneath the rubble. Gaza has become a hellhole of human suffering. Humanitarian organizations that have operated worldwide for decades say they have never witnessed a more terrible situation.

Among those suffering in Gaza are not only over 2 million innocent Palestinian civilians but also over 130 hostages still held by Hamas, including Americans.

Earlier this week, I met with some of the families of Israeli hostages whose loved ones were kidnapped and are still being held captive, as well as one brave woman who was held hostage and released during the November pause.

Every day that they are separated from their loved ones, not knowing what will happen to them next, is a day of unimaginable mental anguish and torment. That is why we must prioritize the release of the hostages and end the suffering of Palestinian civilians. The only way to do that is to secure an immediate cease-fire and release all of the remaining hostages. That must happen, but until it happens, we must do everything in our power to protect innocent civilians and end the humanitarian disaster in Gaza.

Today, four out of five of the hungriest people on Earth are in Gaza. Hundreds of thousands of them are on the verge of starvation, and over 23 children have crossed that grisly threshold and have died of starvation. Cindy McCain, the Director of the World Food Programme, has warned of an imminent famine. Injured children are having their limbs amputated without anesthesia. Sewage is spilling onto the streets, and humanitarian officials are seeing spikes in the spread of various preventable diseases, like diarrhea, among children.

Two weeks ago, the world got a glimpse of a horrible scene: Over 100 starving Palestinians were killed as they reached for food from trucks. In the aftermath of that horrible event, President Biden has ordered airdrops of food supplies. I support that decision because when people are starving, every parcel of food counts. But airdrops are just a drop in the ocean of need, so I was also glad to see the President order the building of a temporary port to help deliver more aid by ship. But that port will likely not be ready for at least 60 days, and even then, it will not be sufficient to meet the humanitarian need.

All of these extraordinary efforts to deliver aid by air and by sea are being undertaken when we know that during the prewar period, when there was already a near blockade of Gaza, about 500 trucks still crossed daily through the Kerem Shalom crossing into Gaza. And those 500 trucks crossed every day when the need was far less acute than it is right now.

So the obvious question is, Why? Why in the world should we have to resort to these extraordinary and more expensive means to deliver insufficient amounts of food and aid by air and sea when we could bring in sufficient amounts of food and aid by truck much more efficiently through Egypt's Rafah crossing and the multiple crossing points into Gaza from Israel?

The answer is because this is a man-made disaster.

The starvation in Gaza is not the result of food scarcity caused by drought or other natural disasters that we see in many parts of the world. This has been caused primarily because the Netanyahu government has used a series of tactics to restrict the amount of aid entering into Gaza. Anyone with eyes to see or ears to hear knows that.

Members of the Netanyahu government, like Smotrich and Ben-Gvir,

have made no secret of their intentions. In October, after the war began, Ben-Gvir said:

So long as Hamas does not release the hostages, the only thing that should enter Gaza is hundreds of tons of Air Force explosives—not one ounce of humanitarian aid.

Smotrich used his power as Finance Minister to block a shipment of flour that could feed 1.1 million people for a month in Gaza. The shipment was finally released 2 days ago after having been blocked for 5 weeks at least, all while people were starving.

At one point, Prime Minister Netanyahu said his government was allowing just the ''minimum'' amount needed, and that was at a time when he and others denied that there was even a humanitarian disaster in Gaza; denied that there was a scarcity of food in Gaza; denied that there was hunger in Gaza.

This is why President Biden has called out those restrictions and why he said in his State of the Union Address:

Humanitarian assistance cannot be a secondary consideration or a bargaining chip.

The President said that his administration is going to ''insist that Israel facilitate more trucks and more routes to get more and more people the help they need—no excuses.''

More than 5 weeks ago, on February 2, 25 Senators sent a letter to President Biden, calling for the Netanyahu government to implement five specific actions to significantly increase the amount of humanitarian aid entering Gaza. To date, none of them have been fully implemented.

That is why many of us have called on President Biden to immediately invoke and implement the Humanitarian Aid Corridor Act, which is section 620I of the Foreign Assistance Act. Now that NSM—National Security Memorandum—20 is in place, which is based on an amendment that 19 of us proposed to the National Security Act, it is essential—essential—that the Biden administration enforce its terms to get humanitarian aid delivered where it needs to go. When people are starving, patience is not a virtue.

It needs to be said that getting humanitarian aid into Gaza is only half the battle. The other half and the more dangerous half is distributing the aid once it is inside of Gaza. It doesn't do any good if you can't safely transport the food to the people who are starving. In other words, you need a safe distribution system for aid inside Gaza. Now, the organization that is the primary distributor of assistance within Gaza has been an entity called the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, known by its shorthand as UNRWA. Americans may have not heard much about UNRWA, so I want to say a little bit about why UNRWA exists and what it does in Gaza and elsewhere. But before I do that, I want to jump to why this is a pressing issue right now.

The future of UNRWA is an urgent matter right now because Prime Minister Netanyahu and his extreme right-wing allies want to get rid of it not just in Gaza but everywhere that it operates. And guess what. Prime Minister Netanyahu and folks on the far right in his government have wanted to abolish UNRWA not just since October 7 but since at least 2017. In fact, in 2018, Prime Minister Netanyahu actually changed official Israeli policy with respect to UNRWA, saying that they wanted to cut off all funding to UNRWA, even at a time that his security team warned that it could create instabilities throughout the region if that happened.

Now we have Republican Members of the House and Senate who are jumping on this bandwagon and saying they want to abolish UNRWA. And how do they want to do this? By inserting a provision in the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs appropriations bill, which is being considered and debated right now as we gather here, to cut off all U.S. funding for UNRWA. That is what they want to do.

So let's go back to why UNRWA was created in the first place.

In 1949—a year after the establishment of the State of Israel—the United Nations formed a new agency to provide vital services for over 700,000 Palestinian refugees who were displaced during the first Arab-Israeli war. Back then, the idea was that UNRWA would provide services to Palestinian refugees until a just and durable solution to their plight was found. As we know all too well, over 73 years have passed without a resolution to that conflict, which is why UNRWA's mission remains essential. Among other services, UNRWA provides schools and primary health services to Palestinian refugees and their descendants in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, the West Bank, and in Gaza.

I hope we all agree that the Palestinian people deserve to live in dignity. The way to do that is to ensure that they also have self-determination in a homeland of their own, just like every Israeli deserves dignity and self-determination in the Jewish and democratic State of Israel.

President Biden and I and many others believe that the only viable, long-term solution to this conflict is a two-state solution, and President Biden has put that idea forward as the best way to create some light at the end of this very dark tunnel. UNRWA was really intended to be a bridge until such a resolution was reached.

Prime Minister Netanyahu has stated very clearly that he is opposed to a two-state solution. He was opposed to the Oslo Accords, and he has been a severe opponent of the two-state solution. And as I said earlier, he also wants to eliminate UNRWA, which today is an organization of over 300,000 employees providing services to Palestinians in three countries and, as I said, also in the West Bank and Gaza.

Mr. President, 13,000 of those 30,000 UNRWA staff operate in Gaza—many of them as teachers. Since the war started with the brutal Hamas attacks on Israel of October 7, UNRWA's schools in Gaza have shut down; and as a United Nations agency, it has deployed its resources to supply humanitarian relief to the civilian population there. It is the main vehicle for distributing humanitarian assistance in Gaza. It won't do any good to get humanitarian assistance into Gaza if you dismantle the U.N. organization principally responsible for delivering that aid to people in Gaza.

This morning, I met with chef Jose Andres, and I applaud him for his efforts and the efforts of the World Central Kitchen around the world, including in Israel and in Gaza. He said:

Support for UNRWA is vital. If you want to feed people you need to support UNRWA.

We may have a temporary port, but when the ship gets to the port, someone has to transfer that food and other assistance from the ship to the people who need it in Gaza, and UNRWA is the principal distributor of assistance. If you talk to the World Food Programme and others, they say very clearly they cannot replace that capacity that UNRWA has.

In late January, the Netanyahu government alleged that up to 14 of UNRWA's 13,000 employees participated in the horrific October attacks against Israel. These are, of course, very serious allegations, and UNRWA has taken them seriously. All agree that any individuals involved in that horror must be held accountable, and even though the Netanyahu government has not provided UNRWA with the underlying evidence, UNRWA immediately fired the alleged perpetrators.

The U.N. Secretary General also took swift action and announced the launch of a full and independent investigation, led by the U.N.'s highest investigative body, into the allegations; and that is ongoing. At the same time, President Biden suspended all U.S. contributions to UNRWA pending the outcome of that investigation. A number of other countries followed suit, as did the EU.

But, since then, two things have changed. First, the Netanyahu government has not shared the underlying evidence with UNRWA nor, as reported by The Wall Street Journal, has it shared the raw evidence with the United States. In fact, I urge every one of my Senate colleagues to read the classified report prepared by the DNI, and I especially urge my colleagues to read the intelligence assessments about the many other claims the Netanyahu government has made against UNRWA—and there have been many. I am sure that many of my colleagues are unaware of the fact that UNRWA has long provided both Israel and the United States with the names and identities of all its employees for full review and vetting. Now, Israel, of course, has far more extensive intelligence capabilities than UNRWA; but, apparently, they have never previously raised complaints about any of the

UNRWA employees on the lists given to them.

Second, the EU and many countries that initially suspended their financial support for UNRWA have since restored their contributions because they have acknowledged the desperation in Gaza and the irreplaceable nature of UNRWA. In fact, even prior to these allegations, UNRWA had asked the U.N. Secretary General to convene an Independent Review Group to assess whether UNRWA was doing everything within its power to ensure neutrality.

So, again, UNRWA in Gaza—an organization with a staff of 13,000 people—is delivering essential life-sustaining aid to over 2 million people. And what the EU and these other countries that have restored UNRWA funding recognize is that it is inhumane to cut off assistance to 2 million people because of the atrocious, alleged acts of 14. Punish the 14. Don't punish 2 million innocent Gazans, and that is why I believe that President Biden should restore this assistance now.

The notion that UNRWA is, somehow, a front group for Hamas is a total lie—pure and simple. The individual dispatched by President Biden to be the U.S. humanitarian coordinator in the region is a veteran diplomat, Ambassador David Satterfield. He has repeatedly debunked claims made by members of the Netanyahu government that humanitarian aid provided by UNRWA has been diverted to Hamas. Specifically, he said the following:

> I have not received any allegations, evidence or reports of any incidence of Hamas diversion or theft of U.S. or other assistance or fuel from UN delivered assistance from any of our partners or from the Government of Israel since the humanitarian assistance resumed in Gaza October 21.

Not a single report from Israeli Government officials or anybody else about Hamas diverting aid that was being transported by UNRWA or other U.N. agencies.

My colleagues, you should all know that the individual overseeing operations on the ground in Gaza today is an American named Scott Anderson. He is a 21-year Army veteran from South Dakota. He is a no-nonsense guy. I urge every Senator to talk to him. The notion that Scott Anderson is part of a front organization for Hamas is patently absurd.

The truth is that before the war started, Prime Minister Netanyahu did not pretend that he wanted to dismantle UNRWA on the grounds that it was a proxy for Hamas. He has long wanted to eliminate UNRWA not only in Gaza but everywhere else that it supports education for Palestinian schoolchildren and healthcare for Palestinians, like in the West Bank and Jordan. As I said, he has been trying to do that since at least the year 2017. And now he has Republicans in Congress joining him and calling for the defunding of all U.S. support for UNRWA, not only in Gaza but throughout the region.

Attempts to discredit UNRWA and the U.N. have gotten so bad that 18 heads of all the major U.N. humanitarian and refugee agencies, together with NGOs like Save the Children and CARE, signed a statement calling for a ''halt to campaigns that seek to discredit the United Nations and non-governmental organizations doing their best to save lives.'' It is making it harder for them to save lives.

If you want to take a combustible situation in the West Bank and make it even worse, then close down schools for kids there. Take away any chance of an education. Snuff out any hopes they may have for a brighter future. Really?

If you want to create instability in Jordan, shut down UNRWA schools and services there. Why do we all think that King Abdallah has warned us about the consequences of shutting down UNRWA?

Here is the crazy thing about this moment: Prime Minister Netanyahu has seized on the lies about UNRWA being a proxy for Hamas in Gaza to achieve his long-term goal of shutting down UNRWA everywhere.

And what adds insult to injury is that UNRWA has not perpetuated Hamas in Gaza, but Prime Minister Netanyahu himself has done exactly that. Let me explain.

You know, there is a lot of talk here in the U.S. Senate about the malign actors who have supported Hamas over the years. One of them is a very malign actor, Iran.

Now, Iran did not create Hamas, nor does Iran exercise command and control over Hamas. But it does support Hamas because, like Iran, Hamas has the despicable goal of eliminating Israel. That is why Iran has supported Hamas.

But what we rarely, if ever, discuss is the inconvenient truth that, until the unexpected horror of the Hamas attack on October 7, Prime Minister Netanyahu himself saw it as in his interest to keep Hamas in control in Gaza.

Don't take my word for it. He told us in his own words back in 2019 at a Likud Party meeting where he said:

> Anyone who wants to prevent the creation of a Palestinian state needs to support strengthening Hamas. This is part of our strategy to divide the Palestinians between those in Gaza and those in Judea and Samaria.

Prime Minister Netanyahu:

> Anyone who wants to prevent the creation of a Palestinian state needs to support strengthening Hamas.

Mr. President, I would like to have printed in the RECORD a piece that appeared in Haaretz, in October of last year, entitled ''A Brief History of the Netanyahu-Hamas Alliance.'' I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Haaretz, Oct. 20, 2023]

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE NETANYAHU-HAMAS ALLIANCE

(By Adam Raz)

For 14 years, Netanyahu's policy was to keep Hamas in power; the pogrom of October 7, 2023, helps the Israeli prime minister preserve his own rule.

Much ink has been spilled describing the longtime relationship—rather, alliance—between Benjamin Netanyahu and Hamas. And still, the very fact that there has been close cooperation between the Israeli prime minister (with the support of many on the right) and the fundamentalist organization seemingly evaporated from most of the current analyses—everyone's talking about ''failures,'' ''mistakes'' and ''contzeptziot'' (fixed conceptions). Given this, there is a need not only to review the history of cooperation but also to conclude unequivocally: The pogrom of October 7, 2023, helps Netanyahu, and not for the first time, to preserve his rule, certainly in the short term.

The MO of Netanyahu's policy since his return to the Prime Minister's Office in 2009 has and continues to be, on the one hand, bolstering the rule of Hamas in the Gaza Strip, and, on the other, weakening the Palestinian Authority.

His return to power was accompanied by a complete turnaround from the policy of his predecessor, Ehud Olmert, who sought to end the conflict through a peace treaty with the most moderate Palestinian leader—PA President Mahmoud Abbas.

For the last 14 years, while implementing a divide-and-conquer policy vis-a-vis the West Bank and Gaza, ''Abu Yair'' (''Yair's father,'' in Arabic, as Netanyahu called himself while campaigning in the Arab community before one recent election) has resisted any attempt, military or diplomatic, that might bring an end to the Hamas regime.

In practice, since the Cast Lead operation in late 2008 and early 2009, during the Olmert era, Hamas' rule has not faced any genuine military threat. On the contrary: The group has been supported by the Israeli prime minister, and funded with his assistance.

When Netanyahu declared in April 2019, as he has after every other round of fighting, that ''we have restored deterrence with Hamas'' and that ''we have blocked the main supply routes,'' he was lying through his teeth.

For over a decade, Netanyahu has lent a hand, in various ways, to the growing military and political power of Hamas. Netanyahu is the one who turned Hamas from a terror organization with few resources into a semi-state body.

Releasing Palestinian prisoners, allowing cash transfers, as the Qatari envoy comes and goes to Gaza as he pleases, agreeing to the import of a broad array of goods, construction materials in particular, with the knowledge that much of the material will be designated for terrorism and not for building civilian infrastructure, increasing the number of work permits in Israel for Palestinian workers from Gaza, and more. All these developments created symbiosis between the flowering of fundamentalist terrorism and preservation of Netanyahu's rule.

Take note: It would be a mistake to assume that Netanyahu thought about the well-being of the poor and oppressed Gazans—who are also victims of Hamas—when allowing the transfer of funds (some of which, as noted, didn't go to building infrastructure but rather military armament). His goal was to hurt Abbas and prevent division of the Land of Israel into two states.

It's important to remember that without those funds from Qatar (and Iran), Hamas would not have had the money to maintain

its reign of terror, and its regime would have been dependent on restraint.

In practice, the injection of cash (as opposed to bank deposits, which are far more accountable) from Qatar, a practice that Netanyahu supported and approved, has served to strengthen the military arm of Hamas since 2012.

Thus, Netanyahu indirectly funded Hamas after Abbas decided to stop providing it with funds that he knew would end up being used for terrorism against him, his policies and his people. It's important not to ignore that Hamas used this money to buy the means through which Israelis have been murdered for years.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. After all, so long as Hamas was in control in Gaza, how could anyone ask Israel to accept a Palestinian State that included Gaza and the West Bank? It is a fair question.

So what are some of the ways in which Prime Minister Netanyahu has enabled Hamas to maintain its control in Gaza? Well, another thing we have heard a lot about around here is the money from Qatar that went to Hamas. It is well established that every penny of that money flowed from Qatar to Hamas with the concurrence of Prime Minister Netanyahu and Israel. That has been the testimony of witnesses in both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. It has also been well documented in numerous news sources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a CNN article entitled ''Qatar sends millions to Gaza for years—with Israel's backing.''

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

[From CNN, Dec. 12, 2023]

QATAR SENT MILLIONS TO GAZA FOR YEARS—WITH ISRAEL'S BACKING. HERE'S WHAT WE KNOW ABOUT THE CONTROVERSIAL DEAL

(By Nima Elbagir, Barbara Arvanitidies, Alex Platt, Raja Razek, Nadeen Ebrahim, and Uri Blau)

Since the October 7 Hamas attack on Israel, the Gulf state of Qatar has come under fire by Israeli officials, American politicians and media outlets for sending hundreds of millions of dollars in aid to Gaza, which is governed by the Palestinian militant group. But all that happened with Israel's blessing.

In a series of interviews with key Israeli players conducted in collaboration with Israeli investigative journalism organization Shomrim, CNN was told Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu continued the cash flow to Hamas, despite concerns raised from within his own government.

Qatar has vowed not to stop those payments. Qatari minister of state for foreign affairs Mohammed bin Abdulaziz Al-Khulaifi told CNN's Becky Anderson on Monday that his government will continue to make payments to Gaza to support the enclave, as it has been doing for years.

''We're not going to change our mandate. Our mandate is our continuous help and support for our brothers and sisters of Palestine. We will continue to do it systematically as we did it before,'' Al-Khulaifi said.

Israeli sources responded by pointing out that successive governments had facilitated the transfer of money to Gaza for humanitarian reasons and that Netanyahu had acted decisively against Hamas after the October 7 attacks.

Here's what we know about those payments and Israel's role in facilitating them.

WHEN DID THE QATARI PAYMENTS START?

In 2018, Qatar began making monthly payments to the Gaza Strip. Some $15 million were sent into Gaza in cash-filled suitcases—delivered by the Qataris through Israeli territory after months of negotiation with Israel.

The payments started after the Palestinian Authority (PA), the Palestinian government in the Israeli occupied West Bank that is a rival of Hamas, decided to cut salaries of government employees in Gaza in 2017, an Israeli government source with knowledge of the matter told CNN at the time.

WHAT DID ISRAEL KNOW ABOUT HAMAS' OCTOBER 7 ATTACK?

The PA opposed the Qatari funding at the time, which Hamas said was meant for the payment of public salaries as well as medical purposes.

Israel approved the deal in a security cabinet meeting in August 2018, when Netanyahu was serving his previous tenure as premier.

Even then, Netanyahu was criticized by his coalition partners for the deal and for being too soft on Hamas.

The prime minister defended the initiative at the time, saying the deal was made ''in coordination with security experts to return calm to (Israeli) villages of the south, but also to prevent a humanitarian disaster (in Gaza).''

Ahmad Majdalani, an Executive Committee member at the Palestine Liberation Organization in the West Bank, accused the United States of orchestrating the payment.

The US was aware of the Qatari payments to Hamas, a former senior State Department official involved in the region told CNN on condition of anonymity due to the sensitivity of the matter.

Qatar was prepared to provide funds to the Gaza Strip through Hamas as early as the 2014 Israel-Hamas war to alleviate the humanitarian crisis there, the official said, and the US at the time left it up to the Israelis to decide whether they would permit this.

''We deferred completely to the Israelis as to whether this was something they wanted to do or not,'' the official said.

WHY DID ISRAEL BACK THE PAYMENTS?

Israeli and international media have reported that Netanyahu's plan to continue allowing aid to reach Gaza through Qatar was in the hope that it might make Hamas an effective counterweight to the PA and prevent the establishment of a Palestinian state.

PA officials said at the time the cash transfers encouraged division between Palestinian factions.

Major General Amos Gilad, a former senior Israeli Defense Ministry official, told CNN the plan was backed by the prime minister, but not by the Israeli intelligence community. There was also some belief that it would ''weaken Palestinian sovereignty,'' he said. There was also an illusion, he added, that ''if you fed them (Hamas) with money, they would be tamed.''

Shlomo Brom, a former deputy to Israel's national security adviser, told the New York Times that an empowered Hamas helped Netanyahu avoid negotiating over a Palestinian state, saying the division of the Palestinians helped him make the case that he had no partner for peace in the Palestinians, thus avoiding pressure for peace talks that could lead to the establishment of an independent Palestinian state.

The former State Department official said that after the 2014 war, Israel felt it was better off with Hamas controlling Gaza as opposed to multiple Islamist groups, or leaving it in a political vacuum.

''It was our impression that the Israelis were comfortable with keeping Hamas in power in a weakened form,'' the official said. ''Our understanding was that Hamas was the lesser of a whole bunch of bad options in Gaza,'' the official added, noting that at least the competing PA could keep Hamas out of the West Bank.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a New York Times article from December of last year entitled '''Buying Quiet': Inside the Israeli plan that propped up Hamas.''

The sub headline is ''Prime Minister Netanyahu gambled that a strong Hamas (but not too strong) would keep the peace and reduce pressure for a Palestinian state.''

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

[From New York Times, Dec. 10, 2023]

'BUYING QUIET': INSIDE THE ISRAELI PLAN THAT PROPPED UP HAMAS

(By Mark Mazzetti and Ronen Bergman)

Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu gambled that a strong Hamas (but not too strong) would keep the peace and reduce pressure for a Palestinian state.

Just weeks before Hamas launched the deadly Oct. 7 attacks on Israel, the head of Mossad arrived in Doha, Qatar, for a meeting with Qatari officials.

For years, the Qatari government had been sending millions of dollars a month into the Gaza Strip—money that helped prop up the Hamas government there. Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu of Israel not only tolerated those payments, he had encouraged them.

During his meetings in September with the Qatari officials, according to several people familiar with the secret discussions, the Mossad chief, David Barnea, was asked a question that had not been on the agenda: Did Israel want the payments to continue?

Mr. Netanyahu's government had recently decided to continue the policy, so Mr. Barnea said yes. The Israeli government still welcomed the money from Doha.

Allowing the payments—billions of dollars over roughly a decade—was a gamble by Mr. Netanyahu that a steady flow of money would maintain peace in Gaza, the eventual launching point of the Oct. 7 attacks, and keep Hamas focused on governing, not fighting.

The Qatari payments, while ostensibly a secret, have been widely known and discussed in the Israeli news media for years. Mr. Netanyahu's critics disparage them as part of a strategy of ''buying quiet,'' and the policy is in the middle of a ruthless reassessment following the attacks. Mr. Netanyahu has lashed back at that criticism, calling the suggestion that he tried to empower Hamas ''ridiculous.''

In interviews with more than two dozen current and former Israeli, American and Qatari officials, and officials from other Middle Eastern governments, The New York Times unearthed new details about the origins of the policy, the controversies that erupted inside the Israeli government and the lengths that Mr. Netanyahu went to in order to shield the Qataris from criticism and keep the money flowing.

The payments were part of a string of decisions by Israeli political leaders, military officers and intelligence officials—all based on the fundamentally flawed assessment that

Hamas was neither interested in nor capable of a large-scale attack. The Times has previously reported on intelligence failures and other faulty assumptions that preceded the attacks.

Even as the Israeli military obtained battle plans for a Hamas invasion and analysts observed significant terrorism exercises just over the border in Gaza, the payments continued. For years, Israeli intelligence officers even escorted a Qatari official into Gaza, where he doled out money from suitcases filled with millions of dollars.

The money from Qatar had humanitarian goals like paying government salaries in Gaza and buying fuel to keep a power plant running. But Israeli intelligence officials now believe that the money had a role in the success of the Oct. 7 attacks, if only because the donations allowed Hamas to divert some of its own budget toward military operations. Separately, Israeli intelligence has long assessed that Qatar uses other channels to secretly fund Hamas' military wing, an accusation that Qatar's government has denied.

''Any attempt to cast a shadow of uncertainty about the civilian and humanitarian nature of Qatar's contributions and their positive impact is baseless,'' a Qatari official said in a statement.

Multiple Israeli governments enabled money to go to Gaza for humanitarian reasons, not to strengthen Hamas, an official in Mr. Netanyahu's office said in a statement. He added: ''Prime Minister Netanyahu acted to weaken Hamas significantly. He led three powerful military operations against Hamas which killed thousands of terrorists and senior Hamas commanders.''

Hamas has always publicly stated its commitment to eliminating the state of Israel. But each payout was a testament to the Israeli government's view that Hamas was a low-level nuisance, and even a political asset.

As far back as December 2012, Mr. Netanyahu told the prominent Israeli journalist Dan Margalit that it was important to keep Hamas strong, as a counterweight to the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank. Mr. Margalit, in an interview, said that Mr. Netanyahu told him that having two strong rivals, including Hamas, would lessen pressure on him to negotiate toward a Palestinian state.

The official in the prime minister's office said Mr. Netanyahu never made this statement. But the prime minister would articulate this idea to others over the years.

While Israeli military and intelligence leaders have acknowledged failings leading up to the Hamas attack, Mr. Netanyahu has refused to address such questions. And with a war waging in Gaza, a political reckoning for the man who has served as prime minister for 13 of the last 15 years, is, for the moment, on hold.

But Mr. Netanyahu's critics say that his approach to Hamas had, at its core, a cynical political agenda: to keep Gaza quiet as a means of staying in office without addressing the threat of Hamas or simmering Palestinian discontent.

''The conception of Netanyahu over a decade and a half was that if we buy quiet and pretend the problem isn't there, we can wait it out and it will fade away,'' said Eyal Hulata, Israel's national security adviser from July 2021 until the beginning of this year.

SEEKING EQUILIBRIUM

Mr. Netanyahu and his security aides slowly began reconsidering their strategy toward the Gaza Strip after several bloody and inconclusive military conflicts there against Hamas.

''Everyone was sick and tired of Gaza,'' said Zohar Palti, a former director of intelligence for Mossad. ''We all said, 'Let's forget about Gaza,' because we knew it was a deadlock.''

After one of the conflicts, in 2014, Mr. Netanyahu charted a new course—emphasizing a strategy of trying to ''contain'' Hamas while Israel focused on Iran's nuclear program and its proxy armies like Hezbollah.

This strategy was buttressed by repeated intelligence assessments that Hamas was neither interested in nor capable of launching a significant attack inside Israel.

Qatar, during this period, became a key financier for reconstruction and government operations in Gaza. One of the world's wealthiest nations, Qatar has long championed the Palestinian cause and, of all its neighbors, has cultivated the closest ties to Hamas. These relationships have proved valuable in recent weeks as Qatari officials have helped negotiate for the release of Israeli hostages in Gaza.

Qatar's work in Gaza during this period was blessed by the Israeli government. And Mr. Netanyahu even lobbied Washington on Qatar's behalf. In 2017, as Republicans pushed to impose financial sanctions on Qatar over its support for Hamas, he dispatched senior defense officials to Washington. The Israelis told American lawmakers that Qatar had played a positive role in the Gaza Strip, according to three people familiar with the trip.

Yossi Kuperwasser, a former head of research for Israel's military intelligence, said that some officials saw the benefits of maintaining an ''equilibrium'' in the Gaza Strip. ''The logic of Israel was that Hamas should be strong enough to rule Gaza,'' he said, ''but weak enough to be deterred by Israel.''

The administrations of three American presidents—Barack Obama, Donald J. Trump and Joseph R. Biden Jr.—broadly supported having the Qataris playing a direct role in funding Gaza operations.

But not everyone was on board.

Avigdor Lieberman, months after becoming defense minister in 2016, wrote a secret memo to Mr. Netanyahu and the Israeli military chief of staff. He said Hamas was slowly building its military abilities to attack Israel, and he argued that Israel should strike first.

Israel's goal is ''to ensure that the next confrontation between Israel and Hamas will be the final showdown,'' he wrote in the memo, dated Dec. 21, 2016, a copy of which was reviewed by The Times. A pre-emptive strike, he said, could remove most of the ''leadership of the military wing of Hamas.''

Mr. Netanyahu rejected the plan, preferring containment to confrontation.

HAMAS AS 'AN ASSET'

Among the team of Mossad agents that tracked terrorism financing, some came to believe that—even beyond the money from Qatar—Mr. Netanyahu was not very concerned about stopping money going to Hamas.

Uzi Shaya, for example, made several trips to China to try to shut down what Israeli intelligence had assessed was a money-laundering operation for Hamas run through the Bank of China.

After his retirement, he was called to testify against the Bank of China in an American lawsuit brought by the family of a victim of a Hamas terrorist attack.

At first, the head of Mossad encouraged him to testify, saying it could increase financial pressure on Hamas, Mr. Shaya recalled in a recent interview.

Then, the Chinese offered Mr. Netanyahu a state visit. Suddenly, Mr. Shaya recalled, he got different orders from his former bosses: He was not to testify.

Mr. Netanyahu visited Beijing in May 2013, part of an effort to strengthen economic and diplomatic ties between Israel and China. Mr. Shaya said he would have liked to have testified.

''Unfortunately,'' he said, ''there were other considerations.''

While the reasons for the decision were never confirmed, the change in tack left him suspicious. Especially because politicians at times talked openly about the value of a strong Hamas.

Shlomo Brom, a retired general and former deputy to Israel's national security adviser, said an empowered Hamas helped Mr. Netanyahu avoid negotiating over a Palestinian state.

''One effective way to prevent a two-state solution is to divide between the Gaza Strip and the West Bank,'' he said in an interview. The division gives Mr. Netanyahu an excuse to disengage from peace talks, Mr. Brom said, adding that he can say, ''I have no partner.''

Mr. Netanyahu did not articulate this strategy publicly, but some on the Israeli political right had no such hesitation.

Bezalel Smotrich, a far-right politician who is now Mr. Netanyahu's finance minister, put it bluntly in 2015, the year he was elected to Parliament.

''The Palestinian Authority is a burden,'' he said. ''Hamas is an asset.''

SUITCASES FULL OF CASH

During a 2018 cabinet meeting, Mr. Netanyahu's aides presented a new plan: Every month, the Qatari government would make millions of dollars in cash payments directly to people in Gaza as part of a ceasefire agreement with Hamas.

Shin Bet, the country's domestic security service, would monitor the list of recipients to try to ensure that members of Hamas's military wing would not directly benefit.

Despite those assurances, dissent boiled over. Mr. Lieberman saw the plan as a capitulation and resigned in November 2018. He publicly accused Mr. Netanyahu of ''buying short-term peace at the price of serious damage to long-term national security.'' In the years that followed, Mr. Lieberman would become one of Mr. Netanyahu's fiercest critics.

During an interview last month in his office, Mr. Lieberman said the decisions in 2018 directly led to the Oct. 7 attacks.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. But Prime Minister Netanyahu's role in keeping Hamas in control in Gaza did not end there.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a New York Times piece, again, from December of last year headlined: ''Israel found the Hamas money machine years ago. Nobody turned it off.''

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

[From the New York Times, Dec. 16, 2023]

ISRAEL FOUND THE HAMAS MONEY MACHINE YEARS AGO. NOBODY TURNED IT OFF

(By Jo Becker and Justin Scheck)

Israeli security officials scored a major intelligence coup in 2018: secret documents that laid out, in intricate detail, what amounted to a private equity fund that Hamas used to finance its operations.

The ledgers, pilfered from the computer of a senior Hamas official, listed assets worth hundreds of millions of dollars. Hamas controlled mining, chicken farming and road building companies in Sudan, twin skyscrapers in the United Arab Emirates, a

property developer in Algeria, and a real estate firm listed on the Turkish stock exchange.

The documents, which The New York Times reviewed, were a potential road map for choking off Hamas's money and thwarting its plans. The agents who obtained the records shared them inside their own government and in Washington.

Nothing happened.

For years, none of the companies named in the ledgers faced sanctions from the United States or Israel. Nobody publicly called out the companies or pressured Turkey, the hub of the financial network, to shut it down.

A Times investigation found that both senior Israeli and American officials failed to prioritize financial intelligence—which they had in hand—showing that tens of millions of dollars flowed from the companies to Hamas at the exact moment that it was buying new weapons and preparing an attack.

That money, American and Israeli officials now say, helped Hamas build up its military infrastructure and helped lay the groundwork for the Oct. 7 attacks.

''Everyone is talking about failures of intelligence on Oct. 7, but no one is talking about the failure to stop the money,'' said Udi Levy, a former chief of Mossad's economic warfare division. ''It's the money—the money—that allowed this.''

At its peak, Israeli and American officials now say, the portfolio had a value of roughly half a billion dollars.

Even after the Treasury Department finally levied sanctions against the network in 2022, records show, Hamas-linked figures were able to obtain millions of dollars by selling shares in a blacklisted company. The Treasury Department now fears that such money flows will allow Hamas to finance its continuing war with Israel and to rebuild when it is over.

''It's something we are deeply worried about and expect to see given the financial stress Hamas is under,'' said Brian Nelson, the Treasury Department's under secretary for terrorism and financial intelligence. ''What we are trying to do is disrupt that.''

That was what Israel's terrorism-finance investigators hoped to do with their 2018 discovery. But at the top echelons of the Israeli and American governments, officials focused on putting together a series of financial sanctions against Iran. Neither country prioritized Hamas.

Israeli leaders believed that Hamas was more interested in governing than fighting. By the time the agents discovered the ledgers in 2018, the prime minister, Benjamin Netanyahu, was encouraging the government of Qatar to deliver millions of dollars to the Gaza Strip. He gambled that the money would buy stability and peace.

Mr. Levy recalled briefing Mr. Netanyahu personally in 2015 about the Hamas portfolio.

''I can tell you for sure that I talked to him about this,'' Mr. Levy said. ''But he didn't care that much about it.''

Mr. Netanyahu's Mossad chief shut down Mr. Levy's team, Task Force Harpoon, that focused on disrupting the money flowing to groups including Hamas.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I want to quote from Mr. Levy, who is quoted in that article. He was the Mossad chief in charge of economic policy. He says: ''I can tell you for sure that I talked to him''—referring to Prime Minister Netanyahu—''about this. But he didn't care that much about it.''

The article goes on to point out that Mr. Netanyahu's Mossad chief shut down Mr. Levy's team, the task force called Harpoon that focused on disrupting the money flowing to groups including Hamas.

So let's go back to why Prime Minister Netanyahu and his extreme right-wing allies, like Smotrich and Ben Gvir, wanted to keep Hamas in place in Gaza. It is because, as they have said, their primary goal was to avoid the establishment of a Palestinian State. And so long as they could keep the Palestinians divided, they could avoid a united national movement for such a state. And so long as Hamas was in control of Gaza, it proved a useful foil against recognizing a Palestinian State that included the West Bank and Gaza, until the horror of October 7.

The corollary of not threatening Hamas's control of Gaza has been to systematically weaken the Palestinian Authority in the West Bank. The terrible irony, of course, is that while helping perpetuate Hamas—which was dedicated to the destruction of Israel and is dedicated to the destruction of Israel—Prime Minister Netanyahu and his allies have undermined the Palestinian Authority and the PLO, which, for over 30 years, since the Oslo Accords, have recognized Israel's right to exist and have sought to coexist with Israel.

Their strategy: Keep Hamas in place; undermine the Palestinian Authority.

In fact, even today, during the war in Gaza, Finance Minister Smotrich is withholding an even greater share of the PA's own funds, and, since coming to power, the Netanyahu government has advanced even more settlements and allowed even more outposts deeper in the West Bank. And, of course, that further undermines the legitimacy of the PA in the eyes of the Palestinian people by exposing their total inability to stop those actions, even as they, the PA, help provide to Israel with security in certain areas of the West Bank.

So Prime Minister Netanyahu has advanced the strategy of weakening the Palestinian Authority and facilitating Hamas in order to prevent Palestinians from being able to live in dignity in a state of their own. And the reason—the reason—that Prime Minister Netanyahu and the far-right extremists in his government, like Smotrich and Ben Gvir, don't want a Palestinian State in the West Bank is that they want it all for themselves in what they envision as a ''Greater Israel.''

If you have Palestinians in the West Bank or who stay in the West Bank, you can't implement the vision of a ''Greater Israel''—their version of one state.

So we come full circle. UNRWA was established to be a bridge to provide services, like education, to Palestinian refugees after they were displaced. I am sure its founders did not expect it to be around for so long, but that is because they likely never envisioned that, 74 years later, the conflict that gave rise to UNRWA would remain unresolved.

But it is unresolved, and now Prime Minister Netanyahu has openly opposed President Biden's call to resolve it, ultimately, by enacting a real two-state solution that would include normalization of relations between Israel and Saudi Arabia and the other Arab countries that have yet to recognize Israel—important security needed for the Jewish State of Israel.

And at the same time that Prime Minister Netanyahu wants to torpedo a two-state solution to resolve the conflict, he also wants to pursue his long-term goal of ending the organization that was not born out of that conflict, UNRWA, and eliminating the services that it currently provides to Palestinian refugees.

The United States should not be complicit in this scheme. We should not be a party to defunding UNRWA in Gaza, which is, right now, playing a critical role in the delivery of desperately needed food and humanitarian assistance to starving people. Nor should we be complicit in defunding the essential services UNRWA provides in places like the West Bank, Jordan, and other places.

I support reforming UNRWA but not eliminating it. The question of defunding UNRWA is, at this very moment, the biggest unresolved issue in the Foreign Operations appropriations bill. I call upon responsible Members of Congress in the Senate and the House to ensure that the United States does not defund UNRWA.

Members of Congress who argue for the elimination of UNRWA have never bothered to drive a short distance from Jerusalem to visit an UNRWA school and hear young students talk about their dreams to be doctors, engineers, and educators, like some of us have done. There is hope in these schools, not hate, and, frankly, that is what we should be able to do here in the U.S. Senate.

We should be on the side of hope. We should not be a party to more people starving in Gaza. We should not be a party to the closing of schools for Palestinian students in the West Bank, Jordan, and other countries. And the United States should not be a party to creating even more instability in the Middle East.

Like many of my colleagues, and like President Biden, I believe the only way to create some light at the end of this dark tunnel is to find a path that ensures security for the Israeli people and dignity and self-determination for the Palestinian people.

That is why I stand with our colleague Senator SCHUMER and his important and timely comments this morning that rejecting the idea of Palestinian statehood and sovereignty is a ''grave mistake'' for regional security and especially for the security of Israelis and Palestinians.

Prime Minister Netanyahu has said that a two-state solution would be a big reward—reward, he says—for Hamas, but the opposite is true. Hamas has one plan: the destruction of the State of Israel and replacing the Jewish democratic state with one of their

own. They want one state. A two-state solution is contrary to everything Hamas stands for and all it seeks to achieve, so, far from being a reward, it would be a denial of their goal of one state under Hamas control.

We all know that the road ahead will be long, and it will be hard. In the aftermath of the horrific Hamas attacks of October 7 and the current humanitarian disaster in Gaza, it is hard to imagine a time of peace and stability. That will only come when Palestinian leaders who fully embrace the right of Israel to exist in security and Israeli leaders who recognize that Palestinians must have a viable state of their own both make the necessary risks for peace.

So let us push for an immediate cease-fire and a release of all the hostages, and then let us create a flicker of hope in this moment of darkness.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, at a later date, I will respond to my colleague from Maryland about UNRWA.

But just to let people know who are following this today, I am the ranking Republican on the State, Foreign Ops Appropriations Subcommittee, and I work very well with Senator COONS. Senator VAN HOLLEN is on the committee. There will not be one dime for UNRWA in any bill I support, period. And that is not just me; that is Senator COLLINS. She is the ranking member who worked very well with Senator PATTY MURRAY to get the supplemental moving. Why is that? Because we believe UNRWA is compromised.

I will come and show you the textbooks that UNRWA uses in the Palestinian community to teach the destruction of the Jewish people. I will show you texts from people in charge of UNRWA on the ground celebrating October 7.

The case has been made over here that UNRWA is no longer a credible organization worth American taxpayer dollars to fund—not one penny for UNRWA.

Helping the Palestinian people begins with changing the way they are taught in school. After we defeated the Germans and the Japanese, it took us a long time to deradicalize a population that was taught from birth to be radical. So what I hope will happen over the course of time is that new people in charge of the Palestinian community in the West Bank and Gaza will stop teaching the death of the Jews, trying to give the Palestinian children a more hopeful life. I hope that happens one day soon.

The reason I came to the floor is I have been asked—probably like the Presiding Officer has—

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me finish. We will come and debate. I have a plane to catch.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. We really should debate because I don't know any evidence at all for your—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will come down, and we will have a discussion about everything I said. Let me finish my thought.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina has the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. We will have a very vigorous discussion about how wrong you are to empower this group that has been perpetrating all of the wrong things, not the right things.

Now, having said all that—

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Will the gentleman yield on that?

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me finish my thought.

Senator SCHUMER, whom I have worked with on immigration, on a bunch of things—I have tried to be bipartisan when it comes to foreign policy. My colleague, the President of the Senate, has been one of my best friends in trying to find a way forward to get Saudi and Israel to recognize each other. That would be a big blow to Iran.

I have been asked, like everybody in the body: What do you think about Senator SCHUMER's speech?

I am dumbfounded. I have always respected him. I disagree with him politically. What he said today was earth-shatteringly bad. The majority leader of the U.S. Senate is calling on the people of Israel to overthrow their government.

Whether you like Bibi or not is not the question. The question is, Is it appropriate for anybody in this body telling another country to take their government down? We are going to have an election here. I hope we take the Biden government down through the election process, but that is for us to decide.

This has been very hurtful. I have been on the phone almost all day trying to explain to people what happened, and I don't have a good explanation.

We are trying to get Saudi Arabia to recognize the one and only Jewish State. That is no easy thing for the Crown Prince to do given this environment.

We are trying to get Israel to take a leap of faith here that it doesn't have to be this way all the time, to do some things that would allow the Palestinian community to reorganize.

Seventy-five percent of the Israeli people do not support a two-state solution now. They have been terribly wounded. There is no support by any politician in Israel—Gantz, Lapid, anybody—to unilaterally declare a Palestinian State.

Five Presidents of the United States have said that if there is ever a Palestinian State, it will come through direct negotiations, without conditions, between the parties.

In the Trump administration, Jared Kushner had a plan to establish a Palestinian State that Prime Minister Netanyahu actually agreed with.

The point here is, what should America be doing now? America should be helping Israel without qualification. We should be trying to find a way to ease the suffering of the Palestinian people, and the best way to do that is to destroy Hamas. The reason so many Palestinians have been killed is because Hamas uses them as human shields.

We live in a world that is literally upside down. We are having prominent Democratic Members—people I respect—calling on the Israeli people to take their government down. I can't believe it. I thought it was a joke. I thought somebody was pranking me this morning. This is a departure in a very serious way about how the United States interacts with its allies. I think it has done enormous damage to very delicate negotiations. I hope that Senator SCHUMER will revisit this.

I don't know who he is trying to please by saying that, but they are not worth pleasing. I don't know who you are trying to please by saying that the Israeli Government needs to cease to exist as it is today and the Israeli people need to find somebody better, in the eyes of Senator SCHUMER.

I am not asking the Israeli people to elect somebody I like; I am asking them: Whenever you have an election, elect somebody you like. I am not asking the people of Israel to bow to my view of how to settle this matter after the largest loss of Jewish life since the Holocaust. I want to give unconditional, unqualified support to the people of Israel to destroy Hamas.

After World War II, if anybody had suggested to America that we need to take our foot off the gas when it came to destroying the Nazis and the Japanese, you would have been run out of town. What won the Oscar? A film called ''Oppenheimer'' talking about how the atomic bomb was created and used by our country to destroy two cities in Japan to end the war.

You have to understand—and the Presiding Officer does; you have done your homework—you have to understand that October 7, to the Israeli people, is Pearl Harbor and 9/11 on steroids. It is not just a tit-for-tat with Hamas; it was an attempt by Hamas to break the back of the Jewish people, to brutally rape and murder in a fashion they want the world to see.

So the Israeli perspective on what to do is similar to what we thought we should do after World War II: total, complete victory; everybody mobilize and do what you have to do to end the war, to take the Nazis down; and the Imperial Japanese Army—destroy it unequivocally.

Millions of people were killed in World War II. War is literally hell. But when you have been attacked the way we were on Pearl Harbor and 9/11, you have to respond forcefully. You have to make sure it never happens again. And the only way Israel can do this is to destroy the military capability of Hamas.

So why did this happen? I believe that the great Satan, which is Iran, wanted this to happen to prevent a reconciliation between Saudi Arabia and the State of Israel, ending the Arab-Israeli conflict. A nightmare for the Ayatollah is that the Arabs and the Jews make peace and economically integrate, leaving them behind.

Israel has signed agreements with six of their Arab neighbors under Bibi's leadership.

When I go, I meet with Lapid, I meet with Gantz, and I meet with Bibi. I meet with everybody because it is not about Bibi; it is not about Gantz; it is about our relationship. If it is Gantz or Lapid next time, I will meet with them. I know them all. Mr. Lapid and I are very good friends. I have known Bibi for 25 years. It is about, what should we do to help our friends in Israel?

Nothing would please me more than to find a way to end this war sooner rather than later and get back on track for their normalization process, but we cannot expect Israel to stop now. It is like putting 80 percent of a fire out—the 20 percent is going to start it all over again.

We are down to six brigades, organized military units that Hamas has to wreak havoc on the Palestinian people and the State of Israel. It is nonnegotiable: Hamas will be destroyed militarily.

I am hoping, in the middle of all this chaos, we can still find a way for Saudi Arabia and Israel to normalize. That would be the ultimate death blow, I think, to the Iranian ambitions in the region. Part of that deal, as the Presiding Officer knows, would be the Palestinians would have a better life eventually; that Saudi Arabia and UAE would invest heavily into Gaza and the West Bank; new, younger, less corrupt people running the place, trying to find a pathway forward where the Palestinians and Israel can coexist in a way that is beneficial for all.

That can never happen until Hamas is destroyed. If Hamas is still in place, they will kill everybody who wants to make peace with Israel. They did it before. They have no desire, as Senator VAN HOLLEN said, of recognizing the Jewish State.

But I will close where I began. What Senator SCHUMER said on the floor of the Senate is taking the country and the Senate down the wrong road. This is not something any of us should be saying—calling on a government to be toppled, basically, by its own people.

At the end of the day, Bibi is not the problem. The problem is radical Islam wanting to kill every Jew they can find. The problem is Iran, which has its mission to destroy the Jewish State and to purify Islam.

I could spend hours talking about the Biden-Obama policy of empowering the Ayatollah, but that is not for today.

So what I would say to what Senator SCHUMER said today—my response to Senator SCHUMER: I am disappointed. You have done a lot of damage, my friend, and you need to fix this.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, we have now at long last passed our first six funding bills for fiscal year 2024. While we are still now working around the clock on the final six bills, I am hopeful we will pass them in a timely, bipartisan way very soon. But I do want to take a moment to step back and really dive into the six bills that we did pass last week and what they mean for my home State of Washington.

I come to work every day focused on how I can use my voice here to help folks back home. When I sit down at any negotiating table, I bring with me the stories of every parent who is struggling to afford childcare or groceries or rent; every farmer and fisher whose livelihood depends on our crops, our salmon, and our environment; every researcher focused on making the next big breakthrough; every mayor focused on improving our infrastructure; and every young person who is concerned about climate change and our most basic rights.

And I take those voices that I hear at home in Washington State—the people I meet—into every room I enter and write their concerns into every bill I negotiate. It is a responsibility I take very seriously, especially as chair of the Appropriations Committee.

And I am thrilled to say the legislation that we passed last Friday—the bill I wrote with my colleagues—includes more than a billion dollars I helped secure for local projects and programs in Washington State and delivers a historic $3 billion investment for the Hanford site cleanup.

I have practically been a broken record in saying the Federal Government has a moral and legal obligation to properly fund the cleanup at Hanford. Our work is far from done. But with this historic $3 billion investment, we are moving in the right direction.

And as long as I am Appropriations chair, I am going to make sure we keep up that momentum. No matter what, we are not going to shortchange the vital cleanup mission at Hanford.

We are facing a housing crisis. And it has been especially hard on families in Washington State. That is why I fought hard to make sure that bill protected and strengthened programs that help families afford the cost of housing and help keep families in their homes.

At the Federal level here, that means homeless assistance grants, eviction prevention grants, and Native American Housing Block Grants, rental assistance programs, programs that help people develop economic independence and help keep kids with their parents, and vital investments to maintain our Nation's affordable housing supply.

But it is not just funding for key national efforts that help Washington State. I am especially proud to have secured funding through congressionally directed spending for the Aurora senior housing development for seniors in Seattle, which will have 90 housing units.

That is a great start, but I know we have a lot more work to do when it comes to tackling the housing crisis. And I will keep pushing for progress with my colleagues every day.

In addition to the roof over their heads, families need food on the table. I held a roundtable in Seattle a few weeks ago, talking with experts and even a mom who depended on WIC; and as I told them, I take this personally.

I remember what it was like when my family fell on tough times and we had to rely on food stamps. Making cuts that leave our kids hungry was never an option for me, which is why I fought tooth and nail to make sure that bill fully funded WIC, which serves over 130,000 moms and kids just in my home State of Washington.

And we fully funded the brandnew permanent summer nutrition program I established—Summer EBT—which will now help feed half a million kids in Washington State alone this summer.

Plus, I secured $1.8 million for the South Kitsap Helpline. This is a resource for struggling families to help expand food distribution. In the richest country in the world, there is no reason to leave our families hungry. It is really that simple.

Now, another important need for working families in Washington State, like in every other State, is childcare. I hear about the childcare crisis everywhere I go.

We are still negotiating the bill that funds the actual Federal investments in childcare. But guess what. For parents to have access to childcare, we need physical childcare centers close to where people live.

So a big priority of mine in the last package was working with local organizations to help them build or expand their childcare centers. And so through Congressionally Directed Spending, we are going to be constructing an early learning center in the Meridian School District and another in Lewis County that will serve 80 students a year; building 17 early childhood education classrooms at the Cora Whitley Family Center in Tacoma; and relocating a Head Start facility for the Spokane Tribe Indians.

We also provided new funding to design child development centers to expand access to childcare for our military families, something I know we need more of.

I remain focused on protecting and strengthening the Child Care Development Block Grant now as we negotiate the next set of bills.

And I will always work to pass my Childcare for Working Families Act, but I will keep fighting alongside that for every step of progress we can make.

In addition to investments to support our families, I worked hard to pass funding for local projects that support our cities and our communities. Congressionally Directed Spending I secured will help Grant County upgrade security at its district court, Bainbridge Island build a brandnew visitors center at the Japanese American Exclusion Memorial, and the Indian American Community Services in Kent rebuild a community hub that will offer everything from small business support to early learning services.

Funds I secured will also support city efforts to improve public safety and make our justice system work better for everyone. And for the first time ever, the funding bill we passed includes $10 million for a new grant program to increase access to sexual assault nurse exams.

I worked very hard alongside Washington State advocate Leah Griffin. She bravely shared her story with me about her sexual assault. And we worked together to pass a new law and fund programs to help survivors get the care and exams they need to pursue justice—from a story Leah came to my office with, to a conversation I had with her directly, to years of advocacy and coalition building on the Hill together, to passing a new law—and now funding a new program to help survivors.

It is so important to me that my constituents know anyone can make a difference and have a voice in their government. And Leah's story and her voice made a difference. I am so proud of her.

I also worked to secure local funding for projects like a public safety radio network in Kittitas and Okanogan Counties and mental and therapeutic court programs in Spokane, Tacoma, and Stevens County.

I was just in Tacoma talking to city officials and others about the partnerships they are building around mental and behavioral healthcare. And I am overjoyed to be able to help and tell them the good news that new Federal resources are on the way to support their efforts.

As another example, I secured a half a million dollars for CHOOSE 180. This is an organization in Burien that is focused on mentoring youth and helping them stay out of trouble and build a brighter future for themselves.

I visited last month, and I got to hear firsthand from amazing young adults who participated in that program. This organization is changing lives for the better. And I am so proud of the work that they are doing.

Infrastructure, critically important. In the bills we passed last week, there are many, many important investments to help build our cities, update their infrastructure, make the streets in downtowns work better for pedestrians, commuters, and families. And that includes safety and accessibility improvements and funding for infrastructure projects in my home State of Washington—in Cle Elum, in Pierce County, in Spokane, in Seattle, in the Heights District development project in Vancouver, and Walla Walla, as well as road projects being undertaken by the Lummi Nation and the Makah Indian Tribe.

Speaking of pedestrians and commuters, we cannot forget about the investments in public transit in this bill. I am thrilled to say I secured new funds in this bill for Sound Transit light rail extension projects to Ballard, West Seattle, and Lynnwood.

And I have to say, House Republicans wanted to cut funding for public transit in their bill to a level where the Lynnwood Link simply would not have had the Federal dollars it needed to get done.

I made sure we stood firm on funding the Capital Investment Grants program. And because of that, we are now going to deliver the full Federal funding this program needs to get across the finish line.

There is also funding in this bill for upgraded bus shelters in Pierce County, a regional transit facility on Whidbey Island. And let's talk about our ferries. When it wasn't easy enough under the toplines in this bill—they were tough—I was able to secure millions in additional funding for the Federal Passenger Ferry Grant Program and include, for the first time ever, language to make sure Washington State Ferries can now apply for the rural ferry grant program.

I can't talk about ferries without talking about our harbors and our ports and our waterways. This package includes a historic $2.77 billion for the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund and new language I have worked hard to get in to make sure Washington State ports get their fair share for those funds.

There are also other crucial investments in our waterways and water infrastructure; millions for maintenance and repairs to the locks of Lake Washington Ship Canal—better known by everyone back home as the Ballard Locks—and preconstruction work at Tacoma Harbor; to say nothing of the bipartisan Infrastructure Law funds that are pouring into our communities. It is so important to all of us.

There is also funding for wastewater treatment projects at Soap Lake, Snoqualmie Pass, and to help the Discovery Clean Water Alliance return more clean water to the Columbia River.

I also worked to protect our State's incredible natural beauty and resources by fighting off devastating cuts and policy riders that House Republicans wanted to make to critical environmental and conservation programs.

This bill that we passed will help our State conserve new public lands, including in San Juan Island National Historical Park, the Willapa National Wildlife Refuge, and the Okanogan-Wenatchee National Forest to protect the Yakama and Wenatchee watersheds. And there are funds for the Mt. Adams Forest project.

I also secured full funding for essential Federal wildfire programs and protected a hard-earned pay raise for our brave Federal firefighters.

And, of course, there are investments to protect and restore our salmon populations, because everyone knows how essential salmon are to our economy at home and our current culture in Washington State. So I fought hard for investments in this bill to support salmon, on top of everything I have already mentioned.

Under tough constraints, I managed to either protect or build on Federal investments in Puget Sound restoration efforts; the Yakima Basin integrated plan; the Northwest Straits Initiative that I created; the National Marine Fisheries Service, including hatchery operations; and Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund.

Last year, I joined leaders from the Jamestown S'Klallam Tribe, local environmental advocates, and experts to track evasive European green crab. This is something I never heard of before the last few years. But they are now invading Washington waters, and I learned more about the threat that they pose to our native species. And I am very glad to say we now have funding to help fight that invasive green crab and language calling for a coordinated Federal approach to this threat.

Another crucial investment: a much-needed $50 million down payment for the fish passage project at the Howard Hanson Dam. And I am so glad the President's fiscal year '25 budget that just came out requested $500 million to build that fish passage facility. And you can bet I will be working to fund that request and finish the job in next year's funding bills.

Of course, how we manage our water resources doesn't matter to just our fish. It is also critical to our communities and farmers, which is why I am pleased we could also include funds in this bill to improve drinking water systems in Dupont and Mattawa and support bridge replacement in Adams and Grant Counties as part of the Odessa Groundwater Replacement Project, which is critical to improving irrigation for our farmers and matters so much to our State's economy.

And I fought hard to secure other critical investments to support our farmers as well.

Last year, I visited WSU for the groundbreaking of their new Plant Sciences Building, which will be at the forefront of responding to challenges Washington State farmers are facing right now.

And I am thrilled to build on that progress by delivering investments in this bill to support researchers at WSU, UW, and the USDA center in Prosser, WA, as they tackle issues like little cherry disease, livestock resiliency, pollution from tires, pulse crop quality, and more.

Of course, when it comes to cutting-edge research, agriculture is just one of

the many fields for where I am very proud to see Washington State researchers leading the way. Whether it is quantum computing in Bothell, clean energy in Tri-Cities at PNNL, or aerospace work in Kent and across western Washington, this bill will propel the innovation that is happening in my State.

And through Congressionally Directed Spending, this bill will help fund new scientific equipment at Gonzaga's Bollier Center for Integrated Science and Engineering, Evergreen State College in Olympia, and Western Washington University's Advanced Technology Laboratory—not to mention funding for WSU to upgrade its electron microscope and develop a new nuclear hot cell facility; and for UW's Tidal-Powered Ocean Observation project in its new lab in Tacoma.

I couldn't leave the floor today without talking about the critical investments in this bill that we made for our veterans and our servicemembers. As chair of the MILCON-VA subcommittee and the proud daughter of a World War II veteran, I worked hard to make sure our funding bill lived up to our Nation's commitment to every man and woman who serves in uniform.

This bill fully funds our veterans' medical care and delivers record investments to tackle veteran homelessness, strengthen mental health services, and support women veterans' healthcare needs.

I also worked hard to secure funding for new barracks and a parachute rigging facility at Joint Base Lewis-McChord; build storage tanks and fuel supply at Point Manchester; update electrical infrastructure at Puget Sound Naval Shipyard; and advance other projects across Washington State bases like equipment, maintenance, and training facilities.

I also made sure our Senate bill reallocated $19 million to build 88 new homes at Smokey Point for our servicemembers and their families who are stationed at Naval Station Everett. I am proud to have gotten this through our final bill to help address a major need for more military houses in Snohomish County.

When it comes to support for our veterans and our VA facilities, I pushed to make sure this bill contains funding to help the American Lake VA Medical Center upgrade its facilities so they can provide quality care and for funding for the Tahoma National Cemetery and its work to ensure we honor the veterans we have lost.

Mr. President, I just covered a lot of ground, so I will wrap things up. The bottom line is: While these first six funding bills are not the bills I would have written on my own, they do protect absolutely critical programs and make needed investments in Washington State and every State in America. Again, let's be clear: We are not done yet. I am working to make sure we see similar results for people in Washington State and across the country in the remaining six bills that we are working on right now, this minute.

I am going to keep bringing the concerns I bring with me to every negotiating room for my constituents and work to get solutions to help them with every bill that I pass.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FETTERMAN). The Senator from Texas.

ISRAEL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I was shocked to hear the comments of the Senate majority leader this morning excoriating our closest ally, the only democracy in the Middle East. You know, we don't appreciate it when other countries tell us how we ought to govern our country. I am sure that feeling is reciprocated by our Israeli allies.

Here is what the former Ambassador of Israel said on social media:

> Regardless of my opinion of Netanyahu and his fitness to serve, Senator SCHUMER'S call for new Israeli elections is deeply disrespectful of our democracy and sovereignty. Israel is an ally, not a vassal state. Along with the U.S., we're one of the few countries [that have never] known a non-democratic government, and the only democracy never to have known a moment of peace. We [certainly] deserve that respect.

I think Ambassador Oren is exactly right. The majority leader's speech this morning was deeply disrespectful of our ally, which is, indeed, as I said, a sovereign nation and a democracy.

I traveled to Israel and Saudi Arabia and Jordan in January with five other members of the Senate Intelligence Committee. We met in Jordan and then in Saudi Arabia with Mohammed bin Salman and then with Prime Minister Netanyahu and the Defense Minister Gallant in Israel.

Of course, war involves collateral damages to innocent people. But the people responsible for initiating that war in Israel was Hamas, a proxy of the Iranian regime—one of many. And for somehow to say now, 5 months after that horrible attack on October 7, that Israel ought to stay its hand and allow Hamas potentially to reconstitute in Gaza is not only deeply disrespectful, it undermines the ability of the Israelis to do what they must do, which is destroy that threat.

I know 3 months after the attack on October 7, when I was in Israel, when I heard some of my colleagues say we need to have a cease-fire—well, I know if Hamas had not started the shooting, that Israel would not have started and we would not find ourselves with all of these casualties on both sides.

But we know that Iran is the head of the octopus and the tentacles reach far and wide. We all learned more about world geography and how the world works in recent years since America—we thought we were safe on our own continent, and we had an ocean to protect us on each side. But 9/11 was a reminder that not even Americans are safe from the hand of terrorists.

And Iran is the No. 1 state sponsor of terror—no doubt about it. They sponsor the Houthis in Yemen. They help Shia militias in Iraq and Syria. They help Hamas in Gaza and Hezbollah in Lebanon on the northern border. Israel is under attack by people who want to wipe that country and those people off the face of the Earth. Of course, they have a right to defend themselves. Of course, they need to eliminate the terrorist threat that killed so many innocent civilians on October 7.

And so for the majority leader to come here and say, ostensibly as a supporter of Israel, that we don't like the current government; that the Israeli people need new elections and to select new leaders; and oh, by the way, you need to quit being so tough on the terrorists known as Hamas—it is shocking to me.

We need to stand with Israel. They need to be able to finish the job, not because they want to, but because they must in order to continue to exist.

OFFICE OF REFUGEE RELOCATION

Mr. President, also today, I was shocked to hear the Secretary of Health and Human Services, Secretary Becerra, say that when it comes to the 400,000 unaccompanied children that have come to America, come to our shores and been placed with sponsors by the Office of Refugee Relocation under Health and Human Services—he said: We don't have any responsibility to those children after they are placed with sponsors.

Just to remind everybody, under current law, if an unaccompanied child shows up at the border—smuggled to the border by criminal organizations that get rich smuggling migrants to the border—they are then turned over by the Border Patrol to Health and Human Services Office of Refugee Relocation. They then identify a sponsor for that child in the interior of the United States. Sometimes it is a family member; sometimes it is not.

There has been precious little vetting of the households in which those children are ultimately placed. And the New York Times, in 2023, wrote several investigative articles documenting the fact that the Biden administration had simply lost those children. In 85,000 cases where the reporters contacted the sponsors of these children, there was never an answer.

Secretary Becerra said this morning: I don't have the authority to do anything after we turn them over to the sponsor.

I said: OK. You can't tell us where these children are? You can't tell us are they going to school? Are they being trafficked for sex? Are they being forced into child labor in violation of the laws that are designed to protect children as has been documented by the New York Times and one of the Senate's own investigating committees?

He said: It is not my job.

Frankly, my conclusion is he simply doesn't care about the welfare of these 400,000 children living in communities all across America. We don't know

whether they have been forced into gangs or whether they dropped out of school. Secretary Becerra and President Biden don't know, and they don't care.

PRESIDENT BIDEN'S BUDGET

Mr. President, on another matter, more than 5 months into the current fiscal year, the Senate has finally made some progress on government funding. Just so anybody listening understands where we are, we are actually doing the work that we were supposed to do last year before the end of the fiscal year, which is September 30. So we are actually dealing with spending bills from 2023 in 2024 because we didn't do the work then. So now, here we are stacked up, lurching from potential shutdown to shutdown with various fiscal cliffs. We avoided one of those cliffs last week when we passed 6 of the 12 annual appropriations bills for fiscal year 2024.

These bills, as well as the six unfinished bills, should have been signed into law before the end of September last year. Instead, the monumental task of funding the government has lingered in purgatory in the Senate as the majority leader has chosen to spend this Chamber's limited time voting on nominations. As a result, we had to pass one stopgap spending bill after another to prevent the government from shutting down. And now the next funding deadline is just over 1 week away.

Unless Congress passes six more funding bills by midnight next Friday, portions of the government will shut down and countless public servants will be left without a paycheck and the American people unnecessarily inconvenienced. Well, that includes American troops that will be left without a paycheck. It includes the Border Patrol. It includes Customs and Border Patrol officers and other law enforcement, many of whom will have to work without pay if that occurs.

I am deeply disappointed we find ourselves with this state of affairs nearly halfway through the current fiscal year. This is Washington dysfunction at its worst. This is the basic job of governing.

I do hope we will be able to make some serious progress in the next 2 weeks to fund the government and wrap up our work on fiscal year 2024 appropriations that we should have done last year so now we could work on next year's before the end of the fiscal year in September.

Earlier this week, President Biden submitted his budget request for fiscal year 2025, which begins in October. It is no secret that this massive document is on the train to nowhere, but that doesn't mean it is totally worthless. After all, a person's budget includes valuable information.

Dating back to his time as a Member of the Senate, President Biden has often repeated a favorite expression of his father's. His dad would tell him: Don't tell me what you value; show me your budget, and I will tell you what you value.

Someone could tell you they care about supporting those who are less fortunate or saving for the future, but one will look at the budget and tell that you really have other priorities. The same is true for the Federal Government. It is easy for leaders to say they value a strong military, just like it is easy to say we stand with Israel while undercutting our ally.

I have worked here long enough to know you can't just listen to what people say; you have to watch what they do.

President Biden's budget provides an unvarnished view of what he values, and in countless ways—in countless ways—it contradicts what he has said to the American people. It is a mountain of reckless, burdensome tax hikes and far-left priorities with a $7.3 trillion pricetag—trillion.

Just like President Biden, this budget request is completely detached from the needs of our country. There is no better example than the President's border budget.

Since he took office, our country has grappled with a completely unprecedented crisis at the border, part of which I spoke about a moment ago.

In 3 years, Customs and Border Protection has encountered more than 7.2 million migrants at the border. That is higher than the total for the entire 12 years of the Trump and Obama administrations.

When this many individuals cross the border every day, the entire system becomes overwhelmed. We don't have enough Border Patrol to respond to the overwhelming number of people coming across the border every day. We don't have the facilities to detain them for the amount of time needed to process their asylum claims. We certainly don't have enough resources to return individuals with no legitimate reason to remain in the United States back to their home country.

We need more personnel, facilities, and resources to address this crisis, as well as changes in policy, but the overarching issue that needs to be fixed is the recordbreaking pace of migration. Everybody knows that if a pipe breaks in your home, your top priority wouldn't be to buy more buckets; it would be to turn off the water. That is what we need to do here. We need to address the wave of humanity that keeps coming and coming and will keep coming and coming. Unfortunately, President Biden's budget wouldn't make any meaningful changes to that.

The only way to stop this unprecedented flow of migration is by discouraging people from coming in the first place. That is called deterrence. The Border Patrol calls it consequences.

When there are no consequences with coming here through illegal channels, then people are going to keep coming. President Biden needs to make it clear that anyone who does not have a legal basis to remain in the United States will be detained and deported. Those are the operative words here, ''detain and deport,'' or ''repatriate,'' if you prefer.

The Biden administration needs to detain every person who crosses the border without legal authority and return every single person who doesn't have a legal basis to remain in the United States. The President's budget, which shows what he values, doesn't provide the resources to do that.

One example is a request for detention beds. That is part of the ''detain'' element that I mentioned. The administration has asked for 34,000 beds for Immigration and Customs Enforcement. That may sound like a lot, but with the volume of people coming across the border, those beds fill up quickly.

For example, during the first 4 months of the fiscal year, we averaged about 240,000—nearly a quarter of a million—migrants each month. That is about 8,000 crossings each day. If we are generous and assume that Immigrations and Customs Enforcement actually acquires all 34,000 beds and that they are empty on day one, those beds would be filled in less than 5 days.

Migrants who are placed in expedited removal and who are seeking asylum are supposed to complete a credible fear screening—a process that typically took about 13 days last year. If the administration wanted to do things by the book—that means follow the law—we would need the capacity to hold every single person who crossed the border for 2 weeks just to figure out whether they are making a credible claim for asylum and then a longer period in which to evaluate those claims.

To reemphasize the point, that is just to figure out if an asylum claim is plausible on its face before an immigration judge determines whether it is supported by any evidence. At current levels, that means we would need more than 100,000 beds just to figure out whether migrants were making facially plausible claims, without even determining whether those claims are supported by real evidence.

As I said, the winning formula is detain-and-deport, not catch-and-release, which is the Biden border policy. The President's budget doesn't provide nearly enough resources for things like removal flights either.

Given the unprecedented pace of illegal border crossings during the Biden administration and the rate at which new migrants are arriving, certainly they see the welcome mat waiting for them—not a red light, not a blinking yellow light, but a green light. ''Come on in''—that is the message that is being sent.

ICE needs a dramatic funding increase for air charter flights, for example, and it needs enough resources to return migrants to their home countries, but the administration has once again failed to give the Agency the resources it needs to carry out its mission.

Our Border Patrol and our Immigrations and Customs Enforcement officers can't do the job we have asked them to do because the Biden administration has undercut them in endless ways. This is hardly a surprise. The administration has constantly treated Immigrations and Customs Enforcement like a corrupt, criminal group instead of a vital law enforcement Agency, which is exactly what they are. Vice President HARRIS, the President's own border czar, once compared ICE to the Ku Klux Klan. How outrageous is that from a supposedly responsible public servant, the Vice President of the United States?

This administration has never been serious about the border, and its budget continues to prove that. Instead, the President's budget focuses on managing the crisis—not fixing it, not solving it, but managing it.

Rather than establish deterrence by eliminating catch-and-release and instituting detain-and-deport, the administration is just building up more resources to try to avoid the public relations disaster when we see people sleeping in the streets in places like Del Rio, El Paso, and Laredo, just to name a few places.

The Biden administration has asked for $4.7 billion for a ''contingency fund'' that could kick in when conditions warrant extra capacity, but really, despite the efforts to try to gloss over what they are doing, this is really about facilitating the recordbreaking flow of migrants into our country.

Once again, President Biden has proven that he has no desire—zero—to stop the flow of people into the country. Instead, he wants to make that process more efficient, as if 7.2 million aren't enough. But with his poll numbers in the tank, President Biden keeps saying he wants to address the border crisis, but he has no one to blame but himself. Yes, this is a manmade crisis, and that man is Joe Biden.

This is not the plan of someone who is interested in making a real and an honest attempt to solve a problem. This isn't a good-faith attempt to achieve operational control at the border, enforce the law, and deter illegal immigration. Unfortunately, it is just more of the same—more of the same policies that created the mess we are in right now.

President Biden may say he values a secure border, but his budget reveals his true values, and that is that he does not.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, before I address recycling and composting, I just want to say something with respect and affection to my friend from Texas.

About a month ago, Democrats and Republicans joined together here on this floor to pass bipartisan legislation to provide for better—much better—security at the border and to make sure that folks from other countries who have a desire to work, the ability to work, are not a threat to our safety or security—that they could be provided an opportunity to help make this a better country.

It was a bipartisan vote, Democrats and Republicans. So I just want to commend the Republicans who joined the Democrats in voting for it. The legislation has died in the House, at least for now, and my hope is that the House will see fit to join us in the Senate to pass commonsense, much needed border security legislation.

RECYCLING AND COMPOSTING

Mr. President, having said that, I came here today to talk about the passage in the Senate earlier this week of the Recycling and Composting Accountability Act and the Recycling Infrastructure and Accessibility Act of 2023—two pieces of bipartisan legislation that, if enacted, will improve our Nation's recycling and our Nation's composting systems.

As a number of our colleagues know, I care a lot about recycling, and I care a lot about composting. I have ever since I was a kid. In fact, I think in our home in Wilmington, DE, we have recycled everything in recent years, from a dehumidifier in our basement to a Ford Explorer out in our driveway. We recycle a whole lot more. We do it every week. I know a lot of other folks in our neighborhood and a lot of other folks in our State do as well. But in our country, we can always do everything better. We can always do things better when we need to.

Through my time in the U.S. Senate, I have looked for and I have found many opportunities for bipartisan support of policies that boost recycling and that boost composting. As my colleagues on this floor have heard me say many, many times, bipartisan solutions are lasting solutions. I believe that with every fiber of my being.

To that end, earlier this Congress, Senator CAPITO, ranking member of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, along with Senator JOHN BOOZMAN from Arkansas and I, worked to advance bipartisan legislation through our committee, through the Committee on Environment and Public Works, that would strengthen our Nation's recycling, composting, and sustainability efforts.

Moreover, we know that recycling is a win-win. Why do I say that? It not only benefits our environment, but it also creates economic opportunity. It creates a lot of jobs, a whole lot of jobs, not just in Delaware but in every State across the country.

When enacted, the Recycling and Composting Accountability Act and the Recycling Infrastructure and Accessibility Act of 2023 will address several of the challenges that America's recycling efforts currently face, including the lack of good data, including limited access to recycling programs in many parts—too many parts—of our country.

To increase the amount of high-quality data available on recycling efforts across America, Senator BOOZMAN and I developed legislation called the Recycling and Composting Accountability Act. Our bill would improve the Environmental Protection Agency's ability to gather data on this Nation's recycling systems and explore opportunities for implementing a national composting strategy.

Some people might say: What is composting, and why is that important? Well, I am excited about the idea of a national composting strategy because implementing such a strategy will help us reduce food waste, which is responsible for over half—that is right—over half of our planet-warming methane emissions that emanate from landfills.

I will say that again. I am excited about the idea of national composting strategy. Why? Because implementing such a strategy will help us reduce food waste. Food waste is responsible for over half—that is right—over half of our planet-warming methane emissions that emanate from landfills. To increase access to recycling programs, Senator CAPITO, Senator BOOZMAN, and I introduced the Recycling Infrastructure and Accessibility Act of 2023. Why did we do that? To create a pilot program at EPA to help expand recycling services in underserved areas.

Many Americans in rural and underserved communities want to recycle and they want to compost, but they are unable to do so because they live in areas that lack the necessary recycling infrastructure, including curbside pickup or community collection centers.

In comparison to our neighbors, how are we doing? I have a friend, and I asked him how he is doing. He said: Compared to what?

Well, why don't we compare ourselves to Canada and maybe Germany? Well, compared to Canada, we have a lot of work to do. For example, British Columbia, our neighbors to the north, up there, they are currently recycling 86 percent of their residential waste—86 percent. Across the pond over in Germany, they are recycling almost half—48 percent, to be exact—of their waste. Yes, 48 percent. I wish I could say we are doing as well, but unfortunately, today in America, our national recycling rate is not even a third but just under that—32 percent. We can do better than that. We have to do better than that.

These two bills will help us to improve our recycling efforts to meet the goal set by the EPA to increase the U.S. recycling efforts—bring it up to 50 percent by the year 2030.

I think people, given a choice, would like to recycle. They would like to compost. We have to make it easy for them to do so.

Both of the bills that I have mentioned are the result of true collaboration and reflect a bipartisan commitment to exploring and addressing our Nation's recycling and composting challenges and opportunities.

We have a moral duty to leave behind a cleaner, healthier planet for future generations, and that is a belief I know is shared by most Americans.

Now that the Senate has passed both of these bills, I welcome all of our House colleagues to join us in this effort.

I want to say to the Presiding Officer, our colleague from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a member of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works—I want to thank him for being part of the effort that has enabled us to bring this legislation to the floor, I believe without opposition and with total, bipartisan support of Democrat and Republican Members.

Hopefully, we will be able to convince our friends over in the House that we come up with some pretty good ideas over here in the Senate from time to time, and these are a couple of them.

I yield the floor.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for 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 JON D. LEVY

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the outstanding career of Chief Judge Jon D. Levy of Portland, ME, and congratulate him on a well-deserved retirement from the judiciary. Jon is retiring after nearly three decades of service on both Maine's State and Federal courts. I have had the privilege of knowing Jon since my time as Governor and his dedication and outstanding service on the bench has continued to impress me over the years.

Jon was born in New York and attended Syracuse University before pursuing his study of law at West Virginia University College of Law. After earning his JD, Jon worked as a law clerk for the U.S. District Court, Southern District of West Virginia, and as special monitor for the Southern District of Texas. In 1982, Jon and his wife—in search of coastline—came to Maine and ultimately settled in York, where Jon practiced family law until 1995.

In 1995, Jon first came to my attention as an outstanding legal practitioner, and he was one of my first judicial appointments as Governor to the Maine District Court. After only a handful of years, Jon became chief judge of the Maine District Court, an upward trajectory he would repeat throughout his career. In 2002, I appointed Jon to the Maine Supreme Court as an associate justice, becoming the first in Maine's history to go directly from the district court to the supreme court without prior service on the superior court. A remarkable feat, but one that Jon deserved.

In 2014, President Obama nominated him to the U.S. District Court for the District of Maine, and he was confirmed with over three-quarters of the Senate's support. Jon served with distinction and always with the utmost respect and dedication to the institution. He retires in May as our chief judge.

It has been a privilege to know Jon and call him my friend, and I am sure he will be dearly missed on the bench. I hope that Jon's analytical, decisive intellect and genuine respect for the law will inspire others to follow in his footsteps. I wish Jon all the best in his next chapter of life and give him my sincerest thanks; he truly is a judge's judge, and Maine is lucky to call him one of our own.●

REMEMBERING GEORGE E. ''COTTON'' FLETCHER

● Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to honor the life of George E. ''Cotton'' Fletcher. Cotton Fletcher was born in St. Petersburg, FL, and shortly after moved to Newberry, FL, where he led family enterprises and created jobs for hard-working Floridians, including a 2,000-acre farm, the Newberry Fletcher Farm Equipment dealership, a cattle ranch, and a family-run sawmill in west Gainesville. Later he turned to property development as the president and CEO of the Fletcher Family of Companies.

Mr. Fletcher also dedicated his life to service. He served in the U.S. Navy and the Air Force, retiring as a major from the Air Force Reserves. His service continued beyond the military, serving 53 years on the Alachua General Hospital Board, which later became Santa Fe Healthcare and included the founding of Haven Hospice in Gainesville, FL. He also served on the Florida Lottery Commission, the Gainesville Area Chamber of Commerce, and as a Paul Harris Fellow Rotary Member.

He is survived by his children Cheryl Hartley (Robert), Cindy Thompson, Deborah Diamond, and Blake Fletcher (Ashley); his sister-in-law Mary Fletcher, son-in-law Lester Thompson; 12 grandchildren Matthew, Bryce, Andrew, Ross, Myles, Chelsea, Ryan, Bella, Reagan, Landon, Greyson, Brady; and 6 great-grandchildren Brendan, Parker, Catherine, Emory, Claire, Ellie.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Kelly, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:03 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1278. An act to designate the Federal building located at 985 Michigan Avenue in Detroit, Michigan, as the ''Rosa Parks Federal Building'', and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 6276. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to identify the utilization rate of certain public buildings and federally-leased space, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7521. An act to protect the national security of the United States from the threat posed by foreign adversary controlled applications, such as TikTok and any successor application or service and any other application or service developed or provided by ByteDance Ltd. or an entity under the control of ByteDance Ltd.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 206. An act to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to regularly review and update policies and manuals related to inspections at ports of entry.

S. 1858. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to establish a deadline for applying for disaster unemployment assistance.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 6276. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to identify the utilization rate of certain public buildings and federally-leased space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

H.R. 7521. An act to protect the national security of the United States from the threat posed by foreign adversary controlled applications, such as TikTok and any successor application or service and any other application or service developed or provided by ByteDance Ltd. or an entity under the control of ByteDance Ltd; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 14, 2024, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 206. An act to require the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection to regularly review and update policies and manuals related to inspections at ports of entry.

S. 1858. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to establish a deadline for applying for disaster unemployment assistance.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–3768. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's proposed fiscal year 2025 Budget and Performance Plan; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–3769. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: DFARS Buy American Act Requirements (DFARS Case 2020–D019)'' (RIN0750–AL74) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2024; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–3770. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Disclosure of Order Execution Information'' (RIN3235–AN22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3771. A communication from the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors'' (RIN3235–AM87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3772. A communication from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Global Magnitsky Sanctions Regulations'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 11, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3773. A communication from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''North Korea Sanctions Regulations'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3774. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indexing Methodology for Title I Manufactured Home Loan Limits'' (RIN2502–AJ52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3775. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Allied Governments Favorable Treatment: Revisions to Certain Australia Group Controls; Revisions to Certain Crime Control and Detection Controls'' (RIN0694–AJ29) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 4, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3776. A communication from the Management Analyst of the Division of Regulations, Jurisdiction, and Special Park Uses, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment'' (RIN1024–AE85) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3613. A bill to require Facility Security Committees to respond to security recommendations issued by the Federal Protective Service relating to facility security, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 118–160).

S. 3648. A bill to amend the Post-Katrina Management Reform Act of 2006 to repeal certain obsolete requirements, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 118–161).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 3934. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a demonstration project to increase access to biosimilar biological products under the Medicare program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 3935. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of Health and Human Services from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing the proposed rule, entitled ''Safe and Appropriate Foster Care Placement Requirements for Titles IV–E and IV–B''; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHMITT (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 3936. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to seek to engage the authorities of Taiwan with respect to expanding cooperation on civilian space activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. HYDE–SMITH:

S. 3937. A bill to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to establish a 3-year phase-in period for de novo financial institutions to comply with Federal capital standards, to provide relief for de novo rural community banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. KAINE):

S. 3938. A bill to designate the community-based outpatient clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Lynchburg, Virginia, as the ''Private First Class Desmond T. Doss VA Clinic''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 3939. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the way beneficiaries are assigned under the Medicare shared savings program by also basing such assignment on primary care services furnished by nurse practitioners, physician assistants, and clinical nurse specialists; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WELCH, Ms. SMITH, Mr. REED, Ms. BALDWIN, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 3940. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a first-time homebuyer credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 3941. A bill to repeal the wage requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. KING, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 3942. A bill to amend the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 to include maple syrup under the seniors farmers' market nutrition program; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3943. A bill to require a plan to improve the cybersecurity and telecommunications of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. VANCE (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 3944. A bill to establish the William S. Knudsen Commission for American Defense-Industrial Mobilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. VANCE:

S. 3945. A bill to restrict the Chinese Government from accessing United States capital markets and exchanges if it fails to comply with international laws relating to finance, trade, and commerce; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3946. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1106 Main Street in Bastrop, Texas, as the ''Sergeant Major Billy D. Waugh Post Office''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Ms. BUTLER):

S. 3947. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to reduce the standard workweek from 40 hours per week to 32 hours per week, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3948. A bill to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to better address certain transactions by foreign entities of concern, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. BUTLER (for herself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. CASEY, Mr.

WELCH, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 3949. A bill to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act to ensure protections for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth and their families; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 3950. A bill to provide States with support to establish integrated care programs for individuals who are dually eligible for Medicare and Medicaid, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 3951. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for adjustments to the Medicare part D cost-sharing reductions for low-income individuals; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 3952. A bill to increase rates of college completion and reduce college costs by accelerating time to degree, aligning secondary and postsecondary education, and improving postsecondary credit transfer; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 3953. A bill to make demonstration grants to eligible local educational agencies or consortia of eligible local educational agencies for the purpose of increasing the numbers of school nurses in public elementary schools and secondary schools; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. LEE, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 3954. A bill to amend the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 to promote timely exploration for geothermal resources under geothermal leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. ERNST:

S. 3955. A bill to require the heads of Federal agencies to submit to Congress an annual report regarding official time authorized under title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 3956. A bill to include phosphate and potash on the final list of critical minerals of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 3957. A bill to require the Director of National Intelligence to develop a strategy to improve the sharing of information and intelligence on foreign adversary tactics and illicit activities affecting the ability of United States persons to compete in foreign jurisdictions on projects relating to energy generation and storage, and for other purposes; to the Select Committee on Intelligence.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 3958. A bill to require the Interagency Working Group on Toxic Exposure to conduct research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of descendants of individuals exposed to toxic substances while serving as members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mr. KING, Mrs. FISCHER, and Mr. TESTER):

S. 3959. A bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to streamline the enrollment processes for individuals applying for a Transportation Security Administration security threat assessment for certain programs, including the Transportation Worker Identification Credential and Hazardous Materials Endorsement Threat Assessment programs of the Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 3960. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide a good faith exception to the imposition of fines for false assertions and certifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. LUMMIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 3961. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to reform certain authorities and to provide greater transparency and oversight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANCE:

S. 3962. A bill to provide for greater accountability in enhanced end-use monitoring, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3963. A bill to clarify that noncommercial species found entirely within the borders of a single State are not in interstate commerce or subject to regulation under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 or any other provision of law enacted as an exercise of the power of Congress to regulate interstate commerce; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3964. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to the highway safety improvement program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. OSSOFF:

S. 3965. A bill to appropriate funds to U.S. Customs and Border Protection for the deployment of nonintrusive inspection technology at the southern land border of the United States; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. BUDD, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. THUNE, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. MORAN, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S.J. Res. 64. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to ''The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act: Prevention and Elimination of Digital Discrimination''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S.J. Res. 65. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Reconsideration of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. BUTLER):

S. Res. 588. A resolution recognizing March 14, 2024, as ''Black Midwives Day''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. Res. 589. A resolution honoring Wadee Alfayoumi, a 6-year-old Palestinian-American boy, murdered as a victim of a hate crime for his Palestinian-Muslim identity, in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. Res. 590. A resolution designating March 15, 2024, as ''Long COVID Awareness Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 160

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 160, a bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes.

S. 173

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 173, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to require the safe storage of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 363

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 363, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the individuals and communities who volunteered or donated items to the North Platte Canteen in North Platte, Nebraska, during World War II from December 25, 1941, to April 1, 1946.

S. 610

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 728

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 728, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 1034

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1034, a bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to establish a competitive grant program for projects for commercial motor vehicle parking, and for other purposes.

S. 1094

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1094, a bill to provide a temporary safe harbor for publishers of online content to collectively negotiate with dominant online platforms regarding the terms on which content may be distributed.

S. 1189

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1189, a bill to establish a pilot grant program to improve recycling accessibility, and for other purposes.

S. 1231

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1231, a bill to prohibit disinformation in the advertising of abortion services, and for other purposes.

S. 1274

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1274, a bill to permanently exempt payments made from the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account from sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) were added as cosponsors of S. 1302, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 1631

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1631, a bill to enhance the authority granted to the Department of Homeland Security and Department of Justice with respect to unmanned aircraft systems and unmanned aircraft, and for other purposes.

S. 1979

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1979, a bill to amend title 9 of the United States Code with respect to arbitration of disputes involving age discrimination.

S. 2048

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2048, a bill to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, and provide for the discoverability and admissibility of gun trace information in civil proceedings.

S. 2515

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2515, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 2692

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2692, a bill to amend the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989 to establish a Portal for Appraiser Credentialing and AMC Registration Information, and for other purposes.

S. 2825

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2825, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the United States Army Dustoff crews of the Vietnam War, collectively, in recognition of their extraordinary heroism and life-saving actions in Vietnam.

S. 2861

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2861, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Billie Jean King, an American icon, in recognition of a remarkable life devoted to championing equal rights for all, in sports and in society.

S. 2890

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2890, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to modify limitations on amounts of farm ownership loans and operating loans, and for other purposes.

S. 3089

At the request of Mr. FETTERMAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3089, a bill to amend the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2023, to expand the replacement of stolen EBT benefits under the supplemental nutrition assistance program.

S. 3348

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3348, a bill to amend the Harmful Algal Blooms and Hypoxia Research and Control Act of 1998 to address harmful algal blooms, and for other purposes.

S. 3422

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3422, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to create a carbon border adjustment based on carbon intensity, and for other purposes.

S. 3502

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3502, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prevent consumer reporting agencies from furnishing consumer reports under certain circumstances, and for other purposes.

S. 3515

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3515, a bill to improve communication between the United States Postal Service and local communities relating to the relocation and establishment of Postal Service retail service facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 3627

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3627, a bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to require a certain efficiency level for certain distribution transformers, and for other purposes.

S. 3666

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3666, a bill to amend the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978 to establish an additional reporting requirement, and for other purposes.

S. 3679

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms.

MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 3679, a bill to reauthorize the Dr. Lorna Breen Health Care Provider Protection Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3916

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3916, a bill protecting the right to vote in elections for Federal office, and for other purposes.

S. 3923

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3923, a bill to provide for the effective use of immigration detainers to enhance public safety.

S. 3927

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3927, a bill to provide a civil remedy for individuals harmed by sanctuary jurisdiction policies, and for other purposes.

S. 3929

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3929, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from taking certain proposed actions relating to a land management plan direction for old-growth forest conditions across the National Forest System.

S. 3930

At the request of Mr. WARNOCK, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3930, a bill to provide downpayment assistance to first-generation homebuyers to address multigenerational inequities in access to homeownership and to narrow and ultimately close the racial homeownership gap in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 3933

At the request of Mrs. BRITT, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3933, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to take into custody aliens who have been charged in the United States with theft, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 62

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 62, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service relating to ''Importation of Fresh Beef From Paraguay''.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 3943. A bill to require a plan to improve the cybersecurity and telecommunications of the U.S. Academic Research Fleet, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise to introduce the Accelerating, Networking, Cyberinfrastructure, and Hardwater for Oceanic Research, ANCHOR, Act. This bipartisan and bicameral legislation would require the National Science Foundation to plan critical cyber security and internet upgrades to essential oceanographic research vessels.

This bill would direct the National Science Foundation to report to Congress on the costs, personnel, and equipment necessary to upgrade the 17 ocean- and lake-going research vessels in the Academic Research Fleet. These ships and their submarines do research around the world across topics as fundamental as climate change, marine health, and national security. This report is an important first step in making needed upgrades to these research vessels for improved science, cyber security, and telecommunications.

Around the world, researchers traverse waters to better understand our oceans. In Alaska, the R/V *Sikuliaq* regularly ventures into icy Arctic waters, breaking ice up to 2.5 inches thick to study remote polar ecosystems. In California, the R/V *Sally Ride* explores the deep ocean in the Pacific, characterizing the toxic legacy of DDT barrels dumped over 50 years ago. In the Great Lakes, the R/V *Blue Heron* navigates Lake Superior, conducting long-term research on harmful algal blooms.

But these important research vessels suffer from aging infrastructure. As ships and submarines collect sensitive data about our climate, foreign adversaries increasingly attack the weakened cyber security defenses on research vessels.

The upgrades planned in the ANCHOR Act are cost-effective, allowing repairs in real time with remote experts that keep ships going on their missions. Improved internet is also a boost for crew morale, science efficiency, and education. With faster upload and download speeds, scientists and crew members will be able to transmit data to shore for processing, make Zoom calls with classrooms on land, and call loved ones or even mental health providers during long months at sea.

I want to thank Senator SULLIVAN for introducing this important legislation with me in the Senate and Representatives MIKE GARCIA and HALEY STEVENS for leading the House companion. I hope all of our colleagues will join us in supporting this bipartisan bill to improve our Nation's oceanographic research and security.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. LEE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. LUMMIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. TESTER, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 3961. A bill to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to reform certain authorities and to provide greater transparency and oversight; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, in just a few weeks, an important but controversial surveillance authority, known as section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, will expire. This extraordinary authority was initially presented to Congress as a temporary emergency counterterrorism tool more than 15 years ago. As is often the case with temporary emergency authorities, section 702 is now used for a wide range of foreign intelligence purposes, from countering Russia to stopping the flow of fentanyl into the United States.

Just last month, the Federal Bureau of Investigation revealed that data collected using section 702 allowed the Agency to foil several attacks in recent years, including attacks that would have crippled U.S. critical infrastructure and even threaten the lives of our U.S. servicemembers. And the authority has helped the U.S. uncover atrocities committed by Russia during its ongoing assault on Ukraine.

I have had demonstrations of the 702 authority, and there is no doubt in my mind that it is a valuable tool for collecting foreign intelligence. But this authority raises serious constitutional concerns, as it allows access not just to communications by those who are foreigners but also to the vast databases of Americans' communications without the customary search warrant required by the U.S. Constitution.

This powerful tool—this effective tool on foreign surveillance—has been used, in my mind, improperly to spy on American protesters, from Black Lives Matter to MAGA loyalists.

The FBI has imposed new limits on the authority of FBI agents to search the communications of Americans. But even after implementing these reforms, the FBI still conducted over 200,000 warrantless searches of Americans in just 1 year—more than 500 searches of Americans per day.

Democrats and Republicans alike are rightly concerned. Our Founders understood the danger of unchecked government surveillance and had the wisdom and foresight to enshrine protections for American citizens in the Constitution. The Fourth Amendment to our

Constitution protects Americans from unreasonable search and seizure, particularly those without a warrant based upon probable cause that had been approved by a judge.

I have long raised concerns about section 702's lack of sufficient safeguards to protect these rights, and I have consistently voted against the extension of section 702 without changes. However, I have also said that I would support section 702 if it includes sufficient safeguards to protect Americans from warrantless surveillance.

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which has primary jurisdiction over FISA, I have evaluated proposed reforms and carefully considered the administration's views. I have also heard from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Existing legislative proposals of the House and Senate go too far for some and not far enough for others.

That is why, today, I am introducing what I hope will be a compromise bill that tries to bridge this divide to protect both our security and our Constitution and guaranteed freedoms.

The Security and Freedom Enhancement Act, or SAFE Act, would enhance our national security by reauthorizing section 702 for 4 more years, while also protecting Americans from warrantless surveillance.

The SAFE Act would require the government to demonstrate to a court that it has probable cause before reading or listening to the private communications of Americans that have been swept up by section 702. Basically, in just a few words to describe the process, if one of our intelligence or law enforcement Agencies suspects that a foreigner is engaged in conduct that is threatening the security of the United States, they call up the records of that foreigner, and if it turns out that foreigner has communicated with an American citizen, the question is, What do you do next? Can you, in any way, monitor that conversation or come up with an investigation of the documents of that American with or without a warrant? That is the fundamental question we are facing here. So the search starts in the right direction, to a foreign source, and ends up dealing with an American—an American, obviously, who has constitutional rights.

The SAFE Act would require the government to demonstrate to a court that it has probable cause, before reading or listening to the private communications of Americans who have been swept up in section 702. However, this requirement will not prevent government agents from searching 702 databases to determine if foreign targets are communicating with Americans, nor will it prevent agents from accessing the communications of those foreign agents.

But if the government wants to review the contents—the contents—of Americans' communication, it would first be required to demonstrate to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court that it has probable cause to do that.

This would not be overly burdensome because a warrant would only be required in cases where the government actually reviews the content of American communications. They estimate that the incidents of American content are 1.58 percent of all 702 searches of Americans.

The SAFE Act also would not require a warrant in cases involving exigent circumstances or cyber security attacks to ensure that there will not be any delay that jeopardizes our national security.

This approach is based on recommendations by the independent Private and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, which we created after 9/11 to ensure that our counterterrorism policies do not violate the constitutional rights of the American people.

The persistent and widespread violation of existing limits on section 702 underscore the importance of court approval, which we will propose.

Better compliance measures within the executive branch are helpful, but they are no substitute for checks and balances by the judicial branch, as the Founders intended.

The SAFE Act, which I am introducing, is a sensible, moderate compromise between more robust reform proposals that address a wide range of surveillance concerns and bills that reauthorize section 702 without adequately addressing these concerns.

I know that compromise does not come easy when it comes to this policy, but a reasonable middle ground that protects our national security and the rights of the American people is possible. The SAFE Act is my offer in compromise to achieve that goal.

With the April 19 sunset of section 702 fast approaching, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in supporting this compromise for the good of the American people.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 3961

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Security And Freedom Enhancement Act of 2024'' or the ''SAFE Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

TITLE I—PROTECTIONS FOR UNITED STATES PERSONS WHOSE COMMUNICATIONS ARE COLLECTED UNDER SECTION 702 OF THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978

SEC. 101. QUERY PROCEDURE REFORM.

(a) MANDATORY AUDITS OF UNITED STATES PERSON QUERIES CONDUCTED BY FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Department of Justice shall conduct an audit of a significant

representative sample of covered queries, as defined in paragraph (6) of section 702(f) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(f)), as redesignated and amended by subsection (b) of this section, conducted during the 180-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, and during each 180-day period thereafter.

(2) COMPLETION OF AUDIT.—Not later than 90 days after the end of each 180-day period described in paragraph (1), the Department of Justice shall complete the audit described in such paragraph with respect to such 180-day period.

(b) RESTRICTIONS RELATING TO CONDUCT OF CERTAIN QUERIES BY FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—Section 702(f) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(f)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (6);

(2) by inserting before paragraph (6) the following:

''(5) QUERYING PROCEDURES APPLICABLE TO FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.—For any procedures adopted under paragraph (1) applicable to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall include the following requirements:

''(A) TRAINING.—A requirement that, prior to conducting any query, and on an annual basis thereafter as a prerequisite for continuing to conduct queries, personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation successfully complete training on the querying procedures.

''(B) ADDITIONAL PRIOR APPROVALS FOR SENSITIVE QUERIES.—A requirement that, absent exigent circumstances, prior to conducting certain queries, personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation receive approval, at minimum, as follows:

''(i) Approval from the Deputy Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation if the query uses a query term reasonably believed to identify a United States elected official, an appointee of the President or the governor of a State, a United States political candidate, a United States political organization or a United States person prominent in such organization, or a United States media organization or a United States person who is a member of such organization.

''(ii) Approval from an attorney of the Federal Bureau of Investigation if the query uses a query term reasonably believed to identify a United States religious organization or a United States person who is prominent in such organization.

''(iii) Approval from an attorney of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for 2 or more queries conducted together as a batch job.

''(C) PRIOR WRITTEN JUSTIFICATION.—A requirement that—

''(i) prior to conducting a covered query, personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation generate a written statement of the specific factual basis to support the reasonable belief that such query meets the standards required by the procedures adopted under paragraph (1); and

''(ii) for each covered query, the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall keep a record of the query term, the date of the conduct of the query, the identifier of the personnel conducting the query, and such written statement.

''(D) AFFIRMATIVE ELECTION TO INCLUDE SECTION 702 INFORMATION IN QUERIES.—Any system of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that stores unminimized contents or noncontents obtained through acquisitions authorized under subsection (a) together with contents or noncontents obtained through other lawful means shall be configured in a manner that—

''(i) requires personnel of the Federal Bureau of Investigation to affirmatively elect to include such unminimized contents or noncontents obtained through acquisitions authorized under subsection (a) when running a query; or

''(ii) includes other controls reasonably expected to prevent inadvertent queries of such unminimized contents or noncontents.''; and

(3) in paragraph (6), as so redesignated—

(A) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (C); and

(B) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) The term 'covered query' means a query conducted—

''(i) using a term associated with a United States person or a person reasonably believed to be located in the United States at the time of the query or the time of the communication or creation of the information; or

''(ii) for the purpose of finding the information of a United States person or a person reasonably believed to be located in the United States at the time of the query or the time of the communication or creation of the information.''.

(c) PROHIBITION ON WARRANTLESS ACCESS TO THE COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER INFORMATION OF UNITED STATES PERSONS AND PERSONS LOCATED IN THE UNITED STATES.—Section 702(f) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(A) by inserting ''and the limitations and requirements in paragraph (2)'' after ''Constitution of the United States'';

(2) by striking paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

''(2) PROHIBITION ON WARRANTLESS ACCESS TO THE COMMUNICATIONS AND OTHER INFORMATION OF UNITED STATES PERSONS AND PERSONS LOCATED IN THE UNITED STATES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), no officer or employee of the United States may access communications content, or information the compelled disclosure of which would require a probable cause warrant if sought for law enforcement purposes inside the United States, acquired under subsection (a) and returned in response to a covered query.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS FOR CONCURRENT AUTHORIZATION, CONSENT, EMERGENCY SITUATIONS, AND CERTAIN DEFENSIVE CYBERSECURITY QUERIES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply if—

''(I) the person to whom the query relates is the subject of an order or emergency authorization authorizing electronic surveillance, a physical search, or an acquisition under this section or section 105, section 304, section 703, or section 704 of this Act or a warrant issued pursuant to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure by a court of competent jurisdiction;

''(II)(aa) the officer or employee accessing the communications content or information has a reasonable belief that—

''(AA) an emergency exists involving an imminent threat of death or serious bodily harm; and

''(BB) in order to prevent or mitigate the threat described in subitem (AA), the communications content or information must be accessed before authorization described in subclause (I) can, with due diligence, be obtained; and

''(bb) not later than 14 days after the communications content or information is accessed, a description of the circumstances justifying the accessing of the query results is provided to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

''(III) such person or, if such person is incapable of providing consent, a third party legally authorized to consent on behalf of such person, has provided consent for the access on a case-by-case basis; or

''(IV)(aa) the communications content or information is accessed and used for the sole purpose of identifying targeted recipients of malicious software and preventing or mitigating harm from such malicious software;

''(bb) other than malicious software and cybersecurity threat signatures, no communications content or other information are accessed or reviewed; and

''(cc) the accessing of query results is reported to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

''(ii) LIMITATIONS.—

''(I) USE IN SUBSEQUENT PROCEEDINGS.—No communications content or information accessed under clause (i)(II) or information derived from such access may be used, received in evidence, or otherwise disseminated in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, except in a proceeding that arises from the threat that prompted the query.

''(II) ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE.—Not less frequently than annually, the Attorney General shall assess compliance with the requirements under subclause (I).

''(C) MATTERS RELATING TO EMERGENCY QUERIES.—

''(i) TREATMENT OF DENIALS.—In the event that communications content or information returned in response to a covered query are accessed pursuant to an emergency authorization described in subparagraph (B)(i)(I) and the subsequent application to authorize electronic surveillance, a physical search, or an acquisition pursuant to section 105(e), section 304(e), section 703(d), or section 704(d) of this Act is denied, or in any other case in which communications content or information returned in response to a covered query are accessed in violation of this paragraph—

''(I) no communications content or information acquired or evidence derived from such access may be used, received in evidence, or otherwise disseminated in any investigation by or in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof; and

''(II) no communications content or information acquired or derived from such access may subsequently be used or disclosed in any other manner without the consent of the person to whom the covered query relates, except in the case that the Attorney General approves the use or disclosure of such information in order to prevent the death of or serious bodily harm to any person.

''(ii) ASSESSMENT OF COMPLIANCE.—Not less frequently than annually, the Attorney General shall assess compliance with the requirements under clause (i).

''(D) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE PURPOSE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii) of this subparagraph, no officer or employee of the United States may conduct a covered query of information acquired under subsection (a) unless the query is reasonably likely to retrieve foreign intelligence information.

''(ii) EXCEPTIONS.—An officer or employee of the United States may conduct a covered query of information acquired under this section if—

''(I)(aa) the officer or employee conducting the query has a reasonable belief that an emergency exists involving an imminent threat of death or serious bodily harm; and

''(bb) not later than 14 days after the query is conducted, a description of the query is provided to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

''(II) the person to whom the query relates or, if such person is incapable of providing consent, a third party legally authorized to consent on behalf of such person, has provided consent for the query on a case-by-case basis;

''(III)(aa) the query is conducted, and the results of the query are used, for the sole purpose of identifying targeted recipients of malicious software and preventing or mitigating harm from such malicious software;

''(bb) other than malicious software and cybersecurity threat signatures, no additional contents of communications acquired as a result of the query are accessed or reviewed; and

''(cc) the query is reported to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court; or

''(IV) the query is necessary to identify information that must be produced or preserved in connection with a litigation matter or to fulfill discovery obligations in a criminal matter under the laws of the United States or any State thereof.

''(3) DOCUMENTATION.—No officer or employee of the United States may access communications content, or information the compelled disclosure of which would require a probable cause warrant if sought for law enforcement purposes inside the United States, returned in response to a covered query unless an electronic record is created that includes a statement of facts showing that the access is authorized pursuant to an exception specified in paragraph (2)(B)(i).

''(4) QUERY RECORD SYSTEM.—The head of each agency that conducts queries shall ensure that a system, mechanism, or business practice is in place to maintain the record described in paragraph (3). Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the SAFE Act, the head of each agency that conducts queries shall report to Congress on its compliance with this procedure.''.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 603(b)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1873(b)(2)) is amended, in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking '', including pursuant to subsection (f)(2) of such section,''.

(2) Section 706(a)(2)(A)(i) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881e(a)(2)(A))i)) is amended by striking ''obtained an order of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court to access such information pursuant to section 702(f)(2)'' and inserting ''accessed such information in accordance with section 702(b)(2)''.

SEC. 102. QUARTERLY REPORTS.

Section 707 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(c) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of National Intelligence, shall submit to the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a quarterly report, which shall include, for that quarter, disaggregated by each agency that conducts queries of information acquired under section 702, the following information:

''(1) The total number of covered queries (as defined in section 702(f)(6)) conducted of information acquired under section 702.

''(2) The number of times an officer or employee of the United States accessed communications contents (as defined in section 2510(8) of title 18, United States Code) or information the compelled disclosure of which would require a probable cause warrant if sought for law enforcement purposes in the United States, returned in response to such queries.

''(3) The number of applications for orders relating to an emergency authorization described in subclause (I) of section 702(f)(2)(B)(i) with respect to a person for which communications contents or information relating to such person were accessed under such subclause and the number of such orders granted.

''(4) The number of times an exception subclause (II), (III), or (IV) of section 702(f)(2)(B)(i) was asserted, disaggregated by the subclause under which an exception was asserted.''.

SEC. 103. ACCOUNTABILITY PROCEDURES FOR INCIDENTS RELATING TO QUERIES CONDUCTED BY THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title VII of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 709. ACCOUNTABILITY PROCEDURES FOR INCIDENTS RELATING TO QUERIES CONDUCTED BY THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall establish procedures to hold employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation accountable for violations of law, guidance, and procedure governing queries of information acquired pursuant to section 702.

''(b) ELEMENTS.—The procedures established under subsection (a) shall include the following:

''(1) Centralized tracking of individual employee performance incidents involving negligent violations of law, guidance, and procedure described in subsection (a), over time.

''(2) Escalating consequences for such incidents, including—

''(A) consequences for initial incidents, including, at a minimum—

''(i) suspension of access to information acquired under this Act; and

''(ii) documentation of the incident in the personnel file of each employee responsible for the violation; and

''(B) consequences for subsequent incidents, including, at a minimum—

''(i) possible indefinite suspension of access to information acquired under this Act;

''(ii) reassignment of each employee responsible for the violation; and

''(iii) referral of the incident to the Inspection Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for review of potentially reckless conduct.

''(3) Clarification of requirements for referring intentional misconduct and reckless conduct to the Inspection Division of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for investigation and disciplinary action by the Office of Professional Responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 708 the following:

''Sec. 709. Accountability procedures for incidents relating to queries conducted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.''.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) INITIAL REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the congressional intelligence committees (as such term is defined in section 801 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1885)) a report detailing the procedures established under section 709 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as added by subsection (a).

(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Federal Bureau of Investigation shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the congressional intelligence committees (as such term is defined in section 801 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1885)) a report on any disciplinary actions taken pursuant to the procedures established under section 709 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as added by subsection (a), including a description of the circumstances surrounding each such disciplinary action, and the results of each such disciplinary action.

(3) FORM.—The reports required under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex to the extent necessary to protect sources and methods.

SEC. 104. PROHIBITION ON REVERSE TARGETING OF UNITED STATES PERSONS AND PERSONS LOCATED IN THE UNITED STATES.

Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) by striking ''may not intentionally'' and inserting the following: ''may not—

''(A) intentionally''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), as designated by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by striking ''if the purpose of such acquisition is to target a particular, known person reasonably believed to be in the United States;'' and inserting the following: ''if a significant purpose of such acquisition is to target 1 or more United States persons or persons reasonably believed to be located in the United States at the time of acquisition or communication, unless—

''(i)(I) there is a reasonable belief that an emergency exists involving an imminent threat of death or serious bodily harm;

''(II) the information is necessary to mitigate that threat;

''(III) a description of the targeting is provided to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, the congressional intelligence committees, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives in a timely manner; and

''(IV) any information acquired from such targeting is used, received in evidence, or otherwise disseminated solely in an investigation by or in a trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before a court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof, that arises from the threat that prompted the targeting; or

''(ii) the United States person or persons reasonably believed to be located in the United States at the time of acquisition or communication has provided consent to the targeting, or if such person is incapable of providing consent, a third party legally authorized to consent on behalf of such person has provided consent;'';

(2) in subsection (d)(1), by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

''(A) ensure that—

''(i) any acquisition authorized under subsection (a) is limited to targeting persons

reasonably believed to be non-United States persons located outside the United States; and

''(ii) except as provided in subsection (b)(2), targeting 1 or more United States persons or persons reasonably believed to be in the United States at the time of acquisition or communication is not a significant purpose of an acquisition; and'';

(3) in subsection (h)(2)(A)(i), by amending subclause (I) to read as follows:

''(I) ensure that—

''(aa) an acquisition authorized under subsection (a) is limited to targeting persons reasonably believed to be non-United States persons located outside the United States; and

''(bb) except as provided in subsection (b)(2), a significant purpose of an acquisition is not to target 1 or more United States persons or persons reasonably believed to be in the United States at the time of acquisition or communication; and''; and

(4) in subsection (j)(2)(B), by amending clause (i) to read as follows:

''(i) ensure that—

''(I) an acquisition authorized under subsection (a) is limited to targeting persons reasonably believed to be non-United States persons located outside the United States; and

''(II) except as provided in subsection (b)(2), a significant purpose of an acquisition is not to target 1 or more United States persons or persons reasonably believed to be in the United States at the time of acquisition or communication; and''.

SEC. 105. FISA COURT REVIEW OF TARGETING DECISIONS.

Section 702 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (h)(2)—

(A) in subparagraph (D)(ii), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (E), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(F) include a random sample of targeting decisions and supporting written justifications from the prior year, using a sample size and methodology that has been approved by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.''; and

(2) in subsection (j)(1)—

(A) by striking ''subsection (g)'' each place it appears and inserting ''subsection (h)''; and

(B) in subparagraph (A), as amended by subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, by inserting '', including reviewing the random sample of targeting decisions and written justifications submitted under subsection (h)(2)(F),'' after ''subsection (h)''.

SEC. 106. REPEAL OF AUTHORITY FOR THE RESUMPTION OF ABOUTS COLLECTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 702(b)(5) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(b)(5)) is amended by striking '', except as provided under section 103(b) of the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.—Section 702(m) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(m)) is amended—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''REVIEWS, AND REPORTING'' and inserting ''AND REVIEWS''; and

(B) by striking paragraph (4).

(2) FISA AMENDMENTS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017.—Section 103 of the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017 (Public Law 115–118; 132 Stat. 10) is amended—

(A) by striking subsection (b) (50 U.S.C. 1881a note); and

(B) by striking ''(a) IN GENERAL.—''.

SEC. 107. EXTENSION OF TITLE VII OF FISA; EXPIRATION OF FISA AUTHORITIES; EFFECTIVE DATES.

(a) EFFECTIVE DATES.—Section 403(b) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–261; 122 Stat. 2474) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1) (50 U.S.C. 1881 note)—

(A) by striking ''April 19, 2024'' and inserting ''December 31, 2027''; and

(B) by striking '', as amended by section 101(a) and by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017,'' and inserting '', as most recently amended,''; and

(2) in paragraph (2) (18 U.S.C. 2511 note), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''April 19, 2024'' and inserting ''December 31, 2027''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 404(b) of the FISA Amendments Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–261; 122 Stat. 2476), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the heading, by striking ''APRIL 19, 2024'' and inserting ''DECEMBER 31, 2027''; and

(B) by striking '', as amended by section 101(a) and by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017,'' and inserting '', as most recently amended,'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking '', as amended by section 101(a) and by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017,'' and inserting '', as most recently amended,''; and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking '', as added by section 101(a) and amended by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017,'' both places it appears and inserting '', as added by section 101(a) and as most recently amended,''; and

(B) by striking '', as amended by section 101(a) and by the FISA Amendments Reauthorization Act of 2017,'' both places it appears and inserting '', as most recently amended,''.

TITLE II—ADDITIONAL REFORMS RELATING TO ACTIVITIES UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978

SEC. 201. APPLICATION FOR AN ORDER UNDER THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR SWORN STATEMENTS FOR FACTUAL ASSERTIONS.—

(1) TITLE I.—Subsection (a)(3) of section 104 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1804) is amended by striking ''a statement of'' and inserting ''a sworn statement of''.

(2) TITLE III.—Subsection (a)(3) of section 303 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1823) is amended by striking ''a statement of'' and inserting ''a sworn statement of''.

(3) SECTION 703.—Subsection (b)(1)(C) of section 703 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881b) is amended by striking ''a statement of'' and inserting ''a sworn statement of''.

(4) SECTION 704.—Subsection (b)(3) of section 704 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881c) is amended by striking ''a statement of'' and inserting ''a sworn statement of''.

(5) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to applications made on or after the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF TECHNIQUES CARRIED OUT BEFORE APPLICATION.—

(1) TITLE I.—Subsection (a) of section 104 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1804) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (8), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (9), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(10) with respect to a target who is a United States person, a statement summarizing the investigative techniques carried out before making the application;''.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to applications made on or after the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN JUSTIFICATION PRIOR TO EXTENSION OF ORDERS.—

(1) APPLICATIONS FOR EXTENSION OF ORDERS UNDER TITLE I.—Subsection (a) of section 104 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1804), as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(11) in the case of an application for an extension of an order under this title for a surveillance targeted against a United States person, a summary statement of the foreign intelligence information obtained pursuant to the original order (and any preceding extension thereof) as of the date of the application for the extension, or a reasonable explanation of the failure to obtain such information;''.

(2) APPLICATIONS FOR EXTENSION OF ORDERS UNDER TITLE III.—Subsection (a) of section 303 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1823) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (7), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) in the case of an application for an extension of an order under this title in which the target of the physical search is a United States person, a summary statement of the foreign intelligence information obtained pursuant to the original order (and any preceding extension thereof) as of the date of the application for the extension, or a reasonable explanation of the failure to obtain such information;''.

(3) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to applications made on or after the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(d) REQUIREMENT FOR JUSTIFICATION OF UNDERLYING CRIMINAL OFFENSE IN CERTAIN APPLICATIONS.—

(1) TITLE I.—Subsection (a)(3)(A) of section 104 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1804) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', and, in the case of a target that is a United States person alleged to be acting as an agent of a foreign power (as described in section 101(b)(2)(B)), that a violation of the criminal statutes of the United States as referred to in section 101(b)(2)(B) has occurred or will occur''.

(2) TITLE III.—Subsection (a)(3)(A) of section 303 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1823) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', and, in the case of a target that is a United States person alleged to be acting as an agent of a foreign power (as described in section 101(b)(2)(B)), that a violation of the criminal statutes of the United States as referred to in section 101(b)(2)(B) has occurred or will occur''.

(3) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to applications made on or after the date that is 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) REQUIRED DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION IN FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE ACT OF 1978 APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et

seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"TITLE IX—REQUIRED DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION

"SEC. 901. DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION.

''The Attorney General or any other Federal officer or employee making an application for a court order under this Act shall provide the court with—

''(1) all information in the possession of the Government that is material to determining whether the application satisfies the applicable requirements under this Act, including any exculpatory information; and

''(2) all information in the possession of the Government that might reasonably—

''(A) call into question the accuracy of the application or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application conducted by the department or agency on whose behalf the application is made; or

''(B) otherwise raise doubts with respect to the findings that are required to be made under the applicable provision of this Act in order for the court order to be issued.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''TITLE IX—REQUIRED DISCLOSURE OF RELEVANT INFORMATION

''Sec. 901. Disclosure of relevant information.''.

(f) CERTIFICATION REGARDING ACCURACY PROCEDURES.—

(1) CERTIFICATION REGARDING ACCURACY PROCEDURES.—Title IX of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as added by subsection (e) of this section, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 902. CERTIFICATION REGARDING ACCURACY PROCEDURES.

''(a) DEFINITION OF ACCURACY PROCEDURES.—In this section, the term 'accuracy procedures' means specific procedures, adopted by the Attorney General, to ensure that an application for a court order under this Act, including any application for renewal of an existing order, is accurate and complete, including procedures that ensure, at a minimum, that—

''(1) the application reflects all information that might reasonably call into question the accuracy of the information or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application, or otherwise raises doubts about the requested findings;

''(2) the application reflects all material information that might reasonably call into question the reliability and reporting of any information from a confidential human source that is used in the application;

''(3) a complete file documenting each factual assertion in an application is maintained;

''(4) the applicant coordinates with the appropriate elements of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003)), concerning any prior or existing relationship with the target of any surveillance, search, or other means of investigation, and discloses any such relationship in the application;

''(5) before any application targeting a United States person (as defined in section 101) is made, the applicant Federal officer shall document that the officer has collected and reviewed for accuracy and completeness supporting documentation for each factual assertion in the application; and

''(6) the applicant Federal agency establish compliance and auditing mechanisms to address, on an annual basis, the efficacy of the accuracy procedures that have been adopted and report such findings to the Attorney General.

''(b) STATEMENT AND CERTIFICATION OF ACCURACY PROCEDURES.—Any Federal officer making an application for a court order under this Act shall include with the application—

''(1) a description of the accuracy procedures employed by the officer or the officer's designee; and

''(2) a certification that the officer or the officer's designee has collected and reviewed for accuracy and completeness—

''(A) supporting documentation for each factual assertion contained in the application;

''(B) all information that might reasonably call into question the accuracy of the information or the reasonableness of any assessment in the application, or otherwise raises doubts about the requested findings; and

''(C) all material information that might reasonably call into question the reliability and reporting of any information from any confidential human source that is used in the application.

''(c) NECESSARY FINDING FOR COURT ORDERS.—A judge may not enter an order under this Act unless the judge finds, in addition to any other findings required under this Act, that the accuracy procedures described in the application for the order, as required under subsection (b)(1), are actually accuracy procedures as defined in this section.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as amended by subsection (e) of this section, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Sec. 902. Certification regarding accuracy procedures.''.

(g) PROHIBITION ON USE OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—Section 104 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1804) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) The statement of facts and circumstances under subsection (a)(3) may only include information obtained from the content of a media source or information gathered by a political campaign if—

''(1) such information is disclosed in the application as having been so obtained or gathered;

''(2) with regard to information gathered from the content of a media source, the application includes an explanation of the investigative techniques used to corroborate the information; and

''(3) with regard to information gathered by a political campaign, such information is not the sole source of the information used to justify the applicant's belief described in subsection (a)(3).''.

(h) LIMITATION ON ISSUANCE OF ORDER.—Section 105(a) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1805(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) for an application that is based, in whole or in part, on information obtained from the content of a media source or information gathered by a political campaign—

''(A) such information is disclosed in the application as having been so obtained or gathered;

''(B) with regard to information gathered from the content of a media source, the application includes an explanation of the investigative techniques used to corroborate the information; and

''(C) with regard to information gathered by a political campaign, such information is not the sole source of the information used to justify the applicant's belief described in section 104(a)(3).''.

SEC. 202. CRIMINAL PENALTIES FOR VIOLATIONS OF FISA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 109 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1809) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''intentionally'';

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''intentionally'' before ''engages''; and

(ii) by striking ''or'' at the end;

(C) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by inserting ''intentionally'' before ''disclose''; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) knowingly submits any document to or makes any false statement before the court established under section 103(a) or the court established under section 103(b), knowing such document or statement to contain—

''(A) a false material declaration; or

''(B) a material omission; or

''(4) knowingly discloses the existence of an application for an order authorizing surveillance under this title, or any information contained therein, to any person not authorized to receive such information, except insofar as such disclosure is authorized by statute or executive order setting forth permissible disclosures by whistleblowers.''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by striking ''five'' and inserting ''8''.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This section and the amendments made by this section may not be construed to interfere with the enforcement of section 798 of title 18, United States Code, or any other provision of law regarding the unlawful disclosure of classified information.

SEC. 203. INCREASED PENALTIES FOR CIVIL ACTIONS.

(a) INCREASED PENALTIES.—Section 110 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1810) is amended by striking subsection (a) and inserting the following:

''(a) actual damages, but not less than liquidated damages equal to the greater of—

''(1) if the aggrieved person is a United States person, $10,000 or $1,000 per day for each day of violation; or

''(2) for any other aggrieved person, $1,000 or $100 per day for each day of violation;''.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Title I of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 is amended by inserting after section 110 the following:

"SEC. 110A. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR CIVIL ACTIONS.

''(a) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—If a court finds that a person has violated this Act in a civil action under section 110, the head of the agency that employs that person shall report to Congress on the administrative action taken against that person pursuant to section 607 or any other provision of law.

''(b) FISC.—If a court finds that a person has violated this Act in a civil action under section 110, the head of the agency that employs that person shall report the name of such person to the court established under section 103(a). Such court shall maintain a list of each person about whom it received a report under this subsection.''.

SEC. 204. AGENCY PROCEDURES TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE.

(a) AGENCY PROCEDURES TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE.—Title VI of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 605. AGENCY PROCEDURES TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE.

''The head of each Federal department or agency authorized to acquire foreign intelligence information under this Act shall establish procedures—

''(1) setting forth clear rules on what constitutes a violation of this Act by an officer or employee of that department or agency; and

''(2) for taking appropriate adverse personnel action against any officer or employee of the department or agency who engages in a violation described in paragraph (1), including more severe adverse personnel actions for any subsequent violation by such officer or employee.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 604 the following:

''Sec. 605. Agency procedures to ensure compliance.''.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each Federal department or agency that is required to establish procedures under section 605 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as added by subsection (a) of this section, shall report to Congress on the implementation of such procedures.

SEC. 205. LIMIT ON CIVIL IMMUNITY FOR PROVIDING INFORMATION, FACILITIES, OR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO THE GOVERNMENT ABSENT A COURT ORDER.

Section 2511(2)(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (ii), by striking clause (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) a certification in writing—

''

''(I) by a person specified in section 2518(7) or the Attorney General of the United States;

''(II) that the requirements for an emergency authorization to intercept a wire, oral, or electronic communication under section 2518(7) have been met; and

''(III) that the specified assistance is required,''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (iii) and inserting the following:

''(iii) For assistance provided pursuant to a certification under subparagraph (ii)(B), the limitation on causes of action under the last sentence of the matter following that subparagraph shall only apply to the extent that the assistance ceased at the earliest of the time the application for a court order was denied, the time the communication sought was obtained, or 48 hours after the interception began.''.

TITLE III—REFORMS RELATING TO PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT AND OTHER COURTS

SEC. 301. FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT REFORM.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR SAME JUDGE TO HEAR RENEWAL APPLICATIONS.—Section 103(a)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''To the extent practicable, no judge designated under this subsection shall hear a renewal application for electronic surveillance under this Act, which application was previously granted by another judge designated under this subsection, unless the term of the judge who granted the application has expired, or that judge is otherwise no longer serving on the court.''.

(b) USE OF AMICI CURIAE IN FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE SURVEILLANCE COURT PROCEEDINGS.—

(1) EXPANSION OF APPOINTMENT AUTHORITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(i)(2) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(2)) is amended—

(i) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) shall, unless the court issues a finding that appointment is not appropriate, appoint 1 or more individuals who have been designated under paragraph (1), not fewer than 1 of whom possesses privacy and civil liberties expertise, unless the court finds that such a qualification is inappropriate, to serve as amicus curiae to assist the court in the consideration of any application or motion for an order or review that, in the opinion of the court—

''(i) presents a novel or significant interpretation of the law;

''(ii) presents significant concerns with respect to the activities of a United States person that are protected by the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

''(iii) presents or involves a sensitive investigative matter;

''(iv) presents a request for approval of a new program, a new technology, or a new use of existing technology;

''(v) presents a request for reauthorization of programmatic surveillance; or

''(vi) otherwise presents novel or significant civil liberties issues; and''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''an individual or organization'' each place the term appears and inserting ''1 or more individuals or organizations''.

(B) DEFINITION OF SENSITIVE INVESTIGATIVE MATTER.—Section 103(i) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(12) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term 'sensitive investigative matter' means—

''(A) an investigative matter involving the activities of—

''(i) a domestic public official or political candidate, or an individual serving on the staff of such an official or candidate;

''(ii) a domestic religious or political organization, or a known or suspected United States person prominent in such an organization; or

''(iii) the domestic news media; or

''(B) any other investigative matter involving a domestic entity or a known or suspected United States person that, in the judgment of the applicable court established under subsection (a) or (b), is as sensitive as an investigative matter described in subparagraph (A).''.

(2) AUTHORITY TO SEEK REVIEW.—Section 103(i) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)), as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the paragraph heading, by inserting ''; AUTHORITY'' after ''DUTIES'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(iii) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so redesignated, by striking ''the amicus curiae shall'' and inserting the following: ''the amicus curiae—

''(A) shall'';

(iv) in subparagraph (A)(i), as so redesignated, by inserting before the semicolon at the end the following: '', including legal arguments regarding any privacy or civil liberties interest of any United States person that would be significantly impacted by the application or motion''; and

(v) by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: ''; and

''(B) may seek leave to raise any novel or significant privacy or civil liberties issue relevant to the application or motion or other issue directly impacting the legality of the proposed electronic surveillance with the court, regardless of whether the court has requested assistance on that issue.'';

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (7) through (12) as paragraphs (8) through (13), respectively; and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) AUTHORITY TO SEEK REVIEW OF DECISIONS.—

''(A) FISA COURT DECISIONS.—

''(i) PETITION.—Following issuance of an order under this Act by the court established under subsection (a), an amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) may petition the court to certify for review to the court established under subsection (b) a question of law pursuant to subsection (j).

''(ii) WRITTEN STATEMENT OF REASONS.—If the court established under subsection (a) denies a petition under this subparagraph, the court shall provide for the record a written statement of the reasons for the denial.

''(iii) APPOINTMENT.—Upon certification of any question of law pursuant to this subparagraph, the court established under subsection (b) shall appoint the amicus curiae to assist the court in its consideration of the certified question, unless the court issues a finding that such appointment is not appropriate.

''(B) FISA COURT OF REVIEW DECISIONS.—An amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) may petition the court established under subsection (b) to certify for review to the Supreme Court of the United States any question of law pursuant to section 1254(2) of title 28, United States Code.

''(C) DECLASSIFICATION OF REFERRALS.—For purposes of section 602, a petition filed under subparagraph (A) or (B) of this paragraph and all of its content shall be considered a decision, order, or opinion issued by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review described in section 602(a).''.

(3) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—

(A) APPLICATION AND MATERIALS.—Section 103(i)(6) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(6)) is amended by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—

''(i) RIGHT OF AMICUS.—If a court established under subsection (a) or (b) appoints an amicus curiae under paragraph (2), the amicus curiae—

''(I) shall have access, to the extent such information is available to the Government, to—

''(aa) the application, certification, petition, motion, and other information and supporting materials, including any information described in section 901, submitted to the court established under subsection (a) in connection with the matter in which the amicus curiae has been appointed, including access to any relevant legal precedent (including any such precedent that is cited by the Government, including in such an application);

''(bb) an unredacted copy of each relevant decision made by the court established under subsection (a) or the court established under subsection (b) in which the court decides a question of law, without regard to whether the decision is classified; and

''(cc) any other information or materials that the court determines are relevant to the duties of the amicus curiae; and

''(II) may make a submission to the court requesting access to any other particular materials or information (or category of materials or information) that the amicus curiae believes to be relevant to the duties of the amicus curiae.

''(ii) SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION REGARDING ACCURACY.—The court established under subsection (a), upon the motion of an amicus

curiae appointed under paragraph (2) or upon its own motion, may require the Government to make available the supporting documentation described in section 902.''.

(B) CLARIFICATION OF ACCESS TO CERTAIN INFORMATION.—Section 103(i)(6) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(6)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''may'' and inserting ''shall''; and

(ii) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—An amicus curiae designated or appointed by the court shall have access, to the extent such information is available to the Government, to unredacted copies of each opinion, order, transcript, pleading, or other document of the court established under subsection (a) and the court established under subsection (b), including, if the individual is eligible for access to classified information, any classified documents, information, and other materials or proceedings.''.

(C) CONSULTATION AMONG AMICI CURIAE.—Section 103(i)(6) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1803(i)(6)) is amended—

(i) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(ii) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

''(D) CONSULTATION AMONG AMICI CURIAE.—An amicus curiae appointed under paragraph (2) by the court established under subsection (a) or the court established under subsection (b) may consult with 1 or more of the other individuals designated by the court to serve as amicus curiae pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection regarding any of the information relevant to any assigned proceeding.''.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act and shall apply with respect to proceedings under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) that take place on or after, or are pending on, that date.

SEC. 302. PUBLIC DISCLOSURE AND DECLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.

(a) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Section 601(c)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1871(c)) is amended by inserting '', including declassified copies that have undergone review under section 602'' before ''; and''.

(b) TIMELINE FOR DECLASSIFICATION REVIEW.—Section 602(a) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1872(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting '', to be concluded not later than 180 days after the issuance of such decision, order, or opinion,'' after ''(as defined in section 601(e))''; and

(2) by inserting ''or results in a change of application of any provision of this Act or a novel application of any provision of this Act'' after ''law''.

SEC. 303. SUBMISSION OF COURT TRANSCRIPTS TO CONGRESS.

Section 601(c) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1871(c)), as amended by section 302 of this Act, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) for any matter at which a court reporter is present and creates a transcript of a hearing or oral argument before the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review, a copy of each such transcript not later than 45 days after the government's receipt of the transcript or the date on which the matter concerning such hearing or oral argument is resolved, whichever is later.''.

SEC. 304. CONTEMPT POWER OF FISC AND FISCR.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 21 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 402, by inserting after ''any district court of the United States'' the following: '', the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review,''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''§ 404. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter—

''(1) the term 'court of the United States' includes the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court or the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review; and

''(2) the terms 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court' and 'Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review' have the meanings given those terms in section 601(e) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1871(e)).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 21 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''404. Definitions.''.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court and the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court of Review (as those terms are defined in section 601(e) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1871(e))) shall jointly submit to Congress a report on the exercise of authority under chapter 21 of title 18, United States Code, by those courts during the 1-year period ending on the date that is 60 days before the date of submission of the report.

TITLE IV—INDEPENDENT EXECUTIVE BRANCH OVERSIGHT

SEC. 401. PERIODIC AUDIT OF FISA COMPLIANCE BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Title VI of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1871 et seq.), as amended by section 204 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 606. PERIODIC AUDIT OF FISA COMPLIANCE BY INSPECTOR GENERAL.

''Not later than June 30 of the first calendar year that begins after the date of enactment of this section, and every 5 years thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall—

''(1) conduct an audit of alleged or potential violations and failures to comply with the requirements of this Act, and any procedures established pursuant to this Act, which shall include an analysis of the accuracy and completeness of applications and certifications for orders submitted under each of sections 105, 303, 402, 502, 702, 703, and 704; and

''(2) submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the audit required under paragraph (1).''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents for the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978, as amended by section 204 of this Act, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 605 the following:

''Sec. 606. Periodic audit of FISA compliance by Inspector General.''.

SEC. 402. INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY PARITY AND COMMUNICATIONS WITH PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.

(a) WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY FOR COMMUNICATIONS WITH PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.—Section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3234) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), in the matter before subparagraph (A), by inserting ''the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board,'' after ''Inspector General of the Intelligence Community,''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1)(A), in the matter before clause (i), by inserting ''the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board,'' after ''Inspector General of the Intelligence Community,''.

(b) PARITY IN PAY FOR PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD STAFF AND THE INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—Section 1061(j)(1) of the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee(j)(1)) is amended by striking ''except that'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''except that no rate of pay fixed under this subsection may exceed the highest amount paid by any element of the intelligence community for a comparable position, based on salary information provided to the chairman of the Board by the Director of National Intelligence.''.

TITLE V—PROTECTIONS FOR UNITED STATES PERSONS WHOSE SENSITIVE INFORMATION IS PURCHASED BY INTELLIGENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES

SEC. 501. LIMITATION ON INTELLIGENCE ACQUISITION OF UNITED STATES PERSON DATA.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the congressional intelligence committees (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003));

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(C) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(2) COVERED DATA.—The term ''covered data'' means data, derived data, or any unique identifier that—

(A) is linked to or is reasonably linkable to a covered person; and

(B) does not include data that—

(i) is lawfully available to the public through Federal, State, or local government records or through widely distributed media;

(ii) is reasonably believed to have been voluntarily made available to the general public by the covered person; or

(iii) is a specific communication or transaction with a targeted individual who is not a covered person.

(3) COVERED PERSON.—The term ''covered person'' means an individual who—

(A) is reasonably believed to be located in the United States at the time of the creation or acquisition of the covered data; or

(B) is a United States person.

(4) INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY.—The term ''intelligence community'' has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

(5) STATE, UNITED STATES, UNITED STATES PERSON.—The terms ''State'', ''United States'', and ''United States person'' have the meanings given such terms in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(b) LIMITATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) through (7), an element of the intelligence community may not acquire a dataset that includes covered data.

(2) AUTHORIZATION PURSUANT TO COURT ORDER.—An element of the intelligence community may acquire covered data if the collection has been authorized by an order or

emergency authorization issued pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) or title 18, United States Code, by a court of competent jurisdiction covering the period of the acquisition, subject to the use, dissemination, querying, retention, and other minimization limitations required by such authorization.

(3) AUTHORIZATION FOR EMPLOYMENT-RELATED USE.—An element of the intelligence community may acquire covered data about an employee of, or applicant for employment by, an element of the intelligence community for employment-related purposes, provided that—

(A) access to and use of the covered data is limited to such purposes; and

(B) the covered data is destroyed at such time as it is no longer necessary for such purposes.

(4) EXCEPTION FOR COMPLIANCE PURPOSES.—An element of the intelligence community may acquire covered data for the purpose of supporting compliance with collection limitations and minimization requirements imposed by statute, guidelines, procedures, or the Constitution of the United States, provided that—

(A) access to and use of the covered data is limited to such purpose; and

(B) the covered data is destroyed at such time as it is no longer necessary for such purpose.

(5) EXCEPTION FOR LIFE OR SAFETY.—An element of the intelligence community may acquire covered data if there is a reasonable belief than an emergency exists involving an imminent threat of death or serious bodily harm and the covered data is necessary to mitigate that threat, provided that—

(A) access to and use of the covered data is limited to addressing the threat; and

(B) the covered data is destroyed at such time as it is no longer necessary for such purpose.

(6) EXCEPTION FOR CONSENT.—An element of the intelligence community may acquire covered data if—

(A) each covered person linked or reasonably linkable to the covered data, or, if such person is incapable of providing consent, a third party legally authorized to consent on behalf of the person, has provided consent to the acquisition and use of the data on a case-by-case basis;

(B) access to and use of the covered data is limited to the purposes for which the consent was provided; and

(C) the covered data is destroyed at such time as it is no longer necessary for such purposes.

(7) EXCEPTION FOR NONSEGREGABLE DATA.—An element of the intelligence community may acquire a dataset that includes covered data if the covered data is not reasonably segregable prior to acquisition, provided that the element of the intelligence community complies with the minimization procedures in subsection (c).

(c) MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall adopt specific procedures that are reasonably designed to minimize the acquisition and retention, and to restrict the querying, of covered data that is not subject to 1 or more of the exceptions set forth in subsection (b).

(2) ACQUISITION AND RETENTION.—The procedures adopted under paragraph (1) shall require elements of the intelligence community to exhaust all reasonable means—

(A) to exclude covered data not subject to 1 or more exceptions set forth in subsection (b) from datasets prior to acquisition; and

(B) to remove and delete covered data not subject to 1 or more exceptions set forth in subsection (b) prior to the operational use of the acquired dataset or the inclusion of the dataset in a database intended for operational use.

(3) DESTRUCTION.—The procedures adopted under paragraph (1) shall require that if an element of the intelligence community identifies covered data not subject to 1 or more exceptions set forth in paragraphs (2) through (6) of subsection (b), such covered data shall be promptly destroyed.

(4) QUERYING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), no officer or employee of an element of the intelligence community may conduct a query of covered data, including covered data already subjected to minimization, in an effort to find records of or about a particular covered person.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a query related to a particular covered person if—

(i) such covered person is the subject of a court order or emergency authorization issued under the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) or title 18, United States Code, that would authorize the element of the intelligence community to compel the production of the covered data, during the effective period of that order;

(ii) the purpose of the query is to retrieve information about an employee of, or applicant for employment by, an element of the intelligence community, provided that any covered data accessed through such query is used only for such purpose;

(iii) the query is conducted for the purpose of supporting compliance with collection limitations and minimization requirements imposed by statute, guidelines, procedures, or the Constitution of the United States, provided that any covered data accessed through such query is used only for such purpose;

(iv) the officer or employee of an element of the intelligence community carrying out the query has a reasonable belief that an emergency exists involving an imminent threat of death or serious bodily harm, and that in order to prevent or mitigate such threat, the query must be conducted before a court order can, with due diligence, be obtained, provided that any covered data accessed through such query is used only for such purpose; or

(v) such covered person or, if such person is incapable of providing consent, a third party legally authorized to consent on behalf of the person has consented to the query, provided that any use of covered data accessed through such query is limited to the purposes for which the consent was provided.

(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR NONSEGREGABLE DATASETS.—For a query of a dataset acquired under subsection (b)(7)—

(i) each query shall be reasonably designed to exclude personal data of covered persons, unless the query is subject to an exception set forth in paragraph (4); and

(ii) any personal data of covered persons returned pursuant to a query that is not subject to an exception set forth in paragraphs (2) through (7) of subsection (b) shall not be reviewed and shall immediately be destroyed.

(d) PROHIBITION ON USE OF DATA OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF THIS SECTION.—Covered data acquired by an element of the intelligence community in violation of subsection (b), and any evidence derived therefrom, may not be used, received in evidence, or otherwise disseminated in any investigation by or in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, office, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or political subdivision thereof.

(e) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board a report on the acquisition of datasets that the Director anticipates will contain information of covered persons that is significant in volume, proportion, or sensitivity.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) A description of the covered person information in each dataset.

(B) An estimate of the amount of covered person information in each dataset.

(3) NOTIFICATIONS.—After submitting the report required by paragraph (1), the Director shall, in coordination with the Under Secretary of Defense for Intelligence and Security, notify the appropriate committees of Congress of any changes to the information contained in such report.

(4) AVAILABILITY TO THE PUBLIC.—The Director shall make available to the public on the website of the Director—

(A) the unclassified portion of the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1); and

(B) any notifications submitted pursuant to paragraph (3).

(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall authorize an acquisition otherwise prohibited by the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.) or title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 502. LIMITATION ON LAW ENFORCEMENT PURCHASE OF PERSONAL DATA FROM DATA BROKERS.

Section 2702 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) PROHIBITION ON OBTAINING IN EXCHANGE FOR ANYTHING OF VALUE PERSONAL DATA BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection and subsection (f)—

''(A) the term 'covered governmental entity' means a law enforcement agency of a governmental entity;

''(B) the term 'covered organization' means a person who—

''(i) is not a governmental entity; and

''(ii) is not an individual;

''(C) the term 'covered person' means an individual who—

''(i) is reasonably believed to be located inside the United States at the time of the creation of the covered personal data; or

''(ii) is a United States person, as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801);

''(D) the term 'covered personal data' means personal data relating to a covered person;

''(E) the term 'electronic device' has the meaning given the term 'computer' in section 1030(e);

''(F) the term 'lawfully obtained public data' means personal data obtained by a particular covered organization that the covered organization—

''(i) reasonably understood to have been voluntarily made available to the general public by the covered person; and

''(ii) obtained in compliance with all applicable laws, regulations, contracts, privacy policies, and terms of service;

''(G) the term 'obtain in exchange for anything of value' means to obtain by purchasing, to receive in connection with services being provided for monetary or nonmonetary consideration, or to otherwise obtain in exchange for consideration, including an access fee, service fee, maintenance fee, or licensing fee; and

''(H) the term 'personal data'—

''(i) means data, derived data, or any unique identifier that is linked to, or is reasonably linkable to, an individual or to an electronic device that is linked to, or is reasonably linkable to, 1 or more individuals in a household;

''(ii) includes anonymized data that, if combined with other data, can be linked to, or is reasonably linkable to, an individual or to an electronic device that identifies, is linked to, or is reasonably linkable to 1 or more individuals in a household; and

''(iii) does not include—

''(I) data that is lawfully available through Federal, State, or local government records or through widely distributed media; or

''(II) a specific communication or transaction with a targeted individual who is not a covered person.

''(2) LIMITATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—

''(i) PROHIBITION.—Subject to clauses (ii) through (x), a covered governmental entity may not obtain in exchange for anything of value covered personal data if—

''(I) the covered personal data is directly or indirectly obtained from a covered organization; or

''(II) the covered personal data is derived from covered personal data that was directly or indirectly obtained from a covered organization.

''(ii) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN COMPILATIONS OF DATA.—A covered governmental entity may obtain in exchange for something of value covered personal data as part of a larger compilation of data which includes personal data about persons who are not covered persons, if—

''(I) the covered governmental entity is unable through reasonable means to exclude covered personal data from the larger compilation obtained; and

''(II) the covered governmental entity minimizes any covered personal data from the larger compilation, in accordance with subsection (f).

''(iii) EXCEPTION FOR WHISTLEBLOWER DISCLOSURES TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.—Clause (i) shall not apply to covered personal data that is obtained by a covered governmental entity under a program established by an Act of Congress under which a portion of a penalty or a similar payment or bounty is paid to an individual who discloses information about an unlawful activity to the Government, such as the program authorized under section 7623 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to awards to whistleblowers in cases of underpayments or fraud).

''(iv) EXCEPTION FOR COST REIMBURSEMENT UNDER COMPULSORY LEGAL PROCESS.—Clause (i) shall not apply to covered personal data that is obtained by a covered governmental entity from a covered organization in accordance with compulsory legal process that—

''(I) is established by a Federal or State statute; and

''(II) provides for the reimbursement of costs of the covered organization that are incurred in connection with providing the record or information to the covered governmental entity, such as the reimbursement of costs under section 2706.

''(v) EXCEPTION FOR EMPLOYMENT-RELATED USE.—Clause (i) shall not apply to covered personal data about an employee of, or applicant for employment by, a covered governmental entity that is—

''(I) obtained by the covered governmental entity for employment-related purposes;

''(II) accessed and used by the covered governmental entity only for employment-related purposes; and

''(III) destroyed at such time as the covered personal data is no longer needed for employment-related purposes.

''(vi) EXCEPTION FOR USE IN BACKGROUND CHECKS.—Clause (i) shall not apply to covered personal data about a covered person that is—

''(I) obtained by a covered governmental entity for purposes of conducting a background check of the covered person with the written consent of the covered person;

''(II) accessed and used by the covered governmental entity only for background check-related purposes; and

''(III) destroyed at such time as the covered personal data is no longer needed for background check-related purposes.

''(vii) EXCEPTION FOR LAWFULLY OBTAINED PUBLIC DATA.—Clause (i) shall not apply to covered personal data that is obtained by a covered governmental entity if—

''(I) the covered personal data is lawfully obtained public data; or

''(II) the covered personal data is derived from covered personal data that solely consists of lawfully obtained public data.

''(viii) EXCEPTION FOR LIFE OR SAFETY.—Clause (i) shall not apply to covered personal data that is obtained by a covered governmental entity if there is a reasonable belief than an emergency exists involving an imminent threat of death or serious bodily harm to a covered person and the covered data is necessary to mitigate that threat, provided that—

''(I) access to and use of the covered personal data is limited to addressing the threat; and

''(II) the covered personal data is destroyed at such time as it is no longer necessary for such purpose.

''(ix) EXCEPTION FOR COMPLIANCE PURPOSES.—Clause (i) shall not apply to covered personal data that is obtained by a covered governmental entity for the purpose of supporting compliance with collection limitations and minimization requirements imposed by statute, guidelines, procedures, or the Constitution of the United States, provided that—

''(I) access to and use of the covered personal data is limited to such purpose; and

''(II) the covered personal data is destroyed at such time as it is no longer necessary for such purpose.

''(x) EXCEPTION FOR CONSENT.—Clause (i) shall not apply to covered personal data that is obtained by a covered governmental entity if—

''(I) each covered person linked or reasonably linkable to the covered personal data, or, if such covered person is incapable of providing consent, a third party legally authorized to consent on behalf of the covered person, has provided consent to the acquisition and use of the data on a case-by-case basis;

''(II) access to and use of the covered personal data is limited to the purposes for which the consent was provided; and

''(III) the covered personal data is destroyed at such time as it is no longer necessary for such purposes.

''(B) INDIRECTLY ACQUIRED RECORDS AND INFORMATION.—The limitation under subparagraph (A) shall apply without regard to whether the covered organization possessing the covered personal data is the covered organization that initially obtained or collected, or is the covered organization that initially received the disclosure of, the covered personal data.

''(3) LIMIT ON SHARING BETWEEN AGENCIES.—An agency of a governmental entity that is not a covered governmental entity may not provide to a covered governmental entity covered personal data that was obtained in a manner that would violate paragraph (2) if the agency of a governmental entity were a covered governmental entity, unless the covered governmental entity would have been permitted to obtain the covered personal data under an exception set forth in paragraph (2)(A).

''(4) PROHIBITION ON USE OF DATA OBTAINED IN VIOLATION OF THIS SECTION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Covered personal data obtained by or provided to a covered governmental entity in violation of paragraph (2) or (3), and any evidence derived therefrom, may not be used, received in evidence, or otherwise disseminated by, on behalf of, or upon a motion or other action by a covered governmental entity in any investigation by or in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, officer, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision thereof.

''(B) USE BY AGGRIEVED PARTIES.—Nothing in subparagraph (A) shall be construed to limit the use of covered personal data by a covered person aggrieved of a violation of paragraph (2) or (3) in connection with any action relating to such a violation.

''(f) MINIMIZATION PROCEDURES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall adopt specific procedures that are reasonably designed to minimize the acquisition and retention, and to restrict the querying, of covered personal data, and prohibit the dissemination of information derived from covered personal data.

''(2) ACQUISITION AND RETENTION.—The procedures adopted under paragraph (1) shall require covered governmental entities to exhaust all reasonable means—

''(A) to exclude covered personal data that is not subject to 1 or more of the exceptions set forth in clauses (iii) through (x) of subsection (e)(2)(A) from the data obtained; and

''(B) to remove and delete covered personal data described in subparagraph (A) not subject to 1 or more exceptions set forth in clauses (iii) through (x) of subsection (e)(2)(A) after a compilation is obtained and before operational use of the compilation or inclusion of the compilation in a dataset intended for operational use.

''(3) DESTRUCTION.—The procedures adopted under paragraph (1) shall require that, if a covered governmental entity identifies covered personal data in a compilation described in clause (ii) of subsection (e)(2)(A) not subject to 1 or more exceptions set forth in clauses (iii) through (x) of such subsection, the covered governmental entity shall promptly destroy the covered personal data and any dissemination of information derived from the covered personal data shall be prohibited.

''(4) QUERYING.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), no officer or employee of a covered governmental entity may conduct a query of personal data, including personal data already subjected to minimization, in an effort to find records of or about a particular covered person.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a query related to a particular covered person if—

''(i) such covered person is the subject of a court order or emergency authorization issued under this title that would authorize the covered governmental entity to compel the production of the covered personal data, during the effective period of that order;

''(ii) the purpose of the query is to retrieve information obtained by a covered governmental entity under a program established by an Act of Congress under which a portion of a penalty or a similar payment or bounty is paid to an individual who discloses information about an unlawful activity to the Government, such as the program authorized under section 7623 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to awards to whistleblowers in cases of underpayments or fraud),

provided that any covered personal data accessed through such query is used only for such purpose;

''(iii) the purpose of the query is to retrieve information about an employee of, or applicant for employment by, a covered governmental entity that has been obtained by the covered governmental entity for employment-related purposes, provided that any covered personal data accessed through such query is used only for such purposes;

''(iv) the purpose of the query is to retrieve information obtained by a covered governmental entity for purposes of conducting a background check of the covered person with the written consent of the covered person, provided that any covered personal data accessed through such query is used only for such purposes;

''(v) the purpose of the query is to retrieve, and the query is reasonably designed to retrieve, only lawfully obtained public data, and only lawfully obtained public data is accessed and used as a result of the query;

''(vi) the officer or employee of a covered governmental entity carrying out the query has a reasonable belief that an emergency exists involving an imminent threat of death or serious bodily harm, and in order to prevent or mitigate that threat, the query must be conducted before a court order can, with due diligence, be obtained, provided that any covered personal data accessed through such query is used only for such purpose;

''(vii) the query is conducted for the purpose of supporting compliance with collection limitations and minimization requirements imposed by statute, guidelines, procedures, or the Constitution of the United States, provided that any covered personal data accessed through such query is used only for such purpose; or

''(viii) such covered person or, if such covered person is incapable of providing consent, a third party legally authorized to consent on behalf of the covered person has consented to the query, provided that any use of covered personal data accessed through such query is limited to the purposes for which the consent was provided.

''(C) SPECIAL RULE FOR COMPILATIONS OF DATA.—For a query of a compilation of data obtained under subsection (e)(2)(A)(ii)—

''(i) each query shall be reasonably designed to exclude personal data of covered persons, unless the query is subject to an exception set forth in subparagraph (B); and

''(ii) any personal data of covered persons returned pursuant to a query that is not subject to an exception set forth in clauses (ii) through (iii) of subsection (e)(2)(A) shall not be reviewed and shall immediately be destroyed.''.

SEC. 503. CONSISTENT PROTECTIONS FOR DEMANDS FOR DATA HELD BY INTERACTIVE COMPUTING SERVICES.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 2711 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(C), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) the term 'online service provider' means a provider of electronic communication service, a provider of remote computing service, any information service, system, or access software provider that provides or enables computer access by multiple users to a computer server, including specifically a service or system that provides access to the Internet and such systems operated or services offered by libraries or educational institutions; and''.

(b) REQUIRED DISCLOSURE.—Section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), in the first sentence, by striking ''a provider of electronic communication service'' and inserting ''an online service provider'';

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service'' and inserting ''an online service provider''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking ''A provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service'' and inserting ''An online service provider''; and

(3) in subsection (g), by striking ''a provider of electronic communications service or remote computing service'' and inserting ''an online service provider''.

(c) LIMITATION ON VOLUNTARY DISCLOSURE.—Section 2702(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''a person or entity providing an electronic communication service to the public'' and inserting ''an online service provider'';

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''a person or entity providing remote computing service to the public'' and inserting ''an online service provider''; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking ''a provider of remote computing service or electronic communication service to the public'' and inserting ''an online service provider''.

SEC. 504. CONSISTENT PRIVACY PROTECTIONS FOR DATA HELD BY DATA BROKERS.

Section 2703 of title 18, United States Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) COVERED PERSONAL DATA.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms 'covered personal data' and 'covered organization' have the meanings given such terms in section 2702(e).

''(2) LIMITATION.—Unless a governmental entity obtains an order in accordance with paragraph (3), the governmental entity may not require a covered organization that is not an online service provider to disclose covered personal data if a court order would be required for the governmental entity to require an online service provider to disclose such covered personal data that is a record of a customer or subscriber of the online service provider.

''(3) ORDERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A court may only issue an order requiring a covered organization that is not an online service provider to disclose covered personal data on the same basis and subject to the same limitations as would apply to a court order to require disclosure by an online service provider.

''(B) STANDARD.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), a court shall apply the most stringent standard under Federal statute or the Constitution of the United States that would be applicable to a request for a court order to require a comparable disclosure by an online service provider of a customer or subscriber of the online service provider.''.

SEC. 505. PROTECTION OF DATA ENTRUSTED TO INTERMEDIARY OR ANCILLARY SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) DEFINITION.—Section 2711 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by section 503 of this Act, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(6) the term 'intermediary or ancillary service provider' means an entity or facilities owner or operator that directly or indirectly delivers, transmits, stores, or processes communications or any other covered personal data (as defined in section 2702(e) of this title) for, or on behalf of, an online service provider.''.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Section 2702(a) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(4) an intermediary or ancillary service provider may not knowingly disclose—

''(A) to any person or entity the contents of a communication while in electronic storage by that intermediary or ancillary service provider; or

''(B) to any governmental entity a record or other information pertaining to a subscriber to or customer of, a recipient of a communication from a subscriber to or customer of, or the sender of a communication to a subscriber to or customer of, the online service provider for, or on behalf of, which the intermediary or ancillary service provider directly or indirectly delivers, transmits, stores, or processes communications or any other covered personal data (as defined in subsection (e)).''.

TITLE VI—TRANSPARENCY

SEC. 601. ENHANCED REPORTS BY DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 603(b) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1873(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking the semicolon and inserting ''; and'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (3) through (7) as paragraphs (6) through (10), respectively;

(3) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) a description of the subject matter of each of the certifications provided under section 702(h);

''(4) statistics revealing the number of persons targeted and the number of selectors used under section 702(a), disaggregated by the certification under which the person was targeted;

''(5) the total number of directives issued pursuant to section 702(i)(1), disaggregated by each type of electronic communication service provider described in section 701(b)(4);'';

(4) in paragraph (9), as so redesignated, by striking ''and'' at the end;

(5) in paragraph (10), as so redesignated, by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''(11)(A) the total number of disseminated intelligence reports derived from collection pursuant to section 702 containing the identities of United States persons, regardless of whether the identities of the United States persons were openly included or masked;

''(B) the total number of disseminated intelligence reports derived from collection not authorized by this Act and conducted under procedures approved by the Attorney General containing the identities of United States persons, regardless of whether the identities of the United States persons were openly included or masked;

''(C) the total number of disseminated intelligence reports derived from collection pursuant to section 702 containing the identities of United States persons in which the identities of the United States persons were masked;

''(D) the total number of disseminated intelligence reports derived from collection not authorized by this Act and conducted under procedures approved by the Attorney General containing the identities of United States persons in which the identities of the United States persons were masked;

''(E) the total number of disseminated intelligence reports derived from collection pursuant to section 702 containing the identities of United States persons in which the identities of the United States persons were openly included; and

''(F) the total number of disseminated intelligence reports derived from collection not authorized by this Act and conducted under procedures approved by the Attorney General containing the identities of United States persons in which the identities of the United States persons were openly included;

''(12) the number of queries conducted in an effort to find communications or information of or about 1 or more United States persons or persons reasonably believed to be located in the United States at the time of the query or the time of the communication or creation of the information, where such communications or information were obtained under procedures approved by the Attorney General and without a court order, subpoena, or other legal process established by statute;

''(13) the number of criminal proceedings in which the Federal Government or a government of a State or political subdivision thereof entered into evidence or otherwise used or disclosed in a criminal proceeding any information obtained or derived from an acquisition conducted under procedures approved by the Attorney General and without a court order, subpoena, or other legal process established by statute; and

''(14) a good faith estimate of what percentage of the communications that are subject to the procedures described in section 309(b)(3) of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (50 U.S.C. 1813(b)(3))—

''(A) are retained for more than 5 years; and

''(B) are retained for more than 5 years because, in whole or in part, the communications are encrypted.''.

(b) REPEAL OF NONAPPLICABILITY TO FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS.—Section 603(d) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1873(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (2); and

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2).

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 603(d)(1) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1873(d)(1)) is amended by striking ''paragraphs (3), (5), or (6)'' and inserting ''paragraph (6), (8), or (9)''.

TITLE VII—LIMITED DELAYS IN IMPLEMENTATION

SEC. 701. LIMITED DELAYS IN IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the congressional intelligence committees (as defined in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003));

(2) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(3) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

(b) AUTHORITY.—The Attorney General may, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence as may be appropriate, delay implementation of a provision of this Act or an amendment made by this Act for a period of not more than 1 year upon a showing to the appropriate committees of Congress that the delay is necessary—

(1) to develop and implement technical systems needed to comply with the provision or amendment; or

(2) to hire or train personnel needed to comply with the provision or amendment.

By Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Ms. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S.J. Res. 65. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Reconsideration of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, on another matter, last week, in the State of the Union Address, President Biden bragged that he was taking ''the most significant action on climate ever in the history of the world.''

What he failed to mention is that his radical climate policy almost always comes at the expense of American workers and job creators.

Just recently, the Biden administration rolled out yet another job-killing mandate that would impose more unilateral economic pain here at home. This one goes well beyond the regulatory standards of most of our European allies, let alone our top strategic competitor, China.

The EPA wants to tighten limits on fine particulates in the air, known as PM2.5, despite its own data showing that concentrations have actually gone down by over 40 percent in the last two decades. The vast majority of these emissions come from sources like wildfires and dust from agriculture and roads that are not easily contained and, in some cases, impossible to control. We are talking about a climate boogeyman conjured out of smoke and dust.

The EPA's new standard is so strict that when it takes effect, 30 percent of U.S. counties, including many in my home State, would immediately find themselves out of compliance, grounding manufacturing growth to a halt. Meanwhile, the job of actually implementing the EPA's new mandate will fall to the States that are forced to inherit all the costs of this bad policy—from offshore manufacturing jobs to greater reliance on China to higher prices when Americans can least afford it.

In order to keep up with President Biden's new mandate, American manufacturers would be forced to import raw materials, like concrete and steel, for virtually any construction project—the kind of projects that grow our economy and support good-paying jobs. In other words, the Biden administration is saying, in no uncertain terms, that they are willing to make our economy more—more—dependent on foreign supply chains just to appease the green activists in this country.

So it is no surprise that State leaders are pushing back on this ruling. Kentucky Attorney General Russell Coleman is leading a lawsuit with West Virginia to challenge the EPA's mandate; and so far, nearly half of our States have signed on. Unlike the Biden administration, local and State leaders understand just how damaging this new rule would be for workers and for job creators back home.

So today, I am happy to announce that Senate Republicans stand ready to do our part. Today, I am introducing a resolution under the Congressional Review Act that would prevent the EPA from plowing ahead with this senseless regulatory overkill.

I am thankful to more than 40 colleagues who have joined my resolution, so far, as cosponsors. Senate Republicans will continue to stand with American workers and job creators, especially when the Biden administration tries to make their work so much harder.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S.J. RES. 65

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress disapproves the rule submitted by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency relating to ''Reconsideration of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter'' (89 Fed. Reg. 16202 (March 6, 2024)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 588—RECOGNIZING MARCH 14, 2024, AS ''BLACK MIDWIVES DAY''

Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. BUTLER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 588

Whereas recognizing March 14, 2024, as ''Black Midwives Day'' underscores the importance of midwifery in helping to achieve better maternal health outcomes by addressing fundamental gaps in access to high-quality care and multiple aspects of well-being;

Whereas the Black Midwives Day campaign, founded in 2023 and led by the National Black Midwives Alliance, establishes March 14th as Black Midwives Day as a day of awareness, activism, education, and community building;

Whereas March 14, 2024, is intended to increase attention on the state of Black maternal health in the United States, the root causes of poor maternal health outcomes for

Black birthing people, and the need for community-driven policies, programs, and care solutions;

Whereas the United States is experiencing a maternity care desert crisis in which 2,200,000 women of childbearing age live in maternity care deserts where they do not have access to hospitals or birth centers offering maternity care or obstetric providers;

Whereas maternity care deserts lead to higher risks of maternal morbidity and mortality as most complications occur in the postpartum period when birthing people are far away from their providers;

Whereas incorporating midwives fully into the maternity care system in the United States would reduce maternal health disparities and help to address the maternity care desert crisis;

Whereas, despite the medicalization of childbirth in the United States, the maternal mortality rates in the United States are among the highest in high-income countries, increasing rapidly and disproportionately higher among Black birthing people;

Whereas maternal health is intractably linked to infant health, as the United States infant mortality rate rose 3 percent from a rate of 5.44 infant deaths per 1,000 live births in 2021 to 5.60 infant deaths per 1,000 live births in 2022, the largest increase in the infant mortality rate in 2 decades;

Whereas Black birthing people in the United States suffer from life threatening pregnancy complications, known as ''maternal morbidities'', twice as often as White birthing people;

Whereas deaths from maternal morbidities have devastating effects on Black children and families, and the vast majority of material morbidities are entirely preventable through assertive efforts to ensure that Black birthing people have access to information, services, and supports to make their own health care decisions, particularly around pregnancy and childbearing;

Whereas the high rates of maternal mortality among Black birthing people span across income levels, education levels, and socioeconomic statuses;

Whereas structural racism, gender oppression, and the social determinants of health inequities experienced by Black birthing people in the United States significantly contribute to the disproportionately high rates of maternal mortality and morbidity among Black birthing people;

Whereas Black birthing people are more likely to report experiences of disrespect, abuse, and neglect when birthing in facility-based settings as compared to White people;

Whereas Black families benefit from access to Black midwives to receive culturally sensitive and congruent care established through trust and respect backed with the wisdom of time-honored techniques and best practices;

Whereas the work and contributions of past and present midwives who have ushered in new life have done so despite a history fraught with persecution, enslavement, violence, racism, and the systematic erasure of traditional and lay Black midwives throughout the 20th century;

Whereas the decline of midwifery across the southern United States reduced the numbers of Black midwives from thousands to dozens throughout the 20th century, leaving many communities without care providers;

Whereas some States have criminalized and suppressed direct-entry midwives, despite rising maternal mortality rates across the United States;

Whereas the resurgence of Black midwifery is a testament to the resilience, resistance, and determination of spirit in the preservation of healing modalities that are practiced all over the world;

Whereas the focus of Black midwifery on holistic care, which involves caring for the whole person, family and community, is what makes a difference in midwifery;

Whereas midwifery honors the right to bodily autonomy for the birthing person and can be facilitated at home, in a birth center, or hospital by working in tandem with doulas, community health workers, obstetricians, pediatricians, and other maternal, reproductive, and perinatal health care providers;

Whereas the Midwifery Model of Care has been proven to have better pregnancy outcomes, including by reducing infant mortality and morbidity, preterm births, reducing medical interventions, and providing the birthing person continuous support;

Whereas, in 2022, the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (referred to in this preamble as ''CERD'') of the United Nations expressed concerns regarding the impact of systemic racism and intersecting factors on access to comprehensive sexual and reproductive health services for women, and the limited availability of culturally sensitive and respectful maternal health care, particularly for those with low incomes, rural residents, individuals of African descent, and indigenous communities;

Whereas CERD recommended that the United States further develop policies and programs to eliminate racial and ethnic disparities in the field of sexual and reproductive health and rights, while integrating an intersectional and culturally respectful approach in order to reduce the high rates of maternal mortality and morbidity affecting racial and ethnic minorities, including through midwifery care;

Whereas, in 2023, the Human Rights Committee of the United Nations expressed similar concerns as CERD and further recommended that the United States take measures to remove restrictive and discriminatory legal and practice barriers to midwifery care, including those affecting Black and indigenous peoples;

Whereas a fair distribution of resources, especially with regard to reproductive health care services, is critical to closing the racial disparity gap in maternal health outcomes;

Whereas an investment must be made in robust, quality, and comprehensive health care for Black birthing people, with policies that support and promote affordable and holistic maternal health care that is free from gender and racial discrimination;

Whereas it is fitting and proper on Black Midwives Day to recognize the tremendous impact of the human rights, reproductive justice, and birth justice frameworks have on protecting and advancing the rights of Black birthing people;

Whereas Black Midwives Day is an opportunity to acknowledge the fight to end maternal mortality locally, nationally, and globally; and

Whereas Congress must mitigate the effects of systemic and structural racism to ensure that all Black people have access to midwives, doulas, and other community-based, culturally matched perinatal health providers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes March 14, 2024, as ''Black Midwives Day'';

(2) encourages the Federal Government and State and local governments to take proactive measures to address racial disparities in maternal health outcomes by supporting initiatives aimed at diversifying the perinatal workforce, increasing access to culturally congruent maternal health care;

(3) commits to collaborating with relevant stakeholders to develop and enact policy solutions that promote health equity, address systemic racism, and support the advancement of Black midwifery;

(4) calls for increased funding for education, training, and mentorship programs that focus on promoting and sustaining Black midwifery across all training pathways;

(5) encourages the Federal Government and State and local governments to authorize the autonomous practice of all midwives to the full extent of their training;

(6) promotes TRICARE and Medicaid coverage of maternity care provided by midwives of all training pathways in the setting of choice of the birthing person; and

(7) supports and recognizes the long-standing and invaluable contributions of Black midwives to maternal and infant health in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 589—HONORING WADEE ALFAYOUMI, A 6-YEAR-OLD PALESTINIAN-AMERICAN BOY, MURDERED AS A VICTIM OF A HATE CRIME FOR HIS PALESTINIAN-MUSLIM IDENTITY, IN THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. KAINE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. MENENDEZ) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 589

Whereas Wadee Alfayoumi, a 6-year-old Palestinian-Muslim-American boy, was loved by his family and friends as an energetic, loving, and joyous light who brought sunshine to his loved ones and classmates;

Whereas, on October 14, 2023, at 11:30 a.m., Wadee Alfayoumi was brutally stabbed 26 times by a hate-driven perpetrator and tragically succumbed to his injuries;

Whereas Wadee Alfayoumi's perpetrator has been indicted for a hate crime by the Will County, Illinois, grand jury, and the Department of Justice has opened a hate crimes investigation into the events leading to Wadee Alfayoumi's death, as there is evidence the perpetrator yelled during the brutal killing, ''All Muslims must die and your people must die'' and has been observed to be a consumer of media containing dehumanizing and hateful rhetoric that is anti-Muslim and anti-Palestinian;

Whereas Wadee Alfayoumi was born and raised in the United States, and his family wanted the United States to provide them a life of safety away from dehumanizing and hateful rhetoric toward Palestinian people;

Whereas no one should be a target of hate because of their ethnicity or religion, whether such ethnicity or religion is expressed verbally or through how one dresses, such as through the wearing of a hijab, keffiyeh, turban, mitpahat, tichel, shpitzel, sheitel, kippah, or yarmulke;

Whereas dehumanizing misinformation and disinformation fuel sentiments of hate that result in violence against those who belong or who are perceived to belong to a certain ethnic or religious group;

Whereas the Palestinian community's migration to the United States dates back to the late 19th century;

Whereas the United States is home to one of the largest Palestinian diasporas in the world that is made up of lawyers, doctors, teachers, business owners, law enforcement, and others, all who contribute to the history, arts, commerce, promise, and character of the United States;

Whereas Wadee Alfayoumi shared a heritage, history, love, culture, tradition, and

brilliance belonging to the Palestinian people and was a symbol of another great Palestinian life full of promise;

Whereas Palestinian children, Israeli children, children in the United States, and those all across the globe deserve to live in peace and be free from discrimination, hate crimes, and violence; and

Whereas the recent Israel-Gaza conflict has had a particularly devastating impact on children in the region, including at one point resulting in a Palestinian child dying every 10 minutes, according to the World Health Organization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate recognizes that—

(1) the United States lost the beautiful light of Wadee Alfayoumi because of hate;

(2) it is the duty of elected officials and media to tell the truth without dehumanizing rhetoric when informing the public of factual information;

(3) freedom of speech and peaceful protest are constitutionally protected and a fundamental cornerstone of democracy; and

(4) the United States has zero tolerance for hate crimes, Islamophobia, anti-Semitism, and anti-Palestinian and anti-Arab discrimination.

SENATE RESOLUTION 590—DESIGNATING MARCH 15, 2024, AS ''LONG COVID AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CASEY, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 590

Whereas Long COVID is a systemic and often debilitating and disabling long-term outcome of an acute COVID-19 infection;

Whereas Long COVID has the potential to worsen pre-existing health conditions and can cause death months to years after an acute COVID-19 infection;

Whereas there are more than 200 documented Long COVID symptoms, which can vary from person to person and can include fatigue, cognitive impairment, muscle or joint pain, shortness of breath, heart palpitations, sleep difficulties, mood changes, and damage to organ systems and tissue;

Whereas Long COVID can trigger other infection-associated chronic conditions such as postural orthostatic tachycardia syndrome and other forms of dysautonomia, mast cell activation syndrome, fibromyalgia, myalgic encephalomyelitis/chronic fatigue syndrome, and many others;

Whereas there is no single diagnostic test or protocol to confirm a Long COVID diagnosis;

Whereas many providers are unprepared to identify, diagnose, or treat Long COVID due to a lack of education and information, and some providers refrain from making a Long COVID diagnosis at all;

Whereas, according to estimates from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, there are 22,000,000 adults and 1,000,000 children currently living with Long COVID in the United States, and there are likely more;

Whereas Long COVID disproportionately affects racial and ethnic minorities, women, the elderly, people with disabilities, and those with lower incomes;

Whereas the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Justice have issued guidance clarifying that Long COVID can be considered a disability under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.);

Whereas Long COVID has had a devastating financial impact on individuals and on the overall economy with an estimated economic cost of $3,700,000,000,000 due to reduced quality of life, lost earnings, and direct medical care spending for those who suffer from Long COVID;

Whereas people with Long COVID are 10 percent less likely to be employed and those who are employed work 50 percent fewer hours than people without Long COVID;

Whereas there may be as many as 4,000,000 fewer workers in the United States workforce due to the impact of the disease;

Whereas there are no approved cures for Long COVID, and most of the treatments involve addressing individual symptoms using established therapies; and

Whereas investing in Long COVID research and promoting the development of treatment and diagnostic tools remain priorities to improve the quality of life for those impacted by Long COVID: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 15, 2024, as ''Long COVID Awareness Day'';

(2) recognizes patients and their families and caregivers who are affected by Long COVID;

(3) commends the work of doctors and researchers who continue to advance the study of Long COVID; and

(4) encourages relevant Federal agencies—

(A) to expand research efforts to develop effective treatments, diagnostics, and cures;

(B) to publish information on Long COVID to educate the public and providers about the impact of the condition; and

(C) to make every effort to ensure that patients and their families and caregivers receive adequate support and care.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I have five requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in open and closed session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 2024, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 2024, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 14, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the privileges of the floor be extended for the balance of the day for my intern, Lucas Rigsby.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following law clerks of the Senate Judiciary Committee be granted floor privileges until March 21, 2024: Casey Adams, Hannah Auten, Anna Pollard, and Patrick Reyes.

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

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following members of my staff be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the Congress: Natasha Kieval, Cassandra Worthington, Nicole Comisky, and Ryan Smith.

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

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF EMANCIPATION HALL IN THE CAPITOL VISITOR CENTER FOR A CEREMONY TO PRESENT THE CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL COLLECTIVELY TO THE 23D HEADQUARTERS SPECIAL TROOPS AND THE 3133D SIGNAL SERVICES COMPANY, KNOWN COLLECTIVELY AS THE ''GHOST ARMY''

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H. Con. Res. 84, which was received from the House and I understand is at the desk.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal collectively to the 23d Headquarters Special Troops and the 3133d Signal Services Company, known collectively as the ''Ghost Army'', in recognition of unique and highly distinguished service during World War II.

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

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I further ask that the concurrent resolution be agreed to and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 84) was agreed to.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 15, 2024

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned to convene for a pro forma session only, with no business being conducted, at 9:25 a.m. on Friday, March 15; that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Tuesday, March 19; that on Tuesday, following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Berner nomination postcloture; further, that if any nominations are confirmed during Tuesday's session, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; finally, that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen on Wednesday, March 20.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of my friend from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to give an update on my oversight work. I often speak on the floor about the importance of oversight. Now, my remarks today have some history that goes back from now back to 8 years ago, so it might not seem very important today, but I speak so the Defense Department won't make the same blunder they made over that period of time. That blunder I am talking about is the mess-up with the JEDI contract, a cloud contract.

The parable of the vineyard tells us about corrupt tenants who tried to steal someone's harvest and keep it for themselves. It is especially bad, then, when public officials try to take the fruit of the taxpayers' vineyard for private gain. We can't ignore this sort of corruption or it will surely get worse.

The 2019 planned Joint Enterprise Defense Infrastructure contract—otherwise known as JEDI—was an attempt to move the entire Defense Department to cloud, meaning cloud computing, which happened to be a very, very expensive project. It was around $10 billion and was ultimately canceled, as it should have been.

Ten billion dollars is a lot of tempting fruit, even by Washington, DC, standards. Early on, there were allegations that various Defense Department officials were helping the big corporation of Amazon behind the scenes to gain a contracting advantage. The allegations caused the inspector general of the Department of Defense to review the matter.

My oversight work started in 2019. My oversight has centered on conflicts of interest on the one hand, and on the other hand, the inspector general's review. It is a good-government oversight inquiry.

I know Amazon didn't end up getting this particular contract, but that doesn't matter to my oversight and what I am telling you today. Even attempted efforts to steer a government contract need to be exposed. That is what the taxpayers deserve.

Sally Donnelly, a key person in my investigation—happened to be a close adviser to then-Secretary of Defense James Mattis and former Amazon consultant—is a central figure. Let me make it very clear. Sally Donnelly was a close adviser to the Secretary of Defense and a former Amazon consultant. So that is the central figure of what I am talking about today.

Throughout her time at the Defense Department, Donnelly received payments from the sale of her consulting business, which she sold right before she entered government service. She didn't disclose precisely who purchased her firm to either the Defense Department, which she should have, or to the inspector general, even when asked the identity under oath.

In late 2022, I obtained new evidence the inspector general failed to obtain during its investigation. That evidence was that the actual name of the company that purchased Donnelly's firm was VMAP—an acronym, V-M-A-P. This company was a portfolio company of C5 Capital, an Amazon-linked company.

The Defense Department inspector general claimed in its 2020 report that it found no evidence that Donnelly ''had an ongoing or undisclosed financial relationship with C5 Capital or Amazon and its affiliates that would have required her to recuse.'' The evidence appears to show otherwise. There was a financial relationship. Why the inspector general didn't find out about it, I don't know.

In two letters last year, I continued to press Donnelly and her then-business partner, Andre Pienaar, the CEO of C5 Capital, for answers. Now, as you might expect, both have refused to cooperate with my oversight inquiry.

The inspector general report also claimed to have found no evidence that Donnelly had any role in the JEDI contract or violated any of her ethical obligations.

For additional transparency, we need to look at Defense Department records from 2017 and 2018, when Donnelly worked there, so you are going to hear a lot of quotes from emails I got.

These records appear to show Donnelly working behind the scenes to favor Amazon. Some of this information was included in the inspector general's report. However, much of it was not included even though the inspector general had access to these government records.

Kevin Sweeney, then-chief of staff to Secretary of Defense Mattis, told the inspector general that he thought Donnelly invited an Amazon vice president responsible for public sector sales to a London dinner with Secretary Mattis in March of 2017. This dinner was shortly after Donnelly began working for the Secretary of Defense. That Amazon executive, Teresa Carlson, used the dinner to invite the Secretary to later meet Amazon CEO Jeff Bezos.

Secretary Mattis also revealed it was Donnelly who suggested he travel to meet tech leaders, including Amazon.

Now, following that London dinner, Donnelly repeatedly pushed for the meeting between Bezos and Mattis. The inspector general report deflected by saying the Secretary's chief of staff, not Donnelly, scheduled his meetings. But that report cuts out part of an email showing that the chief of staff deferred to Donnelly on whether the Secretary should meet with Amazon's CEO.

The inspector general's report also omitted a part of Donnelly's email where she said the Secretary should meet Bezos because he was ''the genius of our age.''

The inspector general's report omitted another email from an Amazon official asking Donnelly for guidance on the Secretary of Defense's Seattle visit to Amazon and what ''landmines we should avoid.'' That same email asked Donnelly to ''put a bug in some ears'' to help Amazon counter challenges from the Defense Department's Chief Information Officer.

Donnelly responded on her government email with inside advice, telling the Amazon official to emphasize ''security security security of [the] cloud.''

Now, just 3 days before the visit to Seattle, a DOD official emailed Donnelly the agenda for Amazon's presentation, which included a ''cloud overview'' by the same Amazon official that had asked her for advice.

An email sent from another Department of Defense official to Donnelly shortly after the Secretary's visit noted that discussion of cloud technology was the centerpiece of meetings with Amazon and other tech leaders.

Donnelly also was informed by a DOD official traveling with the Secretary, on the very day of the Secretary's visit with Amazon's CEO, on August 10, 2017, that the visit ''seemed to morph into an Amazon Web Services sales pitch.''

A followup email from that same official informed her that after the visit, the Secretary of Defense was ''99.9% there in terms of going to the cloud.''

Despite all of this, when asked whether the Defense Department cloud

was discussed during the meeting, Donnelly swore under oath on August 15, 2019: ''I don't know. I wasn't there.''

She also swore that she didn't know how long Bezos was present during the visit. But the same Defense Department official traveling with the Secretary of Defense told her via email that Bezos stayed for the Secretary's entire visit.

The inspector general, however, found no ethics violation, claiming Donnelly had no formal role in the procurement.

Now, the evidence again appears to say otherwise, and there is more.

An email, 2 weeks after the Secretary's Amazon visit from DOD officials, spoke of the need for a memo from the Secretary to ''crush the bureaucratic impediments'' Amazon had been encountering.

In other words, there were a lot of people in the Defense Department who knew something was going on, and they were trying to stop it. That is the way I read that email. Of course, Donnelly and another DOD official were on that email.

In response, that DOD official, with Donnelly still copied, said: ''Sally is already working angles'' to crush those impediments.

On September 13, 2017, merely weeks later, the Deputy Secretary of Defense issued a memo Department-wide crushing those impediments by announcing rapid cloud adoption through ''a tailored acquisition process.''

Now, I suppose ''tailored acquisition process'' has many definitions, but I kind of read that, as suspicious as I am, as trying to short-circuit the process of contracting so some favorable person can get it.

Now, Air Force procurement documents interpreted this memo as what I just said, the Secretary's intention to award the contract to Amazon. Records also show that after the Secretary's Amazon meeting, the head of the Digital Defense Service asked Donnelly for permission to ''let me lead cloud tiger team.''

Donnelly didn't respond that she had no role in the process. Instead, she told the DOD official to ''Do it quick!''

Just a few weeks later, that official was appointed to lead the first phase of the JEDI contract.

Donnelly reportedly organized another dinner in Washington in January 2018. Only four people were there: The Secretary of Defense, Sally Donnelly, Teresa Carlson, and the CEO of Amazon. Carlson directly admitted to the inspector general that the dinner's purpose was to continue the discussion from the Secretary's Amazon visit. That visit, apparently, became a sales pitch. Carlson sent Amazon Web Services sales material to Donnelly's government email for review just hours before that dinner.

Instead of taking this evidence head-on, the inspector general report pointed to the Government Accountability Office, or what we know as GAO around here. The report claimed that the GAO ''also reviewed whether Mrs. Donnelly should have disqualified herself from participating in the JEDI Cloud procurement.''

That same report also claimed the GAO, in resolving a bid protest, agreed with the Defense Department that ''Ms. Donnelly wasn't involved in any way with the JEDI Cloud procurement.''

Attorneys for Donnelly and attorneys for C5's CEO made that very same claim. However, there is one very big problem. Donnelly wasn't even mentioned in the GAO's decision.

The GAO told my office late last year that they have ''no idea where the statement in the DOD Inspector General report comes from.'' The GAO also told my office there is ''simply no support for this statement from the decision itself or the record of the arguments raised by the protester.''

So not only did the inspector general report omit critical evidence, that I have described to Senators today, but it blatantly misstates the work of another government Agency. So we have a big problem not only with conflict of interest, but we have a problem with the inspector general not doing its job because the Inspector General Office's work in this matter is a disgraceful example of government oversight.

Former Department of Defense Acting Inspector General Sean O'Donnell was so embarrassed by his Agency's work that he refused to even name the staff who worked on this incompetent report.

Robert Storch, the current inspector general, has followed suit.

Donnelly has continued to refuse to cooperate with this congressional investigation, yet—can you believe this?—she still sits on the Defense Business Board, providing advice to the Secretary of Defense.

A portfolio company of C5 Capital, according to its own public statements, has gained cyber security business in Ukraine. If that is supported by taxpayers' money, well, they shouldn't get a penny until the CEO cooperates with Congress and clears this matter up.

Inspector General Storch must redo the investigation and rewrite relevant sections of this report, considering the clear failures of the original report.

It is time to clear the air, time to fight corruption, time to restore trust in how you negotiate contracts and how you fight conflicts of interest.

That is the history I have given you today.

Yes, I know the JEDI contract is dead, but right now, there are people in the Defense Department who are still pursuing contracts to make use of the cloud for storage. Hopefully, lessons learned from this report I have given you and what took place in the JEDI contract are lessons learned so they won't be repeated as DOD moves ahead. These are multibillion-dollar contracts.

We need to avoid conflicts of interests like this that I just have pointed out to you. We need to make sure there is good oversight of the expenditure of taxpayers' money, but that ought to start with the people in the Department of Defense itself. It ought to be policed by the inspector general of the DOD. That wasn't done in this case involving Donnelly. And, for sure, Congress shouldn't give up any of its constitutional responsibilities to see that taxpayers' money is spent wisely.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:25 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 9:25 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5 p.m., adjourned until Friday, March 15, 2024, at 9:25 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

JENNIFER L. HOMENDY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRMAN OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

JENNIFER L. HOMENDY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2029. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

KELLY ADAMS–SMITH, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA.

PETER W. LORD, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SENEGAL, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GUINEA–BISSAU.

JEREMEY NEITZKE, OF ILLINOIS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF LESOTHO.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DIRECTOR, AIR NATIONAL GUARD, AND FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 10506:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DUKE A. PIRAK

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. AIDA T. BORRAS

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. JAMES F. GLYNN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) JOSEPH B. HORNBUCKLE

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED AS A PERMANENT COMMISSIONED OFFICER

PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 2101(A)(2):

To be commander

LINDEN M. DAHLKEMPER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

APRIL B. STAHL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

RICHARD G. BARFIELD
FRANTZ PIERRE–LOUIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

JILL E. HOPKINS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JUSTIN J. DUPREE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

MATTHEW J. BARNES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

RAYMOND T. GILLEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DANIEL L. PETTERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JUSTIN L. SANDERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

TIMOTHY W. BLATTER
STEPHEN M. JOHNSTON
MATTHEW D. JUKKALA
JOHN M. KEELEAN
SCOTT P. MARMEN
DONNA M. RIDGEL
ELIZABETH A. ROXWORTHY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

To be colonel

SERENA T. MUKAI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

HAROLD B. BENDER
TIMOTHY J. BOURQUIN
RYAN C. KRAUS
SCHAUN C. MYERS
MITCHELL W. NETHERY
CHARLES E. POORE III
RYAN D. SARENPA
HEATHER J. SIMON
ANDREW R. WERNER
ANGELA R. WHITE
YORLONDO S. WORTHAM

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

RUSSELL D. BOYD
VINCENT A. CUMMINGS
DAVID H. JONES
SCOTTY D. RIGGS
MARK A. TINSLEY
MICHAEL J. WILLER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

ROBERT M. FARMER
CARY S. SNELLING
STEPHEN B. YARBER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

TIMOTHY L. MITCHELL

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 8287:

To be lieutenant colonel

DOUGLAS R. BURIAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

ROMEO P. CUBAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JULIE N. MAREK

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

LESLIE L. HUBBELL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be commander

GEORGE L. BRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 605:

To be commander

SCOTT M. BIRKEMEIER
MATTHEW D. BOUWENSE
STEVEN J. BRINKLEY
ETHAN COPPING
JEFFREY D. FELDMANN
JAMISON R. FIEBRANDT
MARCELLO J. FRIERSON II
SEAN D. GETWAY
MICHAEL S. GROW
MORRIS E. HAMPTON
CALVIN S. HARGADINE
MICHAEL E. HEATHERLY
THADDEUS M. HOKULA
CHRISTOPHER W. JOHNSON
DEVON B. KIBBONS
JORDAN A. KLEIN
EVAN S. LONG
MAYNARD C. MALIXI
CHRISTOPHER G. MARLEY
RENE J. MARTIN
PAUL W. MOODY
MATTHEW G. OMIRE
JOEL L. OVIEDO
AMERICO C. PEREZ, JR.
THEODORE R. PERSON
BRIAN R. PURVIS
SEAN L. ROCHA
TIMOTHY W. ROE
DALLAS B. SMITH
MATTHEW J. STEPKO
GEORGE T. THOMPSON III
ADAM T. VIEUX
JOHN L. VINCENT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BRYAN P. CLAYTON
GEORGE M. JOHNSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

EDWARD L. GUNGON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 605:

To be lieutenant commander

DANIEL M. ARAKI
MICHAEL W. BARBER, JR.
CHRISTOPHER R. BOX
MATTHEW M. CAINE
JAMES J. CATINA
THUAN D. CHU
JONATHAN T. COLLINS
DAKOTA K. DEVERILL
JACOB A. DEWITT
ANTHONY B. DINH
JACOB E. DODGE
JAMES P. DUFFY
JACOB T. DWYER
DEREK R. EATON
JONATHAN R. FARLEY
DEVON L. FLORENDO
MATTHEW A. FLORES
TIMOTHY J. FLOTKOETTER
LUCAS C. FOGUTH
WILLIAM D. H. FOSTER
AMANDA R. GALLO
SAMUEL K. GATES
ADARSH A. GHOSH
ALFREDO GRANADOSANGEL
ZACHARY A. GRIMM
MICHAEL E. HAMP
DONAL P. HANLON
KEITH P. HANTLA
JOHN M. HENDERSON
EVAN M. HENDLER
CHRISTOPHER R. HOWIE
ZACHARY T. JOHNSON
WESTON T. KENNEDY
ISABEL K. KRAUSE
CHRISTOPHER J. LENT
ANALISE M. MARSHALL
ANTONIO O. MARTINEZCHAPEL
ANDREW G. MASTERS
MAXWELL J. MAZUROWSKI
DOUGLAS K. MCKENNA
JOHN W. MELLGARD
CHASE R. PIXA
DONALD H. PUENT III
KATHRYN E. RANSOM
NICHOLAS A. RIEMER
JUSTIN D. ROWAN
ADAM E. SCOTT
ALEXANDER H. SCOTT
BRIAN P. SEXSON
RYAN L. THOMAS
MELISSA B. TREMBLAY
JAKE VANRIPER
JENNA M. WESTERBERG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 605:

To be captain

ANDRES J. AVILES
JONATHAN R. BAUGH
MATTHEW H. BEACH
CLINTON J. CHRISTOFK
JAMES L. CLARK III
ANDREW L. DOMINA
JUSTIN P. ECKHOFF
JAMES E. FULKS
PRESTON W. GILMORE
JASON N. GLAB
JUSTIN R. HARDY
WILLIAM J. HOWEY III
MICHAEL W. KESSLER
SAULOMON D. KING
DOMINIC J. KRAMER
JUNIOR C. LORAH
ALAN T. MARDEGIAN
RYAN T. MATTSON
MICHAEL S. MCGUIRE
CRYSTAL A. MILLER
ANDREW W. PITTMAN
JON B. QUIMBY
MICHAEL A. SAMMATARO
GORDON M. SCHRIVER
ANTONIA K. SHEY
RICHARD W. SKINNELL
ANTHONY G. STRANGES
JERIAHMI L. L. TINSLEY
JAMES G. TUTHILL III
ANTHONY M. WILSON
TRAVIS L. WOOD
ADAM I. ZAKER

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED AS A PERMANENT COMMISSIONED OFFICER PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 2101(A)(2):

To be lieutenant commander

TAMMY BOLIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED AS A PERMANENT COMMISSIONED OFFICER PURSUANT TO THE AUTHORITY OF TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 2101(A)(2):

To be lieutenant commander

DEREK D. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2121(E):

To be captain

JENNIFER J. ANDREW
MATTHEW S. AUSTIN
MICHAEL W. BAIRD
PATRICIA M. BENNETT
TORREY H. BERTHEAU
BRIAN R. BETZ

MICHAEL D. BRIMBLECOM
MARY D. BROOKS
KEVIN A. BROYLES
BRADLEY A. BRUNAUGH
KENNETH J. BURGESS
JASON A. BUSTAMENTE
JOEL B. CARSE
AARON J. CASAVANT
ERIC W. CHANG
BRADLEY D. CONWAY
ALLISON B. COX
JONATHAN W. COX
BYRON A. CREECH
MICHAEL R. DARRAH
JESSICA S. DAVILA
ARTHUR M. DEHNZ
PHILLIP A. DELISLE
JARROD M. DEWITZ
JENNIFER R. DOHERTY
PATRICK A. DRAYER
LAUREN F. DUFRENE
STANLEY P. FIELDS
JASON S. FRANZ
MATTHEW A. GANS
LISA L. GARCEZ
CHRISTJAN C. GAUDIO
SARAH J. GEOFFRION
JASON D. HAGEN
JUAN M. HERNANDEZ
MICHAEL J. HUNT
RAYMOND D. JACKSON, JR.
KEVIN L. KAMMETER
LUANN J. KEHLENBACH
MARGARET D. KENNEDY
COREY M. KERNS
MATTHEW R. KOLODICA
RICHARD E. KUZAK
AMANDA M. LEE
CLAY D. MCKINNEY
BORIS MONTATSKY
SAMUEL R. NASSAR
ERIC G. PARA
CHRISTOPHER R. PARRISH
LUKE R. PETERSEN
JEFFREY R. PLATT
JASON T. PLUMLEY
BEAU G. POWERS
RANDY L. PRESTON
MILES R. RANDALL, JR.
KENT R. REINHOLD
KENNETH H. ROCKHOLD
THOMAS C. RODZEWICZ
ELIZABETH M. ROSCOE
JENNIFER M. RUNION
STACI K. RUTSCH
BRENT R. SCHMADEKE
JONATHAN D. SHUMATE
DANIELLE M. SHUPE
LUKE M. SLIVINSKI
BENJAMIN J. SPECTOR
ROBERT E. STILES
STEVEN D. STOWERS
KEITH O. THOMAS
JAROD S. TOCZKO
JORGE L. VALENTE
ALLISON M. WALLACE
MATTHEW J. WALTER
REBECCA A. WALTHOUR
RYAN A. WATERS
MATTHEW G. WEBER
CHARLES K. WILSON
CHRISTOPHER J. YOUNG

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

CORI A. ALSTON, OF TEXAS
ELIZABETH LOUISE ALTMAIER, OF VIRGINIA
TODD PAUL ANDERSON, OF VIRGINIA
DEBRA ANN BARBESSI, OF VIRGINIA
ALYSSA NICOLE BARCENAS, OF VIRGINIA
ERIN KATHLEEN BARRETT, OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRA LEE BRANDON BERNARDO, OF FLORIDA
ERIC J. BERNAU, OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA L. BIGKNIFE, OF VIRGINIA
ERIC ANDERSON BISHOP, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM TYLER BRENT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SUE S. CHAISONE, OF VIRGINIA
ADRIENNE M. CROZAT, OF VIRGINIA
CASEY A. DRISCOLL, OF VIRGINIA
JOYCE E. DUDLEY, OF MARYLAND
TAMARA L. EDMONSTON, OF VIRGINIA
HEIDI L. ELKINS, OF VIRGINIA
MARCUS B. FERGUSON, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM J. GEIS, OF VIRGINIA
JACOB ERIC GJESDAHL, OF WASHINGTON
ALFREDO L. GONZALEZ, OF FLORIDA
ADAM RICHARD HALL, OF ILLINOIS
JASON WILLIS HICKMAN, OF VIRGINIA
GRANT A. HOLYOAK, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD A. HOUSTON, OF VIRGINIA
DYLAN SIMON HUNZIKER, OF WASHINGTON
JONATHAN MARTIN ISHEE, OF VIRGINIA
PAULETTE KAY JANUS, OF ILLINOIS
ALEXANDRA K. JOHNSON, OF HAWAII
JULIE MARIE KAUFFMAN, OF VIRGINIA
AMANDA E. KEFALAS, OF VIRGINIA
CRISTIN MICHELLE KIRSCHNER, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES O. KNABLE, OF MARYLAND
BETH A. KUCH, OF HAWAII
VANESSA D. LEWIS, OF VIRGINIA
JULIAN H. LIPSCOMB, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MATTHEW THEODORE LOWE, OF VIRGINIA
ERICA L. MAGNUSSON, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT T. MCNEARY, OF ARKANSAS
CHIKONDI O. MSEKA, OF VIRGINIA
KATHLEEN P. MURPHY, OF VIRGINIA
ASEEBULLA A. NIAZI, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
BRANDON PALADINO, OF VIRGINIA
EDGAR R. PAREDES, OF VIRGINIA
THOMAS M. PHELAN, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER ANN PIERSON, OF TEXAS
ZACHARY DAVID POZUN, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL K. RAYNES, OF VIRGINIA
ANDREW M. REEVES, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN ERIC RIES, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES E. ROBBINS, OF TEXAS
JOSEPH SANDS, OF VIRGINIA
CIERRA GENEVA SAYLOR, OF FLORIDA
CEDAR IMBODEN SIMMERS, OF FLORIDA
MATTHEW S. SIMON BARTHOLOMAUS, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH KIM SONG, OF VIRGINIA
JASON J. STEPHENSON, OF VIRGINIA
MARGARET HILLMANN WALROD, OF FLORIDA
JAMES J. WICKERSHAM, OF VIRGINIA
MARK A. WILSON, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT WIMBERLEY, OF VIRGINIA
JORDAN E. YOUNES, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

JAMIE MARTIN, OF RHODE ISLAND

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, AND A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

VASILLI A. ALAFOGIANNIS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MICHAEL T. MCMAHON, OF VIRGINIA
JAMES T. SUOR, OF MARYLAND

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO BE A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER, A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

CAREYLOU S. ARUN, OF MARYLAND
ROSS R. BELLIVEAU, OF FLORIDA
CODY ALAN DIETRICH, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT D. GAINES, OF ARIZONA
ANDREW J. GLASS, OF CALIFORNIA
BRYAN J. GOLDFINGER, OF CALIFORNIA
ANTONIOS LOULOUDAKIS, OF VIRGINIA
KOLBJORN T. NELSON, OF MINNESOTA
DANIEL T. PINT, OF NEW YORK

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

STEPHEN L. GREEN, OF TEXAS
JANEE P. PIERRE–LOUIS, OF OHIO
MEGAN A. SCHILDGEN, OF VIRGINIA
ILONA L. SHTROM, OF VIRGINIA
MICHELE RENEE SMITH, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO BE A CONSULAR OFFICER, AND A SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

STEPHANIE RICHE BOLES, OF OREGON
DAVID JOSHUA BOLTON, OF TEXAS
ANNE MARIE BROOKS, OF VERMONT
ROGER WILLIAM CALDERONE, OF ILLINOIS
MATTHEW LENT CASE, OF MAINE
JENNIFER DAWN CHICOSKI, OF FLORIDA
MICHAEL RYAN ERICKSON, OF VIRGINIA
GARRETT MARTIN GEHRER, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL DAVID GODLEY, OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA MONIQUE GORDON, OF TEXAS
LEWIS AARON JONES, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
SHANAH SEYUN LEE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHAEL EVAN MANGELSON, OF UTAH
ANASTASIA FEOFANOVA MUKHERJEE, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLES BLAKESLEY MURRAY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NATHANIEL LELAND SEARS, OF NEW YORK
MICHAEL ABRAM SHVARTSMAN, OF FLORIDA
RUTH PATRICIA SOBERANES, OF ARIZONA
NATHAN SAMUEL STICKNEY, OF OREGON
BRENDON HAHNS THOMAS, OF MICHIGAN
ELISABETH ANN URFER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF CAREER–MINISTER:

KARL WILLIAM FICKENSCHER, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHANIE A. FUNK, OF FLORIDA
SEAN M. JONES, OF TEXAS
CLINTON DAVID WHITE, OF MARYLAND

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR:

ELIZABETH ARLEVA CHAMBERS, OF VIRGINIA
SHERI–NOUANE B. DUNCAN–JONES, OF WASHINGTON
JOHN L. DUNLOP, OF VIRGINIA
MICHAEL J. EDDY, OF NORTH CAROLINA
GABRIEL F. GRAU, OF FLORIDA
REBECCA A. LATORRACA, OF VIRGINIA
MARIA LISA ROSE P. MAGNO, OF VIRGINIA
RICHARD L. NELSON, OF TEXAS
ANUPAMA SPATIKA RAJARAMAN, OF TEXAS
JOEL SANDEFUR, OF MARYLAND
MATTHEW D. REES, OF MARYLAND
V. KATE SOMVONGSIRI, OF WASHINGTON
MARGARET ELIZABETH ENIS SPEARS, OF MARYLAND

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

CHRISTOPHER W. ABRAMS, OF NEW YORK
RANDY ALI, OF FLORIDA
JORGE MARCELO ARELLANO, OF NEW YORK
MICHAEL THOMAS BEHAN, OF CALIFORNIA
KIMBERLEE BELL, OF NEVADA
RICHARD A. BURNS, OF NORTH CAROLINA
SCOTT S. CAMERON, OF VIRGINIA
MARK JOSEPH CARRATO, OF OREGON
MATTHEW EVAN COHEN, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL JOSEPH DESISTI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JERI L. DIBLE, OF WASHINGTON
REBEKAH R. EUBANKS, OF ILLINOIS
BRIAN A. FRANTZ, OF WASHINGTON
FARHAD GHAUSSY, OF CALIFORNIA
JENNIFER A. GRAETZ, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN F. HANSEN, OF MONTANA
DANIEL ELIOT HARTER, OF VIRGINIA
GREGORY G. HOWELL, OF ARIZONA
MARK K. HYLAND, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER MICHAEL KELLY, OF MISSOURI
EMILY COFFMAN KRUNIC, OF FLORIDA
TED LAWRENCE, OF CALIFORNIA
KENNETH W. MACLEAN, OF FLORIDA
LEANNA L. MARR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KEVIN DAVID MCGLOTHLIN, OF FLORIDA
ANDREW J. MCKIM, OF CALIFORNIA
EDWARD R. MICHALSKI, OF OHIO
ERIN NICHOLSON, OF VIRGINIA
LAURA PALMER PAVLOVIC, OF VIRGINIA
PETER RILEY, OF CALIFORNIA
HEATHER ANN SCHILDGE, OF VIRGINIA
ADAM PHINEAS SCHMIDT, OF CONNECTICUT
TODD M. SORENSON, OF TEXAS
SHANDA L. STEIMER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ELEANOR MARIE TANPIENGCO, OF VIRGINIA
RITU K. TARIYAL, OF FLORIDA
DAVID J. THOMPSON, OF VIRGINIA

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBERS OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER–COUNSELOR:

RUSSELL DUNCAN, OF MARYLAND
MARK CLAYTON PRESCOTT, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

THE FOLLOWING–NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE FOR PROMOTION INTO THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR:

JOHN HURLEY, OF MARYLAND

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 14, 2024:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DENNIS B. HANKINS, OF MINNESOTA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI.