United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MARCH 21, 2024 *No. 50*

Senate

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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Our guest Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Adolphus Lacey, senior pastor of the Bethany Baptist Church, Brooklyn, NY, will open the Senate in prayer.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God, we evoke Your Name in this place. We thank You for the life and for giving it to us more abundantly. We thank You for the power and privilege of prayer, and we humbly approach Your throne of grace to thank You and share our petitions.

We offer thanks to those who surrender their lives in service to this great Nation by willingly choosing to represent us. We thank You for their families and friends who loan them to us. May there be no lack in their lives because of their service.

We pray that, at this moment, You will pour out Your spirit of wisdom and compassion on these Senators as they chart the course of this Nation. Embolden them with the burden that they are someone's last resort and the hope that they can make a difference in someone's life.

Bless this assembly as they wrestle with how to express Your love for all of us and for this moment. Then, O God, bless all the people of all the States in this land that we love, to emulate and require of our leaders what you require in the words of the Prophet Micah: to act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with our God.

In Your Name, we pray. 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 21, 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I would just like to make my morning remarks a bit later, but I want to acknowledge and thank my good friend the Reverend Adolphus Lacey of the famous Bethany Baptist Church, not too far from where I live in Brooklyn, for leading us in this morning's prayer.

It is great to see you here. You are a leader in bringing the message of the Lord down here to all of us, but also doing many good works here on Earth. You do both, as the Prophet Micah would have wanted you to do.

And I have a great relationship with Bethany Baptist Church. Bill Jones—when I ran for Congress, they were sort of running a racist campaign against me, and Bill Jones—the Reverend Bill Jones—who was a disciple of Dr. King, rallied the ministers to support me and help me win.

So the relationship with Bethany Baptist goes way back, but it has even blossomed further under the great leadership of Pastor Lacey. I am so proud he is here so all of the Nation can see why we in Brooklyn love Pastor Adolphus Lacey.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I also want to recognize the Reverend Adolphus C. Lacey for not only offering that beautiful prayer but for his extraordinary leadership and advocacy in Brooklyn, NY, and beyond.

He is the senior pastor at Bethany Baptist Church in Brooklyn. He is a pastor, theologian, and activist who has served as the spiritual adviser to the New York Justice League. He is also a member of the East Brooklyn Congregations in the National Action Network and also a member of the Kappa Alpha Psi Fraternity, Inc.

He is an extraordinary public servant who has dedicated himself to lifting up other communities, to lifting up his community, to lifting up those who need a voice. And I am so grateful for his shining presence, for the light he is bringing to this community, as he brings to all of New York.

I yield the floor.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

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

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 Jose Javier Rodriguez, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, earlier this morning, the legislative text for the final six appropriations bills was released, I am happy to say, clearing another hurdle toward our ultimate goal of funding the Federal Government. I thank the appropriators, their staffs, and everyone involved for working themselves to the bone to release these bills. I imagine some folks here in the Capitol are past the point of exhaustion.

This funding agreement between the White House and congressional leaders is good news that comes in the nick of time. When passed, it will extinguish any more shutdown threats for the rest of the fiscal year, it will avoid the scythe of budget sequestration, and it will keep the government open without cuts or poison pill riders.

It is now the job of the House Republican leadership to move this package ASAP.

Just like the funding bills Congress passed 2 weeks ago, this package avoids draconian Republican cuts on major Democratic wins that help American families, American workers, and America's national defense. We have secured an increase in childcare services. We boosted disease research and prevention. We funded school mental health programs and suicide prevention—so needed in this modern world in which we live. We are strengthening the border with new resources for frontline personnel. We are investing in safer, more secure elections. We Democrats are very proud of both. The hard right pushed for cuts that would have impacted K through 12 education and services for low-income families. Democrats stopped it. The hard right wanted to add terrible poison pill riders to attack freedom of choice. Democrats stopped that too.

Now Congress must now race to pass this package before government funding runs out this Friday. Once the House acts, the Senate will need bipartisan cooperation to pass it before Friday's deadline and avoid a shutdown.

I want to thank President Biden, Speaker JOHNSON, Leader JEFFRIES, and Leader MCCONNELL for their leadership. I also thank Chairwoman MURRAY and Vice Chair COLLINS and their staffs, as well as my own staff, for their tireless leadership of the Appropriations Committee throughout the entire process. I don't think they got any sleep from about Saturday to today. I really thank particularly Meghan Taira and Ray O'Mara from my staff, who did such a strong job on this.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE

Mr. President, now on judge shopping, last week, I was very pleased that the Judicial Conference announced commonsense policy reforms limiting the practice of judge shopping, by having civil cases with statewide or nationwide implications assigned to judges at random.

Unfortunately not everyone was pleased—namely, those on the right who have made judge shopping their specialty. So today, I am sending a followup letter to the Judicial Conference encouraging them to defend their policy as it is implemented across the country.

I am also writing the chief judge of the Northern District of Texas, where judge shopping has been rampant, urging him to apply the reforms of the Judicial Conference as quickly as possible. When I wrote to the chief judge roughly a year ago about judge shopping, he said fixing the problem through random assignments presented logistical challenges.

So, in my letter today, I will ask the judge to please explain: How many civil cases with statewide or national injunctions does his jurisdiction handle? How does the district create rules for case assignment? How will they implement the Judicial Conference's rules to ensure public trust? The answers to these questions would greatly inform us in the Senate as we think about ways to strengthen our judiciary.

I must say, over the past week, I have really been troubled to hear some of my colleagues on the other side attack the Judicial Conference simply for doing its job, which Congress authorized it to do over a century ago. My Republican colleagues forget or ignore that even their side has acknowledged in the past that not only is judge shopping a problem but that the Judicial Conference itself has a role to play to address it. But now some Republicans are howling at the Moon over this announcement. My friend the Republican leader, for one, led his colleagues in writing a number of chief judges, urging them to basically ignore the Judicial Conference.

Let me say this: Judge shopping as it is practiced here in Texas distorts the entire judicial system. There is only one judge sitting in one district. Hard-right plaintiffs from across the country know they can bring their cases and get them before a judge who has views that are way over. It jaundices the fairness of the legal system. When you know there is one judge sitting and he or she has a particular philosophy and you have to get that judge when you file a case, again, it attracts hard-right plaintiffs who are so unrepresentative of America, like bees to honey, and they all flock to those one or two or three judicial districts where there is one judge or a minimal number of judges sitting.

My Republican colleagues actually refuse to explain why judge shopping is remotely defensible—because it so distorts the system and casts a cloud of unfairness over our whole judicial system, like the system is sort of rigged because you know you can get this judge, and you know what the outcome will be. The mifepristone case is the most glaring, immediate example.

Of course, my Republican colleagues don't explain why, by the way, because, of course, they can't say the quiet part out loud: Judge shopping is a key part of the hard-right's toolkit, something they have built up over the years. Just take the example of the Amarillo Division of the Northern District of Texas, where a single district judge has become the darling of extremist litigants for his outlandishly fringe opinions on everything from birth control to affordable healthcare to LGBTQ discrimination. Republicans might not want to say it openly, at least those who opposed here, but nobody is being fooled. Conservatives go to this one judge because they know he is on their side ideologically—what an abuse of the functioning of our Federal courts.

So, yes, the Judicial Conference was right to issue reforms to limit judge shopping. Neither party—no philosophy—should be able to cherry-pick judges of their choice. Random assignment is the way it works for nearly every court in the country.

I am always ready to work with Senators from either party to consider all commonsense ways to improve how our courts are administered. I wholeheartedly agree that Congress should take its role of judicial oversight seriously, particularly at a time when activist judges committed to special interests are eroding the rule of law. Congress must provide a check on the judiciary, and that is what the Founding Fathers intended in our legislation as decades, even centuries, also point out.

In this instance, it is troubling Republicans can't seem to admit the obvious: Abuses like the ones we see coming out of the Northern District of Texas should come to an end.

REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE BUDGET

Mr. President, on the RSC budget, yesterday, as President Biden announced tens of thousands of new jobs to take our country forward, House Republicans released a budget plan that would take us backward. The Republican Study Committee's fiscal year 2025 budget plan reads like a wish list for Donald Trump and the MAGA hard right, and it sure is a loser for the American people.

Remember, the RSC is hardly a small group. It is made up of over 170 House Republicans—80 percent—80 percent—of the House Republicans, including Speaker JOHNSON and his entire leadership team. The budget plan is the Republican agenda, plain and simple.

By releasing this budget, the vast majority of House Republicans are calling for cuts to Social Security and Medicare. Do you hear that, the folks in America? The vast majority of House Republicans want to cut Social Security and Medicare. Beware of what they want. They want to threaten IVF access. They want to deny healthcare to people with preexisting conditions. They want national abortion bans, and they want to sabotage any hope of lowering prescription drug costs. The list could go on and on.

The Republican Study Committee plan is cruel; it is fringe—way out of line with what most Americans want—but, unfortunately, it is what the House Republicans envision for our country. It speaks volumes that, on the very same day President Biden and Democrats announced tens of thousands of new jobs to increase U.S. microchip production, the Republican Study Committee called for over $1.5 trillion in cuts to Social Security.

It is just like former President Donald Trump, who recently said, ''There is a lot you can do,'' regarding cuts to Social Security.

The RSC's budget also doubles down on Republican efforts to threaten in vitro fertilization access.

Republicans can pretend all they want to sound moderate on women's choice now that they have created so much backlash, but this budget plan makes it clear they are the same old anti-choice, anti-woman party, and I have no doubt—should they get into power in the House, Senate, and Presidency, which I don't think will happen and hope and pray won't happen—choice will be clearly at risk.

That is not all. The RSC's budget would gut the Affordable Care Act and CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program, which means ripping away health coverage for millions of American families and people with preexisting conditions. The RSC's budget, of course, includes trillions of dollars in tax cuts for the wealthiest few and large corporations, leaving working-class people—middle-class families—to pick up the tab.

The Republican agenda released yesterday is dangerous and disastrous for America and the American people. The contrast could not be clearer. While Democrats invest in the American people, the Republican agenda released yesterday is dangerous—disastrous—for the American people.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

NOMINATION OF ADEEL ABDULLAH MANGI

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have spoken repeatedly about the nomination of Adeel Mangi to the Third Circuit Court of Appeals. Notwithstanding his anti-Semitic affiliations, it seems every week a new law enforcement organization announces its opposition to this nominee for his record of associating with the most radical type of anti-police activists—those who support cop killers.

Apparently, some Democrats are finally listening to law enforcement and the Jewish groups sounding the alarm.

Last week, a number of Democratic Senators reportedly told the White House that they didn't think Mr. Mangi has the votes. This, of course, produced a panic on the left. This week, a New York Times columnist accused Republicans of Islamophobia for criticizing Mangi and his dalliance with anti-Semitic activists. Democrats, on the other hand, were urged to get in line and vote for him.

Who is giving this advice?

Well, the author of the piece herself had previously speculated that Israel may be engaged in genocide in Gaza. She called the Israeli war of self-defense a ''charnel house of horrors.'' She defended the anti-Semitic Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions movement, and she even got mealymouthed about the October 7 attacks, saying:

[T]wo can play the game of who started it and who is to blame, rolling back the clock to biblical times to try to fix ultimate responsibility for the catastrophe of Israel and Palestine.

So, again, what has Mr. Mangi done to deserve friends like these or, indeed, to merit such a vehement, blinkered defense from the Biden administration?

Just yesterday, the White House called opposition to Mr. Mangi's nomination a ″smear campaign solely because he would make history as the first Muslim to serve as a federal appellate judge.''

How insulting. What self-respecting attorney wants to hear that a President cares more about the demographic tick boxes than their life's work?

Besides, in the case of Mr. Mangi, Senate Republicans' opposition has absolutely nothing to do with his Muslim faith. Rather, it has everything to do with his longstanding sympathy for and association with some of the most radical elements in society.

I happily voted for the first Muslim article III judge at the outset of the Biden administration, also of New Jersey—so did 31 of my Republican colleagues—in one of the largest bipartisan votes for a judge in the Biden Presidency. But we didn't support this nominee because he was Muslim; it was because he had an extraordinary personal and professional background.

Mr. Mangi's associated center at Rutgers asks convicted terrorists if we overly ''exceptionalize'' 9/11. Judge Quraishi, on the other hand, thought 9/11 was exceptional and joined the Army soon after, rendering honorable service in Iraq.

Mr. Mangi spent his career making millions in defending corporate clients like foreign energy companies, massive drugmakers, and even chocolate monopolies, all while volunteering his time to support anti-police activists. Judge Quraishi, on the other hand, supported law enforcement professionally, first at Immigration and Customs Enforcement and then as an assistant U.S. attorney.

We are told that any questioning of Mr. Mangi's record is Islamophobia. On the other hand, the terrorist-adjacent Council on American-Islamic Relations demanded that Senators probe Judge Quraishi's experience in the Army and in law enforcement, saying their concerns ''must be addressed.''

According to Democrats' rhetoric, shouldn't this organization also be condemned for Islamophobia?

Two Muslim Biden nominees with records as different as night and day—Republicans happily supported the nominee who served his country and backed the blue. We have and we will continue to oppose the nominee who has repeatedly chosen, instead, to mingle with supporters of terrorists and cop killers.

I hope more Democrats will join us in opposing Mr. Mangi, and should they fall victim to spurious associations of bias, perhaps they should remind the White House of an alternative candidate, rested and ready, in the Federal courthouse in Trenton, NJ.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, Adeel Mangi has been nominated by President Biden to serve on the Third Circuit. We have had a hearing before the Judiciary Committee, a vote in the committee, and his name is on the calendar.

In recent weeks, we have heard an amazing number of attacks against this individual. It is hard to imagine some of the things that are being said about him. They bear no resemblance to the truth.

What was said this morning on the floor of the U.S. Senate is painful. To accuse a nominee of being anti-Semitic is heartbreaking when it is not true. In this case, it clearly is not true.

After the initial hearing on Mr. Mangi, who would be the first Muslim to serve on the Federal circuit bench, we received communications from several groups in defense of his nomination and critical of the questioning that took place in the Senate Judiciary Committee. One of the most noteworthy came from the Anti-Defamation League.

The ADL issued a statement in response to what they called ''the inappropriate and prejudicial treatment of

Adeel Abdullah Mangi, a nominee for the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.'' I am going to read this in its entirety because it clearly rebuts the charge that was made on the Senate floor today that this nominee is anti-Semitic:

As the leading anti-hate organization in the world, whose mission is ''to stop the defamation of the Jewish people and to secure justice and fair treatment to all,'' ADL is compelled to speak out about the inappropriate and prejudicial treatment of Adeel Abdullah Mangi, a nominee for the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals, during the Judiciary Committee Hearing on December 13, 2023.

The ADL statement goes on to say:

During his confirmation hearing, Mr. Mangi was subjected to aggressive questioning unrelated to . . . professional expertise or qualifications. Rather, he was forced to provide responses to a wide range of inquiries regarding his views on global strategic considerations in a manner that inappropriately politicized these issues and raised serious questions regarding pretext and bias.

The ADL statement goes on to say:

Just as associating Jewish Americans with certain views or beliefs regarding Israeli government actions would be deemed antisemitic, berating the first American Muslim federal appellate judicial nominee with endless questions that appear to have been motivated by bias towards his religion is profoundly wrong.

The ADL goes on to say:

Hate, bias, and bigotry have no place in government, especially in the hallowed halls of Congress. When nominees approach a congressional hearing, their religion, heritage, race, gender, or any other protected identity characteristic should not be a subject for political fodder.

This was an attempt to create controversy where one did not exist.

ADL urges leaders to refrain from fueling discrimination and hate—and urges the Senate to offer Mr. Mangi a fair vote, based on his qualifications and fitness for the job.

That statement from the ADL—as they describe themselves, the ''leading anti-hate organization in the world'' when it comes to the Jewish people—is specific and directed toward those who are really making criticisms of Mr. Mangi which are not warranted in any aspect of fact.

To have a man characterized as anti-Semitic on the floor of the U.S. Senate is a gross miscarriage of justice in this case. This gentleman could not have been more explicit in his statements against terrorism, against what happened in Israel on October 7, and the fact that he is coming before this body with no prejudice whatsoever toward the Jewish people.

The questions that were asked of him, a Muslim nominee, are heartbreaking. At one point, one of the Republican Senators asked if he celebrated 9/11 in his family household. He said: Of course not. He was sickened by what happened on that day and had friends who were associated with the losses.

This kind of treatment of any nominee is unacceptable in America. To charge someone as anti-Semitic on the floor of the U.S. Senate is truly unfortunate, if not scandalous in itself. We should be fair to every nominee, whether proposed by a Democratic or Republican President, and we should not have any prejudice or bigotry when it comes to a person because of their religious beliefs.

I am sorry that this was said on the floor of the Senate this morning. I hope that the person who did it will have second thoughts about whether or not that was appropriate.

CREDIT CARD COMPETITION ACT OF 2023

Now, Mr. President, on a completely separate issue, last month, I invited the CEOs of Visa, Mastercard, United Airlines, and American Airlines to testify before the Judiciary Committee, which I chair, about competition in the credit card market.

I have been working for nearly 20 years to break the Visa-Mastercard duopoly in the debit and credit markets, which would reduce costs for small businesses and lower prices for consumers.

In 2006, I was the most junior member of the Judiciary Committee when I first learned about interchange fees. I literally didn't know they existed. They are known as swipe fees as well. These are fees that are deducted every time you swipe your debit or credit card and paid to the bank that issued the card.

For debit transactions, this fee is now capped at 21 cents, plus .05 percent of the transaction. That is because of legislation which is known either in an honorable way or in a questionable way as the Durbin amendment that I wrote in the year 2010. However, for credit card transactions, interchange fees are much higher—in the range of 2 to 3 percent. That means if you go to a restaurant and pay $20 for your meal, 40 to 60 cents goes to the bank that issued the credit card you used to pay for the meal.

This may not sound like a lot, but it adds up. It is estimated that businesses paid more than $100 billion in swipe fees on Visa- and Mastercard-branded cards in 2023 alone. In fact, swipe fees can be small businesses' second highest cost behind only the cost of labor.

Small businesses have no choice but to pay the fees. Visa and Mastercard control more than 80 percent of the U.S. credit card market, accounting for 576 million cards. They use this power to dictate interchange fees to businesses. It is a take-it-or-leave-it proposition.

Because margins at these small businesses are often low, they feel compelled to pass on these fees directly to consumers in the form of higher prices. This means all of us—whether you pay with a credit card, a debit card, or cash—are subsidizing banks like JPMorgan Chase, which just announced it made $49.6 billion in net income in 2023—the most in the history of the American banking industry.

Thankfully, there is an answer or a solution to the problem. The Credit Card Competition Act, a bipartisan bill I introduced last year with Republican Senator ROGER MARSHALL of Kansas, would inject much needed competition into the credit card market and break the Visa-Mastercard stronghold.

Here is what our bill says: If a bank with $100 billion or more in assets—only 30 banks, incidentally, qualify—wants to issue a credit card on the Visa or Mastercard network, it would have to offer a second network other than Visa or Mastercard to process transactions.

That is known euphemistically as competition. In this way, merchants will finally have a choice. If Visa or Mastercard offers the best service or security or the lowest cost, the merchant can use it, but if the other network offers a better deal, the merchant can choose that instead. That is known as competition.

By forcing Visa and Mastercard to actually compete for merchants' business, we are aiming to end the cycle of increasing interchange fees that is breaking the backs of small businesses.

As you can imagine, Visa, Mastercard, and their big bank partners don't like our bill.

The bill is expected to save merchants and consumers $15 billion every year in interchange fees. That is $15 billion a year coming out of the pockets of Wall Street banks and into the pockets of American consumers.

That is why the credit card companies and banks have poured more than $51 million into lobbying efforts to defeat my bill—$51 million. They have also enlisted airlines in their effort. An article in The Atlantic recently explained why:

Airlines are just banks now. They make more money from [their] mileage programs [and credit cards] than from flying airplanes.

So as you think of a major airline, like United Airlines, it is basically a credit card company that owns some planes. That is why anyone who has traveled through the airport here in DC, watched TV, or used the internet is probably seeing ads claiming ''DICK DURBIN wants to take away your credit card rewards.'' The problem in these breathless claims is that they are false. Rewards programs will be alive and well long after the Credit Card Competition Act becomes law. We know this from data, real-world experience, and common sense.

Let's start with data. One study found that my bill would have a negligible impact at most on rewards and noted that banks' swipe fees provide a more than sufficient margin to maintain current reward levels. That is a far cry from what consumers suffered when United Airlines recently devalued its miles for international travel last summer.

These findings are consistent with the experiences of other countries. Other countries have decided to protect their consumers from these swipe fees with their credit cards. Australia capped the interchange fee at 0.8 percent in 2003. The European Union

capped interchange fees at 0.3 percent in 2015.

Rewards programs haven't gone away in either place. In fact, most major European airlines offer rewards programs that are comparable, if not better, than the ones offered in the United States. The reason is simple: Banks have to compete against each other for customers, and there are few things that make one credit card more attractive to a customer than others, other than perhaps a better rewards program. This dynamic won't change when the Credit Card Competition Act becomes law.

That brings me back to the hearing. The Judiciary Committee last held a hearing on competition in the credit card market in May of 2022. Visa and Mastercard have increased their fees since that hearing and are planning to do so again next month. Even in the midst of concerns about inflation, they keep raising this fee over and over again, even as consumers are trying to fight the fires of inflation.

That is why I invited the CEOs of Visa, Mastercard, United Airlines, and American Airlines to come testify before the Judiciary Committee on April 9.

Guess what? All four CEOs rejected my invitation. They are just too darn busy to come and explain the major source of profits for their businesses. They are too darn busy to come explain what they are doing to consumers and families across America.

Some say: We just don't understand the issue well enough to testify before your committee.

They are the CEOs of the company, and they don't understand the issue? Like their attacks on my bill, the CEOs' excuses why they can't appear before the American people to answer questions don't hold water.

Killing the Credit Card Competition Act has been and remains a top priority for these companies, as evidenced by the more than $51 million lobbying effort that they have undertaken against my bill. I guess I should feel flattered that they would spend $51 million lobbying to try to stop this legislation; but, frankly, it infuriates me that they won't come before this committee under oath and testify, yet they are spending all this money in secret fashion.

Several of the CEOs have been personally engaged in this issue. Scott Kirby, who is the CEO of United Airlines, told investors that my bill is ''bad policy'' and that he had personally ''spent a fair amount of time in DC talking about [the bill].'' Mastercard CEO Michael Miebach told investors he was ''closely engaged'' in efforts to defeat this legislation.

If these CEOs are willing to discuss the Credit Card Competition Act with Wall Street investors and lawmakers behind closed doors, they should be willing to answer questions before the Senate Judiciary Committee and the American public under oath.

If the credit card market really is working for small businesses and consumers, then I say to Ryan McInerney, Michael Miebach, Scott Kirby, and Robert Isom: You should have nothing to hide. The fact that you are refusing to appear and publicly defend your skimming of every credit card transaction in America speaks volumes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). The Senator from Arkansas.

EL SALVADOR

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I recently returned from a trip to El Salvador, where I met President Nayib Bukele and saw firsthand the effects of his remarkable transformation of that country from the most dangerous nation in our hemisphere to one of the safest.

As we drove around San Salvador, the images were commonplace yet extraordinary—children played soccer in the parks, young women jogged at twilight, couples dined outdoors—commonplace because one should expect to see such scenes in any decent community; extraordinary because they were unheard of just a few years ago.

Unfortunately, this trip was also a reminder that President Biden is as weak, unpopular, and divisive abroad as he is at home. And just as he coddles criminals and cartels in our own country, he too often sympathizes with them in other nations.

Since taking office, President Biden has refused to meet President Bukele, Secretary of State Tony Blinken has criticized him, and the administration has significantly reduced foreign assistance to his government.

One must ask why. After all, President Bukele is the most pro-American leader in Latin America, and he overwhelmingly won two elections—free and fair elections, I must add, contrary to liberal allegations. Indeed, one of his bigger vote shares came from Salvadorans living outside the country, including in the United States, far removed from any supposed intimidation or coercion inside El Salvador.

It is not surprising because, after years of bloodshed, the Bukele government is bringing stability and safety to a country that desperately needs it, which is also good for America. There has been a 40-percent drop in illegal Salvadoran migrants arriving at our border.

No, Joe Biden doesn't oppose President Bukele for good or fairminded reasons. He opposes President Bukele because he is tough on El Salvador's murderous gangs, the most prominent of which is MS–13, a group with the psychotic motto ''kill, rape, control.''

Our own country has experience with this sadistic gang. In 2017, not far from here in Wheaton, MD, members of MS–13 beheaded a man, cut his heart out, and stabbed him over 100 times. The year before, members of the gang murdered two teenage girls on Long Island, NY, using baseball bats and a machete. And just last year, an illegal immigrant member of MS–13 in California was convicted of torturing and murdering a 10-year-old boy. Let me say that again. He tortured and murdered a 10-year-old boy.

That is what MS–13 has done here in America, the richest and most powerful Nation in the world. It has done far worse to the people of El Salvador. And MS–13 isn't alone. Factions of the infamous 18th Street gang also terrorized the country. Before the government's crackdown, more than 100,000 gang members and associates roamed the streets of the nation of fewer than 6½ million people. For years, they waged war with each other and the government, turning neighborhoods and cities into ungovernable battlefields. They would impress preteen boys into their gangs or demand preteen girls provide sexual favors—or they would kill the whole family and still take the boy or girl.

As a result, El Salvador has long been one of the most dangerous nations on Earth. Indeed, it was so dangerous that many of my Democratic colleagues have argued that those fleeing the country should automatically be eligible for asylum here. In late March 2022, 2 years ago, the nation reached its breaking point when gang members committed 87 murders in a single weekend, killing more people in 3 days than were killed in the entirety of the previous month. Tragically, March 26, 2022, marked the deadliest day in El Salvador since the end of that nation's civil war 30 years ago.

Finally, people had had enough. President Bukele requested the declaration of a state of emergency, and the National Assembly agreed. The government surged troops throughout the country, overwhelming the gangs and arresting and imprisoning its members. One active gang member told reporters:

> There were too many soldiers everywhere all at once.

According to recent estimates, the Bukele government has imprisoned more than 75,000 gang members and killed hundreds more. President Bukele's prison-or-death anti-gang strategy has worked. In 2022, the number of murders in El Salvador dropped nearly 57 percent and then dropped another 70 percent last year. In 2018, the Salvadoran murder rate stood at 53 per 100,000. Last year, it was 2.4 per 100,000. For context, Washington, DC, had a murder rate of 40 per 100,000 last year. That means I was much safer 2 days ago in what was once the murder capital of the world than any of us today are in Joe Biden's Washington.

Yet Joe Biden, one of the least popular, least successful, and most procriminal leaders in the world, is lecturing one of the hemisphere's most popular and accomplished Presidents on crime. In particular, the Biden administration has expressed concern that the emergency declaration, which suspends certain due process protections, is a threat to the rule of law—apparently, an even greater threat than the marauding thousands of gang members still at large.

President Biden evidently doesn't understand that order is a prerequisite for law. Indeed, it is a prerequisite for nationhood. Without order and the state's monopoly on force, you don't have a country, and you certainly can't have a democracy.

Perhaps President Bukele's tactics are harsh. I don't think so, but I will grant you that. But they were also absolutely necessary to establish order. And I would remind the Biden administration that El Salvador's gang members aren't victims; they are murderers, rapists, and many of them have American blood on their hands.

I saw up close thousands of these savages—or devils, as President Bukele puts it—when I toured the Terrorism Confinement Center, the massive new prison housing tens of thousands of gang members. The inmates live together by the dozens in group cells. They don't go outside. They don't take classes. They don't get visitors. Most will never leave.

Armed guards are everywhere you turn inside the triple-walled prison, including on the steel-grate ceilings so guards can monitor the inmates from above. Some so-called human rights groups whine about this prison. I guess they think it is too harsh. And it is not Club Med, I will concede, but the inmates receive food and water, they conduct personal hygiene daily, and doctors and nurses work at an aid station next to the cells.

Those same groups also complain about a supposed lack of due process. I don't know. Call me crazy, but if it is illegal to belong to a gang and you have got MS–13 tattoos all over your face and body, I am not sure what more process you are due. Maybe that is just me.

No, the victims aren't the devils I encountered at the Terrorism Confinement Center. The people of El Salvador are the victims. After years of abuse, law-abiding Salvadorans, particularly those from poor and working classes, overwhelmingly support President Bukele's efforts to restore order and a meaningful rule of law.

I am hopeful that El Salvador's leaders will help bring stability and prosperity to a nation that deserves better than gangland terrorism, and I urge the administration that if it is unwilling to help, at least stay out of the way.

Finally, the example of El Salvador not only exposes the failures of President Biden's approach to foreign policy but also his approach to crime. If nothing else, President Bukele has proven once again that incarceration works, obviously. If you lock up murderers, amazingly enough, there will be fewer murders—a truth so obvious that only liberal ideologues could miss it.

Sadly, that is what we have in many places in today's criminal justice system: progressive lawyers who refuse to prosecute criminals; progressive judges who refuse to sentence them appropriately; and progressive politicians who pass jailbreak bills to release them. So long as we continue to pursue these progressive policies, our communities will, sadly, continue to look more and more like El Salvador—not the El Salvador of today but of just a few years ago.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE WEEK

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this week, we celebrate National Agriculture Week. It is a time to celebrate America's farmers and ranchers, the hard-working men and women who fill America's supermarkets and Americans' dinner plates. Much of daily life here in the United States depends on the food, fuel, and fiber that America's farms and ranches produce. And this week in particular, we thank those who do the hard work of feeding America—and the world.

There are a lot of factors that go into a farm's or ranch's success. Today, I want to talk about just one of those factors that affects a lot of farms and ranches, and that is trade. Trade is critical to the continued success of American agriculture. One in four acres on U.S. farms is planted to be exported to a foreign market, and exports are responsible for a fifth of U.S. farm revenue.

For the 2023 marketing year, American farmers planted nearly 70 million acres of major crops to supply international markets. But we have a problem. Thanks in large part to the Biden administration's almost complete inaction on trade, U.S. agriculture exports are declining. In fact, last year, the United States posted a $16.6 billion agricultural trade deficit—16.6 billion. And that trade deficit, believe it or not, is projected to be nearly twice as large this year, in an area of our economy where typically we have run, historically, trade surpluses.

This would be bad enough on its own, but it is particularly distressing at a time of economic uncertainty for a lot of farmers and ranchers. Like so many other Americans, farmers and ranchers have suffered under President Biden's inflation crisis. Net farm income is expected to see its largest 2-year drop in 40 years.

We should be doing whatever we can to reverse this trend and help farmers and ranchers succeed, and a good place to start would be opening new markets for American agricultural products.

The sorry state of agriculture trade is emblematic of the Biden administration's generally unambitious trade agenda. The President made it clear early on that trade would not be high on his agenda, and unfortunately, he has lived up to that.

Increased market access—long a priority of the United States—has almost completely dropped off the radar under President Biden. The U.S. Trade Representative has openly said that the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework, which contains one of the few trade initiatives that the administration has actually undertaken, was, in fact, designed not—not—to include tariff reduction. In other words, the Biden administration deliberately chose not to pursue a key market-opening measure, and now, the Biden administration has put even this halfhearted trade initiative on hold, declining to move forward with the trade portion of the Indo-Pacific agreement.

A year ago, I came to the floor to discuss my bipartisan bill to kick-start negotiations on a comprehensive free-trade agreement with the United Kingdom. Now, you would think that a free-trade agreement with one of our oldest allies and largest trading partners would be a no-brainer, but the administration has punted on that one, too.

On digital trade—an area where the United States has historically been a leader and in which we should continue to lead—the Biden administration is pulling back. Last fall, the U.S. Trade Representative abandoned long-standing U.S. policy on digital trade at the World Trade Organization—a move that risks letting China take our place in writing rules for a major sector of the global economy.

The United States is currently negotiating zero—zero—free-trade agreements. But while the Biden administration keeps America on the sidelines, other countries are building up their trading portfolios. The European Union is negotiating new free-trade agreements. So is the United Kingdom. China is aggressively working to expand its trading network.

The Biden administration's failure on trade is putting our country at a competitive disadvantage. The administration is not only forfeiting opportunities for American leadership, it is harming American businesses, farms, and ranches that look to trade as a way to grow.

Earlier this week, I joined Senator BLACKBURN and other Senators in a letter to the President urging the administration to uphold America's long-standing leadership on digital trade. Last week, I led a group of Republican Senators urging the administration to work on expanding export opportunities for American agriculture.

If we want American farmers, ranchers, and business owners to succeed in the global economy, trade has to be a priority, and I will continue to do everything I can to urge the Biden administration to get off the sidelines on trade and start opening up new opportunities for American producers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes and Senator MANCHIN for up to 5 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 4364

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, yesterday at about this same time, I came to the

floor, and I made three predictions. Even though not a single Member of this body had seen the full text of the thousand-page spending bill that we received just after 2:30 a.m. this morning, I predicted three things about that bill. I predicted that it would, No. 1, be full of corrupting earmarks—well, the bill has nearly 1,400 earmarks, and 138 pages of the more than thousand pages in this bill are dedicated to earmarks alone; two, that it wouldn't force Biden to secure the border—well, it doesn't; and three, that it would perpetuate massive deficits—it does. I really hate to say, ''I told you so.''

It is now Thursday, a little less than 48 hours before the funding deadline, and we received the 1,012-page bill at 2:30 in the morning. We are told that the only way we can avoid a shutdown is to vote for a thousand-page bill negotiated in secret and put forward at the last minute by the law firm of SCHUMER, MCCONNELL, JOHNSON, and JEFFRIES.

With a little less than 48 hours on the clock, we can be sure that there will be no time to read the text, to vet it with our staffs and our constituents, to debate the bill and offer amendments to improve the bill. Regardless of what State we come from or what party we are a part of, this is not what our constituents, our voters, sent us to Washington to do.

These bills—massive legislative undertakings that bundle most of the Federal Government's funding into a single package—have become synonymous with legislative manipulation because that is precisely what they are.

The firm's modus operandi involves crafting these omnibus bills behind closed doors, with only a select group of appropriators contributing to their formulation.

Now, by design, the bills are unveiled to the public and to most of Congress with barely any time to spare before a potential government shutdown. This strategic timing, arranged by the firm and often arranged right before a long-scheduled recess or holiday, ensures the bill passes with minimal scrutiny and little or no meaningful opportunity for amendment or debate. It is a charade, occasionally softened by allowing a few votes here and there on a few token amendments. But make no mistake, the firm wields its enormous influence to ensure that no substantial changes are made that would threaten, as they perceive it, the sanctity of their original drafts.

Members are cornered into a false dichotomy, arranged and contrived entirely by the firm: Pass the bill—unread, undebated, unamended—or face the chaos and public ire of a government shutdown. Thus, the individual voices of the people's elected lawmakers in Washington and, by extension, the will of the American people—those who elected us to come here—are diluted in a process dominated by the few at the expense of the many.

This is exactly the type of dichotomy we tried to avoid when we passed a CR in November of last year. We extended the deadline into the new year. We established two separate funding deadlines into January and February specifically to avoid the dreaded Christmas omnibus, when the firm historically drops a bill just as we are planning to all leave and spend the holidays with our families.

By avoiding the Christmas crunch for the first time in a very long time, that CR was intended to give us the time to properly debate, amend, and ensure that all of the people's elected lawmakers in Washington engaged in a fair and transparent process. But now, we are in the very scenario we tried so hard to avoid, with a massive bill just before a recess, just before the Easter holiday. So what happened? What happened? How are we in the exact same spot we found ourselves in just a few months ago that we worked so hard to avoid and we promised we would avoid?

Today, with just over 48 hours before the government runs out of funding, this body once again throws American taxpayers and our voters under the bus, forsaking fiscal sanity. In so doing, they oppose measures that the vast majority of Americans support—measures that Republicans fought to include in this legislation, which were overwhelmingly rejected by just a handful of Members, so overwhelmingly supported by voters and overwhelmingly rejected by a narrow sliver of Members of this and the other body.

Those measures would have, among other things, banned the use of funds to implement Green New Deal-related policies that have been overfunded over the last few years; blocked funds for racist DEI programs across the Department of Defense and the intelligence community Agencies; prohibited the use of funds for bureaucrats to label free speech that they happen to disagree with as ''misinformation''; measures to ensure that only the American flag may be flown at all government buildings.

It contains no new funding for a border wall or any of the other core border security elements in H.R. 2, which are so badly needed at this time. Our country is under invasion with the acquiescence of the President of the United States. It contains nothing to stop Biden's invited invasion from happening right now at our southern border.

Instead of securing our border, we are spending millions of taxpayer dollars on radical pet projects that exist to weaken and divide our country culturally and economically—pet projects like $1.8 million for a hospital in Rhode Island that performs abortions, including late-term abortions; $475,000 for an activist organization that has designed curriculum and materials for children ages 2 through 5 to ''introduce the kids in our classroom to a wide variety of gender expressions''; $400,000 for the largest LGBTQ advocacy organization in New Jersey—their efforts include focusing on what they call transgender student rights, which include letting boys use girls locker rooms and play in girls athletics in high school; $676,000 for an organization that has been actively supportive of Black Lives Matter and painted a BLM mural in front of Cincinnati's city hall in 2020; $2.8 million for an institution that released what they call an ''Inclusion, Diversity, Equity and Accessibility'' charter in 2020, which stated that ''diversity, inclusion, equity, and accessibility are critical components within the fabric of the institute to excel in basic and applied research, solve complex environmental issues, and advance DRI's mission''; $500,000 for a radical activist organization that hosts training workshops on implicit bias, social inclusion and equity, decolonization, and land acknowledgement; $450,000 for a childcare initiative that is being established to provide childcare for immigrant families.

So instead of securing our border, it appears we are using taxpayer money to create welfare programs for illegal immigrants who have invaded our country. That is because this whole system of government funding is designed to not benefit the vast majority of Americans. It benefits the very architects of these bills—the appropriators, the earmarks, the lobbyists, and the special interests. These entities thrive in the shadows in this process, influencing legislation in ways that serve the architects themselves, often—indeed, always—at the expense of the general public.

Americans are bearing the cost of decisions made without their knowledge or their consent, manifesting in skyrocketing costs of living and a staggering national debt now exceeding $34 trillion. Not only do they not have a say in this process, those they elected to have a say in this very same process are excluded, and that is wrong.

We must dismantle this corrupt process and restore once again transparency and accountability to the way we fund our government. The process behind what we expect from this insulting spending bill is a disgrace, and let history show that a few of us stood up and said no.

This is not the way. What we need is a short-term CR—a continuing resolution—through April 12 to give lawmakers time to review, debate, and amend the bill. Even if by some twist of fate, even if by some gift by God, you are able to discern every single word in this bill and you digested it over the last few hours and you still love the bill, you should acknowledge that most Members—I would say all—lack that capacity and therefore deserve the opportunity, whether you love the bill or hate the bill at the end of the day, to fully review it, vet it with constituents, debate it, and, yes, offer amendments at a meaningful window of opportunity.

Voting for this bill is voting in favor of massive, bloated deficits that are crippling America and making life

unaffordable, corrupting earmarks, and funding Biden's border invasion. So I invite my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in fighting for fiscal responsibility and the best interests of the American families we are supposed to represent in Washington—after all, they elected us—because we are certainly not doing that now.

To that end, I offered up a solution. Again, whether you love this bill or hate it after reviewing it, which will take some time, you should still want it to be adequately vetted first.

And to that end, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 235, H.R. 4364; I further ask that the Lee amendment at the desk be considered and agreed to, the bill as amended 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 Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Reserving the right to object, as I mentioned yesterday, we really have to get a move on and close the book on fiscal year 2024. We are 6 months into this fiscal year already. It is time to take the government off autopilot.

We have a carefully negotiated package. It is bipartisan. It is bicameral. It reflects the input of nearly every Senator and the priorities of every State in America and it is ready to go. We need to focus on the deadline in front of us and get this passed in a swift, bipartisan way so we can avoid a shutdown.

I would remind all of my colleagues so we can turn to fiscal year 2025. My focus remains on working with all of my colleagues to get that package over the finish line in a timely way. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. I will sit down in a moment to let my friend and colleague JOE MANCHIN speak.

I want to point out for a moment a couple of things. My friend and colleague from the State of Washington is objecting to this measure that would allow all Members adequate time to review the bill and to vet it with constituents and debate it and discuss it and amend it on the floor. She said that we have to get a move on; the government has been on autopilot, meaning under a continuing resolution for too long. True. Absolutely true.

But I find it stunning the suggestion that she is saying now that time is of the essence. Now, we didn't have the bill yesterday or the day before or the day before or the day before that when we were promised the bill. We didn't have it. We have it now.

She identified the precise moment in history—the precise moment in 2024—when we can no longer move forward for another day. We have to get a move on right, right now. They are the only ones who know this.

She also says it is bipartisan, bicameral; that it is a carefully negotiated agreement. That is great. That small handful of people who actually saw this bill and were involved in its final formulation, I am sure, will find that very comforting. For the rest of us who didn't see it until 2:30 a.m. this morning and the 330 million Americans out there who will have to pay for this stuff, that is not adequate notice. That is not a carefully negotiated agreement. That is collusion among the few affecting the many adversely.

I find this very, very disturbing that we couldn't get the American people and their elected representatives a few more days so that they can understand what is in there. It begs the question, What are they hiding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

NATIONAL INLAND WATERWAYS WORKERS SAFETY AWARENESS DAY

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of National Inland Waterways Workers Safety Awareness Day and to honor the life of Gabe White, a young West Virginian who lost his life far too soon.

Gabe was a deckhand, a Boy Scout, a graduate of Gilmer County High School, and, most importantly, he was a son, a brother, a nephew, a cousin, and a friend.

I want to thank Gabe's family for being with us here today and allowing me to share Gabe's story with the rest of the country, which underscores just how incredibly important barge safety is and must be.

Gabe was a Wheeling, WV, resident who loved music, art, video games, and sports. He was always curious and interested in learning more about the world and those around him. He appreciated history and was always starting interesting discussions with his friends and family. He engaged.

Gabe also loved the outdoors. As a Scout, he fell in love with hiking and camping, even during the winter. Gabe and his troops hiked and camped much of the Greenbrier River Trail. He had the honor of being an Order of the Eagle recipient, in addition to his rank as Life Scout. Gabe was always a leader while he was a Scout, which he typically tried to avoid because he always focused on being a team player, working with others.

Everyone around Gabe knew him as someone who was always ready to jump in and step up to the plate to lend a helping hand when needed. During his senior year of high school, Gabe decided to join the high school baseball team after only ever playing 1 year of Little League.

Later, Gabe's friends and teammates and family finally found out that Gabe only joined the team because he was worried they wouldn't have enough players to form a team and play that last season. Gabe knew it was his friends' last chance to play baseball, as they were graduating that year. So he was adamant in helping out.

Gabe showed up with a positive attitude to every practice and game and was always prepared to do whatever his coach and teammates needed him to do. Again, Gabe was always there to show up and step up to the plate when he knew his teammates and friends needed him most.

Gabe was a true West Virginia Mountaineer through and through.

Gabe often talked about his desire to become a father and was looking forward to becoming an uncle when his brothers had children.

After he graduated high school, Gabe got a job working as a deckhand. He was proud of his job and having this new opportunity. He was excited to learn all the new things about working on a barge on the river with his team of deckhands.

However, on the morning of March 22, 2023, Gabe arrived at work as usual when an accident occurred that tragically resulted in his death at just the age of 20. Following an investigation, it was determined that not only was no safety equipment issued, but Gabe was out of line of sight of the crane operator, and no spotter was present. Gabe's death never, never should have happened. It was preventable, and we must acknowledge this.

This is why I am proud to introduce the National Inland Waterways Workers Safety Day resolution with my colleague from West Virginia, SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO. Our resolution designates March 22, 2024, as National Inland Waterways Workers Safety Day in recognition of the 1-year anniversary of Gabe's passing.

Workers in the national inland waterways play a crucial role navigating ships, barges, and tugboats that deliver the goods that we need and use. They work hard, loading and unloading barges and transport vessels, and cleaning and caring for vessels and shipyards to move the goods for America.

Our resolution recognizes the need to continue to improve the safe transportation of domestic cargo and, above all else, to reduce transportation vessel- and shipyard-related incidents, fatalities, and injuries so another family like Gabe's does not have to endure such a tragic loss. And I have said, Gabe's life was not in vain. He will save many others.

The safety of deckhands, engineers, masters, mates, and shoreside workers are of the utmost importance. It is critical to equip them with the necessary knowledge and resources to perform their duties safely and effectively and return home every evening safe.

I want to applaud the efforts of the Coast Guard, American Waterways Operators, Maritime Trades Department, and other groups that are working to reduce the incidents of workplace injuries and fatalities in and around towing vessels.

I encourage industry and worker groups to observe March 22 to not only

honor Gabe's life but to also observe the day with appropriate programs and activities that increase safety awareness in and around towing-vessel employment.

I want to again thank Gabe's family, all of you who came to visit with us today and to honor Gabe in such a meaningful way and to ensure accidents like this never happen again.

May God bless Gabe and his family and keep all the workers on the waterways safe from any injuries.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER CLOTURE VOTE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote by which cloture was not invoked on the Rodriguez nomination is agreed to, and the motion to reconsider is agreed to.

The motion to proceed to the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The motion to reconsider is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 117, Jose Javier Rodriguez, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor.

Charles E. Schumer, Bernard Sanders, Mazie K. Hirono, Thomas R. Carper, Benjamin L. Cardin, Ron Wyden, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Jeanne Shaheen, Tammy Baldwin, Tim Kaine, Richard J. Durbin, Tina Smith, Brian Schatz, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jack Reed.

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 Jose Javier Rodriguez, of Florida, to be an Assistant Secretary of Labor, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 50, nays 49, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 99 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—49

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

NOT VOTING—1

Mullin

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). The yeas are 50, the nays are 49.

The motion is agreed to upon reconsideration.

The Senator from Ohio.

TRIBUTE TO DIANA BARON

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Presiding Officer from the State just north of mine.

Mr. President, I rise today to honor a longtime member of my staff, Diana Baron, as she celebrates her 25th year serving the people of Ohio.

Diana is a dedicated public servant, a caring colleague, and an effective and indispensable member of my staff. She is on the floor right now wondering why we got her in here. I see the surprise on her face, but the camera will not show that.

Despite growing up in Oklahoma City, graduating from Tufts University in Boston—a school she still dearly loves—Diana found her way to this Ohio office 25 years ago. We are lucky that she stayed.

Today, new staff are always surprised to hear that Diana isn't from Ohio. She knows more about our State than almost anybody I know. Over the years, we have given her the title of ''Honorary Ohioan.''

She joined our team serving Ohioans back when I worked down the hall, when I represented the people of Lorian, Elyria, Medina, and Wadsworth, in that part of northeast Ohio. She worked her way up. After a few years serving as a legislative assistant, Diana was ready for something new.

As we moved to the Senate, Diana led the way. With her command of logistics, her efficiency, and her work ethic, she found a role that suited her perfectly and suited us perfectly: director of scheduling—one of the most important offices, as all of my colleagues know, in the U.S. Senate. She has been leading the way ever since. From making sure I can meet with every Ohioan possible to making it all over the State to roundtables and plant tours and picket lines and speeches and events, Diana is behind the scenes making it happen. Surely—pardon the cliche—she keeps the trains running every day, every hour. She navigates ever-changing vote schedules in this body, getting staff the information they need to do their jobs. You always rely on her to get it done.

We don't always make it easy. My staff, I—none of us makes it easy. There is always another event to schedule, something to change, a meeting with an Ohioan who drops by at the last minute, or a different corner of the State to visit when I am home every weekend. Day to day, messages go long, traffic slows us down, but Diana keeps at it. She is always thinking three steps ahead of each of us. She comes ready, if plan A doesn't work, to do plan B; if plan B doesn't work, to do plan C.

We ask Diana to fit more in 1 day than 24 hours should allow. She not only makes the most of every minute, she makes an exceptionally challenging job look oh so easy. She makes it look easy on the hardest days, on the days when the stress has to be pretty overwhelming. She juggles a million different responsibilities. That doesn't go unnoticed. That is why I am here.

Ohioans, on their way in and out of meetings, express their gratitude to Diana for making it happen. They thank her for fitting them in. They thank her for making them feel welcome. They thank her for sometimes rearranging the day to do so. She goes above and beyond to carve out the time they need to share their priorities or concerns or ideas. She makes sure they know their advocacy is important and a priority for this office. This office is known for reaching out and listening to people because the best ideas don't come from me; they come from Ohioans.

Ohioans are lucky to have Diana on their side, and so am I. Diana is an invaluable resource to every department. Her work supports every single part of the office. It makes our day-to-day operations possible. She is the glue that holds it all together.

Among the Senate schedulers, Diana is a force. Everybody knows her. Everybody knows that if you want to learn how to do this job, director of scheduling, talk to Diana Baron. Staffers at every stage of their careers look to her, look up to her, seek her advice, and rely on her counsel. In our office, Diana, it goes without saying, is an institution.

As we came upon this milestone of 25 years earlier this calendar year, her current colleagues and former staff shared stories with us—with Maggie in our office and Sarah, both sitting with Diana in the back—shared stories of memories and tributes to working alongside her. While every submission mentioned Diana's effectiveness as a scheduler, the testaments and testimony of who she is and how she engages and cares for her colleagues were just—no other way to put it—overwhelming.

Every year, she brings Ohio State and DC staff and Brown alums together

for the annual March Madness bracket competition. She has been doing it for years. I asked her the other day, not knowing I was going to talk about her on the Senate floor, and she said it happened sometime—I don't know—20-plus years ago. She puts in the effort to collect brackets and organize the pool. This isn't really part of her official job, mind you, taxpayers watching this. She creates the opportunity for colleagues to connect. It is something we look forward to and appreciate.

While we are excited to see whose bracket wins—and I never do or even get close—the best part of the tournament is the emails Diana sends after each slate of games with a rundown of what happened, her observation and analysis, as if she is a 30-year veteran of calling NCAA basketball games. The enthusiasm is contagious. Her knowledge of the tournament and its history is also impressive.

More impressive to me is her baking, and it is legendary. You know it is going to be a good day when she arrives carrying a tray covered in tinfoil or a piece of big Tupperware. Office favorites include her lemon ricotta cookies, her strawberry shortcake, and her pumpkin whoopie pies. If you mention a recipe you are struggling to perfect, where do you go? You go to Diana Baron back in the middle of the office. She is ready with a genius tip.

If my colleague is going through a hard time, chances are Diana will come in with chocolate chip cookies, carrot cake, or a platter of their favorite treat. She just kind of knows what each person in the office likes.

She is our resident foodie. She has endless recommendations for restaurants. If people come from Ohio or elsewhere and ask ''Where do I go?'' she has good ideas. She is happy to share suggestions with her coworkers—something pretty much everybody in the office takes her up on. Staff visits her desk to ask where they should go to dinner almost as often as they have a scheduling request.

It is not just Ohio or DC; some of the times I have seen Diana most excited is when we are out of session and she has built up vacation time. She loves traveling to Europe. She could have been a world-class travel agent and travel planner. She loves to do that. She has ventured around the world. She always shares her exciting stories. And I run into people in Ohio who have seen her somewhere around the world.

If one of her colleagues has an upcoming trip, Diana knows the best neighborhoods to stay in, the best restaurants to eat at, the best places to explore. She generously shares her tips and tricks and wants to hear how it all went when they get back.

Something we hear again and again from staff—if you mention just once a baked good or a restaurant or a trip, a new hobby or a book you are reading, Diana listens, and, most amazingly considering the responsibilities and the complexities and all that, she actually remembers. She will check back in to ask what you thought. She will send an article you might be interested in. She will pay attention and will get to know the people she works with.

She always finds a way to connect, whether you are a current colleague or a former one. It doesn't matter if it has been days or weeks since it has come up; if Diana sees something related to a colleague's interest, she will send it their way. She goes the extra mile to learn about coworkers and their interests and what is happening in their lives and in the lives of their families, especially their pets.

She loves her pet cat. I am more of a dog person, but that is really beside the point. It is clear how much that matters to the people she works alongside and what she means to this office. I might say I still like cats to anybody watching who owns cats in Ohio.

Some of her former colleagues wrote:

Diana is the kind of friend that, once she knows what your thing is, anything about it that she comes across, not only will she think of you, but she goes the extra step to share it with you.

Somebody wrote that when Maggie and Sarah and all were gathering stories.

Diana is always willing to help out and go above and beyond [the call of duty] for her colleagues and the people of [our State].

Another one:

Diana makes the office feel like family.

Another one:

Diana takes pride in her work and is deeply committed to serving Ohioans, and I am grateful to have learned from working alongside her.

Diana's thoughtfulness has touched countless members of our staff and office alum. For over 25 years, as our team has changed, as they inevitably do as people do and move on to other places and other jobs, her dedication to Ohio and her respect for this institution has remained steadfast.

One of my proudest parts of this job is how so many people in this office come and learn and stay and get better and stay and work and learn Ohio so well. Diana is at the top of that list—at the top of that mountain, if you will. She has been a constant presence. She has been a rock for her colleagues. She has held people together through tough times.

None of us—and I say none of us—could do our jobs without Diana. We couldn't get to meet with all the Ohioans we have the privilege of meeting with. We couldn't accomplish all we set out to do in a single week. We couldn't enjoy it like we do with Diana on our team, and that makes it a pleasure to come to work in the morning for so many of us. For that, we are grateful.

We are grateful for her service to our State and our country, her presence on our team, and her thoughtfulness to our colleagues.

On behalf of everyone in our office and everyone who has ever worked in our office—if you have worked in the Banking and Housing Committee, she works with them every day too—and all those who have had the honor of working with her, we congratulate Diana Baron on 25 years serving Ohio, and we expect many, many more years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

DEMOCRATIC CAUCUS

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, last week on this very floor, the Democratic leader of the Chamber, Senator SCHUMER, delivered an unprecedented speech that clearly, in my mind, crossed a line, wading into the electoral process of a free and fair democracy and one of our greatest friends—not just any democracy but one of our most steadfast allies, Israel, who is currently in a war for their survival against a terrorist organization that wishes to remove their country from existence.

The remarks by Leader SCHUMER calling for a new election in Israel and the replacement of Prime Minister Netanyahu were many things—I thought irresponsible, ill-advised, and misguided—but above all else, it is hypocritical and sends the wrong message to the world and our allies during a vacuum of American leadership on the international stage.

My Republican colleagues were quick to draw contrast to these remarks and affirm our support for Israel and for the leadership they have duly elected in their democracy.

But don't just take my word for it. Michael Herzog, Israel's Ambassador to the United States, called these comments ''counterproductive to our common goals.'' Former Israeli Prime Minister Naftali Bennett noted that he is opposed to any ''external political intervention in Israel's internal affairs.'' Even political opponents to Prime Minister Netanyahu quickly condemned this rhetoric, saying that any interference in Israel's electoral process is ''unacceptable.''

So not only are these remarks unacceptable, but they come at a time when we should be displaying our unwavering support of our friend Israel, not calling their leadership into question.

It is important that we identify this situation for exactly what it is: an attempt by the opposite party to appease the progressive wing of the left that wishes to vilify Israel and abandon them when they need us the most. I can assure you this is something that Senate Republicans will not stand for.

Can you imagine if the roles were reversed here, if the leaders of another country called for new elections in the United States and named our leader an ''obstacle to peace'' and claimed that our government was not serving the needs of our people? The calls claiming election interference from this Chamber would be deafening.

Just like those in the United States, where the American people decide who leads their country, the people of Israel are the only ones who can decide which leader meets their needs. Prime Minister Netanyahu said himself: ''We're

not a banana republic.'' They are not. They are a democracy.

My Democratic colleagues here in the Senate have said quite a bit about foreign election interference and attacks to democracy in recent years, with Senate leadership saying in 2019 that ''foreign election interference cannot be ignored'' and that our government ''must make clear that the cost of trying to interfere with American elections will be dear'' or, from another leader, calling it ''reprehensible'' . . . ''that the American people would not have the last word, that there would be other factors and other people, other countries engaged in our election.''

That is exactly what was called for last week. The words of my colleagues ring as true then as they do now. No one but the American people should have a say in our democracy and how our country is run. But that same protection needs to be applied to our allies in free and fair democracies and the rights of their citizens to choose the leaders that guide their country and represent their interests. That is especially true when it comes to an ally at war such as Israel.

My Republican colleagues and I recognize this as hypocrisy, and it is shocking to me that our President, President Biden, would support these comments.

Unfortunately, this isn't the first time we have seen this level of hypocrisy from the other side of the aisle. Let's talk about energy policy debates. We saw the other party praise the EPA's electric vehicle mandates just yesterday without recognizing that they are the ones who are forcing closures of powerplants through policies like Clean Power Plan 2.0, cutting off the very baseload power that these supposed electric vehicles are going to need to operate.

I mean, there is a bit of hypocrisy. We have not enough power, and we are telling people when and how to run their heat, yet we are going to tell them what types of cars they need to have by 2032. As a data point, 7.6 percent of cars sold in the United States last year were electric vehicles. The goal is to get almost 70 percent of those cars by 2032.

In the State of West Virginia, new vehicles, electric vehicles: 1.1 percent. They kind of don't do so great on those hills in the middle of the cold. I am just saying.

On issues regarding the economy, we have seen the passage of trillions of dollars in reckless spending and increased taxes by the Democrats that lead to high inflation, only for the President to establish a Strike Force on Unfair and Illegal Pricing to blame others for the impacts of their policies. He is also worried about how many chips are in a bag. We got that at the State of the Union. Or even regarding the foundation of the rules that this body stands on. We have seen Senate Democrats wage war to remove the filibuster in recent years—the same rule they fought tirelessly to protect while they were in the minority. Now many of them signed on to the letters.

Perhaps one of the greatest hypocrisies we have seen on display was when the President delivered his campaign rally disguised as a State of the Union Address a few weeks ago.

When he was sworn into office, one of the biggest promises he made was to unite this country. Instead, in that speech, he alienated us, disparaged us—anybody who disagrees with his policies.

This continued hypocrisy and these political games are not lost on the American people. They want election officials to stand for their interests and to deliver on what they are going to do. This is a central tenet to effective government and something that guides my work on behalf of West Virginians every single day.

I, along with my fellow Senate Republicans—and I see my colleague from Nebraska here—will continue our efforts to lead our country toward a stronger future and to call out these pretenses when we see them.

NATIONAL INLAND WATERWAYS WORKERS SAFETY AWARENESS DAY

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to recognize Gabe White. His family is here at the Capitol today. He is a West Virginian who tragically lost his life a year ago, I believe, this week.

Gabe is a native of Gilmer County. He was 20 years old when he passed away. It was as a result of a barge accident in Follansbee, WV.

At the request of his family, Senator MANCHIN and I have introduced a resolution to declare March 22—the date of Gabe's tragic passing—as National Inland Waterways Workers Safety Awareness Day. It is our hope to ensure that similar accidents such as this will never happen again.

The resolution is currently moving towards passage in the Senate, and I would encourage my colleagues to support this.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The Senator from Tennessee.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. HAGERTY. Mr. President, I rise today as the Senate again finds itself facing a potential government shutdown due to the majority leader's political games. And again, the Senate must consider what we will do in response to the grave national security crisis that is emanating from our southern border.

It is deja vu from 2 weeks ago, when I offered a simple amendment regarding just one corrosive, anti-Democratic effect of this crisis. My amendment would have stopped illegal aliens from being counted for allotting congressional seats and, therefore, electoral college votes.

It did so by requiring the census to determine basic population statistics—like the number of citizens, noncitizens, and illegal aliens who are living in this country—and by requiring that only U.S. citizens be counted for the purposes of determining the number of House seats and the number of electoral college votes in America.

Currently, illegal aliens are counted when determining Americans' representation in government and the worth of their vote. The more illegal aliens and noncitizens in your State or district, the greater your voting power in Congress and in Presidential elections.

This means that in a State like California—or a city like New York—millions of illegal aliens result in several more congressional seats and electoral votes for that jurisdiction.

That helps explain why the majority leader worked so fervently 2 weeks ago to avoid a vote on my amendment—until it was clear that such obstruction would lead to a government shutdown. It also explains why every single Democrat voting on my amendment opposed it. Because when it comes to the census, the majority leader believes that ''every person must be counted.'' Evidently, that means illegal aliens too.

And with respect to commonsense proposals like mine—to count citizens, not illegal aliens—for apportioning voting power in America, what does the majority leader have to say? Well, he calls it an attempt to weaponize the census.

Really? That is quite rich. Aren't Democrats weaponizing the census by counting people living in our country illegally? Do we count diplomats? Do we count people who are here on vacation? Why would we count people who are here illegally? That is the essence of weaponizing the census.

Here is what is really going on. Several weeks ago, video emerged of a Democrat House Member from the majority leader's home State in which she called for more illegal immigration to her district for redistricting purposes.

What she means is that Americans are fleeing blue cities and States en masse because of bad government, but congressional seats are allocated based on population. So if you are losing population, you either have to backfill it or lose congressional seats.

This Representative stated that, because of her population loss, she needed to fill her district with illegal aliens to keep from losing her seat. That is exactly what my amendment would have prevented.

The Representative who made these comments is not only from the same State as the majority leader but she represents the same district that the majority leader formerly represented when he served in the House of Representatives.

This is the same district which houses James Madison High School. You remember James Madison High School. That is the school that cleared out its own students to make room for illegal alien housing. It is even the high school that the majority leader

himself attended. You talk about weaponizing the census.

If you don't believe me, listen to what New York City is saying itself. Just last week, New York City announced that it is challenging the 2023 Census Bureau annual estimates, arguing that the government failed to count some 50,000 illegal aliens currently in the city. They are desperate to count these illegal aliens because 727,000 people have moved out of New York since 2020. They have got to backfill that population to preserve their Federal influence.

It is clear why the majority leader and my Democrat colleagues voted against any change to the census. It is not because they are afraid that Republicans will weaponize it; it is because Democrats already have weaponized it.

Prior to this vote, the concept was decried by Democrats in the media as a ''conspiracy theory.'' Democrats' unanimous vote against ending this practice changed it from a conspiracy theory to a conspiracy—period.

It is why they have done nothing to secure our southern border, and it is why there is no outrage from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle when confronted with the fact that the number of illegal aliens who have entered the United States since Biden took office exceeds the population of 36 States. And President Biden and Democrats aren't just sitting back and allowing the crisis at our southern border to unfold; they are actively encouraging it.

For example, President Biden has been secretly flying hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens from foreign countries into blue-city airports across the United States in order to resettle them there.

Earlier this month, scarce details emerged regarding the administration's secret flights. They revealed that more than 320,000 illegal aliens were flown directly into the United States last year alone. One can't help but wonder whether the President is trying to make it even easier for blue States to backfill their declining populations and shore up their political power by delivering these illegal aliens directly to them.

Flying migrants from foreign countries into the United States in the midst of a record-shattering illegal immigration crisis is completely absurd. I plan to soon file an amendment to the appropriations bill that would prohibit the Biden administration from doing this.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this commonsense measure.

The question is simple: Are Democrats willing to allow a vote on my amendment to stop President Biden from using secret flights to import hundreds of thousands of illegal aliens into the United States? Or are they so desperate to preserve this political power grab that they can't risk the possibility of losing it by allowing such a vote to occur?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

ISRAEL

Mr. RICKETTS. Mr. President, on October 7, Hamas—a terrorist organization—committed a horrible atrocity on the people of Israel. Over 1,100 people were killed, hundreds taken hostage.

We must support Israel to destroy this terrorist organization called Hamas. We must get our five American hostages back, and all the hostages must be released. We need to have an ironclad friendship with Israel to get this done.

This seems obvious to most Americans. However, on the floor of this very institution, the majority leader got up and called for new elections in Israel; and Israel's Prime Minister, he said, was the obstacle to peace.

It is absolutely outrageous the majority leader would make that speech from this floor while we have five American hostages being held by a terrorist group. He was pandering to the fringe anti-Israel, pro-Hamas wing of his party. It is despicable. It is terrible that he would undermine an ally of ours who shares our values, who has a democratically elected government, and undermine them in their hour of need when they are fighting against a terrorist organization.

This is good versus evil. The atrocities Hamas committed were barbarous, uncivilized. And yet the majority leader took their side.

Americans know Hamas must surrender—Hamas must surrender and release the hostages—and that we need to support Israel until Hamas is destroyed.

So what was the majority leader doing? Well, was he really concerned about the elections in Israel, or was he concerned about our elections? Pandering to the pro-Hamas terrorist wing of his party, somehow trying to distance himself from Israel—it is unbelievable.

Now, President Joe Biden, on October 7, talked the talk. He said we would stand with Israel no matter what. But the President called the majority leader's speech a good speech. He has been backing away from our ally Israel.

There are even reports that he is considering conditioning some of the aid to meeting Hamas's conditions. This is outrageous. What do you think Hamas does when they see the President of the United States start to step back from our ally?

If they were going to negotiate a cease-fire and somehow release hostages, you know that this is actually the opposite of what they are going to do now. They know if the President is weakening, the longer they hold out, the better their position is. It is the opposite of what we should be doing.

Hamas is a terrorist organization and understands one and one thing only, and that is strength. We need a President who is going to project that strength—project the strength and support our ally Israel. That is what would bring our hostages home. That is what would bring all the hostages home.

Let Israel do the work of civilized nations and destroy this terrorist organization. That is what needs to happen.

Everyone in America knows it is not the Israeli Prime Minister Binyamin Netanyahu who is the obstacle to peace; it is Hamas who is the obstacle to peace.

Hamas started this. October 6 there was a cease-fire. They broke it on October 7. Hamas is responsible for every death on October 7 and every death since then. They are the obstacle to peace.

I am proud to stand with my colleagues and remind the majority leader that Hamas is a terrorist organization that is the obstacle to peace, not our friend and ally Israel.

I will point out to him what Americans know: that this is a terrorist organization that needs to be destroyed. We must stand with Israel. I am proud to say I stand with Israel. The majority leader and the President must reverse course and stand with Israel as well.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

ELECTRIC VEHICLES

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak about the President's most recent attacks upon the freedoms of the American people. This week, the Biden administration, the Environmental Protection Agency, announced that it is going to put stringent new limits on gas-powered cars.

In effect, this delusional new regulation is attempting to kill the sale of gas-powered cars in America and, in doing so, try to force every American to buy an electric car.

President Biden seems to want to regulate every room in the house of the American people. He started in the kitchen with our stoves, continued throughout the house, and now he is headed to the garage. This is a coercive crusade, and it is a crusade against consumer choice. It is a crusade against convenience and also against affordability.

Last year, less than 1 in 10 of the vehicles sold in this country were electric vehicles. Under this new rule, Biden is demanding that the EVs make up two-thirds of all new car sales by the year 2032. Apparently, the administration thinks it is smarter than everyone else. They want to pick what you can drive and punish people who choose to drive something different. Why? Well, it is all in the name of the smug superiority of the coastal elites who think they ought to be running the country.

Now, this is the crux of the new Biden car ban. Driven by this blind faith in the climate religion regardless of the cost to our country in terms of energy being affordable, available, or reliable. The costs are real, and they

are expensive. The benefits are theoretical, unproven, exaggerated, and certainly burdensome. President Biden is pushing ahead anyway.

To Democrats, what kind of cars Americans drive isn't a practical question; it is one based on theology. Their war against gas-powered cars amounts to what I believe is foolishness at best and leftwing lunacy at worst. Americans reject and continue to reject this unwelcomed intrusion into our lives. They reject it for good reason. They know that this Biden car ban will drive their lives into the ditch.

Certainly, that is the case for the people of my home State in Wyoming. It is bad for the families in my home State. It is bad for the workers in my home State. It is bad for American national security. Farmers and ranchers count on their vehicles. It can be a matter of life and death. People know not to run out of fuel, not to run out of gas. They know what it is like in the winters. They know to always be fully prepared and fully loaded with gas before they head out on the roads in Wyoming.

They want their vehicles to be reliable and affordable. We have, in Wyoming, cold winters, vast distances. Electric cars are not meant to benefit and survive in either. President Biden's push to force Wyoming drivers to buy expensive vehicles they don't want, don't need, and most families can't afford is ridiculous and an abuse of power.

Electric cars are a reasonable choice for some people. They aren't a reasonable choice for everyone, and that is why these new administrative rules are so unreasonable. Electric cars should never be Americans' only option. And no one should be forced to buy a vehicle at a time they can least afford it.

Because of what we have seen with Bidenomics, that time when people can least afford things is turning out to be right now. People are suffering from the costliest regulatory agenda in history and also for increasingly higher interest rates for auto loans. Trying to force families to buy expensive new vehicles they don't want and can't afford is completely out of touch.

It has also become clear that Joe Biden's car ban is going to lead to a steep loss of jobs in the auto industry, particularly union jobs. We heard loud and clear from the unions about it. As the CEO of Ford Motor Company, Jim Farley, said last year, electric vehicles will require 40 percent less labor to make than the typical traditional gas-powered vehicle. According to one estimate, the transition to EV production will kill about 117,000 auto jobs in the United States. Another estimate puts that number much, much higher.

It is already hitting home for some automakers and autoworkers. The owner of Chrysler laid off 1,200 employees at his Jeep plant in Illinois. Ford cut 3,000 white-collar jobs last year. The reason for the layoffs, both companies say, is the EV transition. By pushing ahead with this Green New Deal fantasy, Joe Biden is pushing hundreds of thousands of union workers off the assembly line and into the unemployment line.

Plus, the Biden car ban puts activist demands ahead of America's national security. I mean, that is what is happening. President Biden is rejecting what is needed by American workers to try to appeal to a group of voters influenced by a TikTok climate influencer who visited the White House, met with John Podesta, and is now trying to drive the administration's energy policy.

When we take a look at the electric batteries that are used to power these vehicles, where are they coming from? Well, 80 percent of the world's electric batteries right now are coming from communist China. Communist China controls 60 percent of the critical minerals that are used to make these batteries. When Joe Biden and the Democrats try to force-feed electric vehicles to Americans, it is a recipe for more dependence on the dictators and the despots, including the Chinese Communist Party.

We need to change course. We want to stop Biden's mandate madness. We are working to put American drivers, not Washington bureaucrats, back in the driver's seat for when people make decisions in this country. Americans should be able to make their own decisions about what type of vehicle works best for them and be able to buy it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for 10 minutes.

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

Mr. CARPER. My colleague JOHN BARRASSO has just spoken. He and I used to lead the Environment and Public Works Committee. We worked together over the years on a lot of issues. He is good at finding the middle in a bunch of those and I think I am, too, and so is our Presiding Officer.

I want to follow up on the issue of electric vehicles. The reason why there is a strong interest in this country and around the world in electric vehicles is because they don't put greenhouse gases into the atmosphere. The reason why we are concerned about greenhouse gases coming out of fossil fuel vehicles—it is something like 30 percent of the greenhouse gases in this country being produced by our mobile fleet, our cars, our trucks, our vans—almost all of them are gas- and diesel-driven.

We are seeing a real tick up in the last 3 or 4 years in electric vehicles. There is a lot of interest right now in a combination—hybrids—where you run for a while—vehicles run for a while on battery and for a while some of these on other sources of fuel. I think we need both of those.

The reason, again, why it is important for us to do something real with respect to reducing greenhouse gas emissions, about 30 percent of our greenhouse gas emissions come from the cars, trucks, and vans we drive—about 30 percent. About another 25 percent comes from the powerplants—coal-fired plants, natural gas-fired plants. That creates the electricity we use in our businesses and our homes. Maybe another 20 percent of our greenhouse gases in this country come from manufacturing plants—steel mills, asphalt plants, that kind of thing.

Should we be concerned about this? Yes. Last year was the hottest year on record on our planet—hottest year. It was the hottest year in the United States, and the expectation is that it is going to continue to worsen as time goes by.

For those of us who live in the coastal communities, there is a great concern in Delaware and all up and down the east coast, gulf coast, and Pacific coast about sea level rise. We see threats to people's homes, their businesses, their jobs. So there is a real incentive to do something about that as well.

One of the things Senator BARRASSO and I and JOHN NEELY KENNEDY, the Senator from Louisiana, have worked on before is one of the major sources of carbon emissions, which, as I mentioned, is our mobile fleet. But another one comes from, believe it or not, refrigerants that are in the air-conditioners, the freezers—the coolants that we have used—something called HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons. There is a need to actually phase those down.

We have new substances that can be used as a refrigerant to address the concerns that we have with HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons.

The two colleagues I just mentioned, we all worked together toward legislation—a treaty called Kigali—the last couple of years to adopt a stepdown plan over 15 years so we reduce about 85 percent of our use of those HFCs.

Why am I interested in HFCs? In terms of the threat they pose to us with respect to climate change, they are 1,000 times more potent than carbon dioxide. Think about that. HFCs are 1,000 times more potent. That is why we are concerned about doing something, and we are.

Methane. We have way too much methane in our air. And I worked a couple of years ago with my colleague JOE MANCHIN from West Virginia and others from EPA to come up with a methane emissions reduction program, which is now being implemented.

Why do we care about methane emissions? They are about 85, 90 times more potent than carbon dioxide when it comes to climate change.

There used to be, oh gosh, a criminal. I am trying to think of what his name was. He was up in New York State back during the Depression. He used to rob banks. He used to rob banks. The Presiding Officer may remember this story. He used to rob banks—a lot of them. He finally got caught and was

arrested, put on trial. He came before the judge and the judge said to him: Why do you rob banks? He said: Your honor, that is where the money is.

The reason why we go after hydrofluorocarbons, the reason we go after methane and auto emissions is that is where the emissions are. They pose a great threat to our planet.

The young people sitting down here to the right of our Presiding Officer today, they look young, and they are probably all about 15, 16, 17 years old. They are pages. They are from all over the planet. I want to make sure, at the end of the day, they have a planet to grow up on. I want to make sure they will have families of their own and their children and grandchildren will have a planet to grow up on and grow old on. I also want to make sure they have jobs to support themselves and their families.

One of the untold stories about the work that we are doing to reduce these greenhouse gas emissions is we can create jobs while doing that. We can create a lot of jobs in terms of building vehicles, cars, trucks, and vans. We put people to work, believe it or not, using hydrogen. This is something that is especially a bright future in our country.

People are going to hear a lot in the days to come—weeks to come—something called hydrogen hubs. We could actually use hydrogen to fuel airplanes. We could use hydrogen to fuel buses. We put out a lot of emissions. We could use hydrogen to fuel large trucks—all of that. We could use hydrogen to create electricity in powerplants.

The question is, Are we doing that? We are. We are doing it in a way that creates jobs—a whole lot of jobs. The idea that if we want to reduce emissions, harmful emissions, we will cripple the economy—that is not really true. We can have both. It is like having your cake and eating it too; in this case, having the benefit of reducing greenhouse gas emissions and creating a whole lot of jobs and putting people to work.

One more word on hydrogen hubs. The Presiding Officer and I and others have worked on this for a while. The administration has put out some guidance from the Treasury Department on the use of hydrogen to help reduce emissions. As it turns out, I studied economics in school. I got here later on. I spent a lot of time in the Navy, and I know a thing or two about nuclear power. You hear a lot about nuclear power. There is a process called electrolysis where we can use electricity created by nuclear power, which puts out no emissions—no harmful emissions. And there is electricity created by hydro. In Maine, where the Presiding Officer is from, they have a fair amount of electricity that is produced by hydroelectric power. I learned just several years ago that there is a process called electrolysis that uses electricity that comes from nuclear powerplants and electricity that comes from hydroelectric plants and puts out no emissions. And we can use that electricity in conjunction with water, H_2O, in a way that separates the ''H''—the hydrogen—from the oxygen, and we can harness that hydrogen and use it in a lot of ways that would enable us, as I have just spoken, to reduce harmful, harmful emissions. And we have got to be smart enough to do that.

Janet Yellen, the Secretary of the Treasury, was before our committee today, before the Finance Committee. I found it a good exchange, with respect to the Treasury Department. They are in the process of writing guidance. Sort of like when we pass a law, the Federal Agency writes a rule or regulation to say what the law is all about now. The folks over at the Treasury Department are trying to write the guidance, if you will. They help guide us as we move to adopt hydrogen more completely. And through the process of electrolysis, we can create it.

So it is acknowledged that we sort of have our differences. Those of us in the Senate, Democrats and Republicans, are anxious to make sure we don't leave the opportunity to create hydrogen through electrolysis, using nuclear energy and using the hydropower. And we had a very good exchange, and she did express an openness and a willingness to hear us out and maybe try to find the middle in ways that create jobs, in ways that help preserve this planet so that someday these young pages, when they are old pages and they have children of their own, they will have a planet that they can be proud of and they can live on.

One of my favorite international leaders is the President of France, a guy named Macron. A couple weeks ago, our President gave the State of the Union Address. I thought he gave a really good one. But about 2, 3, maybe 4 years ago, we had another leader who spoke to a joint session of the House and Senate in the House Chamber, and it was the President of France, a fellow named Macron, who was actually a leader—I think a global leader—on climate change and how to deal with that.

And one of the reasons he is interested in this is, the last time I saw and I noticed when they had the Tour de France—I don't know if any of our young people ride bicycles, but the Tour de France is a great bicycle race. About a year or 2 years ago, when they had the Tour de France, they had to call it off in different parts. They couldn't complete the race because the pavement that they were riding their bikes on was melting. It was melting.

This stuff is real. We are not making it up. And the question is: What are we going to do about it? What are we going to do about it in ways that put people to work, keep people working? We can do that.

I drive an EV. For many, many years, I drove a 2001 Chrysler Town and Country minivan for, like, 20 years, and I had 600,000 miles on it. And my wife says I am cheap, and I wouldn't buy a new car. Finally, I did, and I bought an electric vehicle, and I have had it for a couple of years now. And not only do I feel good about it—just recharge this in our garage. We have a place to charge it. And there are other places, these Wawa convenience stores all up and down the east coast. Wawas have charging stations all over the Atlantic coast. Sometimes we use those.

But the thing that is especially attractive about the vehicle that we drive—that I drive—is frankly the maintenance costs are de minimis. It is amazing. We have had it 2 years and spent almost nothing on maintenance costs.

The other thing is they are fun. And I remember when I was a kid, the age of these guys, how much fun it was to get my learner's permit and later on a driver's license and to be able to drive and be on my own. And I feel the same sense of joy in driving today because of what we have with the EV.

So with that having been said, I will close with comments about JOHN BARRASSO. I think the world of JOHN; he knows that. And I always look for ways to work with him. He is a strong advocate for nuclear energy, and my hope is that, although there are some things we are going to disagree on, we can agree on something called the ADVANCE Act.

The ADVANCE Act, which has come out of the Environment and Public Works Committee, is sort of the next generation of nuclear powerplants, and nuclear power can be used for a lot of good use, good purposes. We always have to do it in a way that is safe. You always want to make sure that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has the resources that they need to do their jobs, to keep us safe so we can have safe nuclear power.

I am a Navy guy. I spent a lot of years in the Navy in Alaska, before serving in the U.S. Senate, and I used to fly P–3 aircraft missions. We used to fly in and out of the Brunswick Naval Air Station, up in Maine, when the Presiding Officer was Governor of Maine.

But one of the things that Senator BARRASSO and I agree on is the need for more nuclear, and we have an opportunity to move forward on small nuclear reactors. And they are safe and provide the electricity that we need in a lot of different ways. And my hope is that we cannot just talk about it to the folks that agree to disagree, but always look for ways to agree to help save our planet and help create a lot of jobs for those who live here.

With that, I yield back. I see our colleague from Texas, Senator CORNYN, has come to the floor, who is the ranking member of the Trade Subcommittee of the Finance Committee, which I am privileged to chair.

I am going to pause for a moment and see if he is ready to take the floor before I yield.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

ISRAEL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, following Hamas's brutal attack against Israel on October 7, some 5 months ago, Republicans and Democrats came together, along with the President of the United States, and declared our support for Israel. We all condemned the Hamas terrorists, as well as Iran, which is the main support for this proxy of the number one state sponsor of international terrorism.

We all watched in horror at the videos we saw of Hamas attacking innocent men, women, and children, and we all vowed to stand in solidarity with Israel as they did whatever they needed to do to defeat this evil.

As time passed, it seems like the roar of support among some of our friends across the aisle, including the Senate majority leader, has softened, to say the least. Some of our colleagues have even gone so far as to cast blame on Israel for the violence that is unfolding in the Middle East. They are blaming the victim, not the perpetrator. More than two dozen Senate Democrats have even joined with liberal activists to demand a cease-fire.

The quickest way to a cease-fire is for Hamas to lay down its weapons, but we know they are not going to do that because they are committed to the eradication of the State of Israel. ''Wipe them off the face of the planet'' is their goal.

This once rock-solid support on a bipartisan basis has slowly eroded, and it reached a new low last week when the Senate majority leader came to the floor to excoriate not Hamas, not Iran, but Israel and its leadership.

Israel, we know, is our single closest friend and ally in the Middle East, one of the very few democracies. Yes, they have messy politics. By the way, we have messy politics, too, here in this country, but we respect—we should respect—the sovereignty of that nation and their ability to make hard decisions on their own behalf without being lectured by the President of the United States and by the Senate majority leader.

The majority leader criticized Israel's response to the October 7 attack. He condemned Prime Minister Netanyahu's leadership, and he called—get this—he called for an election in Israel to replace him. In my time in the U.S. Senate, I have never seen anything quite like this. The majority leader's comments mark a sharp departure from his previous stance solidly in support of Israel. And, unfortunately, I presume for political reasons, he has decided to undermine our support on a bipartisan basis for Israel and to make it a partisan issue and to attack the leader of a sovereign ally and one dealing with the horrific aftermath of a terrorist attack.

Can you imagine, in the wake of 9/11, if our closest allies had called upon the American people to change our President to align with their political preferences? We would have been insulted. We would have been offended and completely outraged. The suggestion that the leader in a foreign country knows the needs of a country better than its own citizens is appalling.

On top of that, it undermines Israel's most critical job at this moment, which is to eliminate the terrorist threat against its own people. This is not like al-Qaida, thousands of miles away across an ocean. This is in the backyard of Israel. By browbeating Israel and criticizing its leaders, the majority leader has undermined the trust and confidence Israel needs in our commitment to continue to help them complete this job of eliminating the terrorist threat.

Yes, innocent people are getting hurt, but that is not the fault of the victim. That is the fault of the perpetrator of this violence. And, yes, maybe some of us would like to see different tactics chosen on the battlefield, but that is not our call. We have to trust our friend and ally Israel to make the best decisions in defense of its own sovereignty and its own existence. And, yes, we can all have private opinions about how they are going about it.

But the truth is America's role in this conflict should not be confused. We should not be saying: Well, on one hand, we support Israel. On the other hand, we think they are being too tough on Hamas.

We need to support our closest friend and ally in the region. It is just that simple. It is the choice between good and evil.

If you watch the videos of Hamas's attack against Israeli civilians on October 7—as I know the Presiding Officer has, and all of us have been exposed to it—you will recoil in horror as babies are killed, where women are sexually assaulted. I, actually, for the first time in my life, saw a video of a Hamas terrorist behead an innocent Israeli civilian—behead.

That is what we are dealing with. That is what Israel is dealing with.

There should not be confusion. We should be approaching this with complete clarity. For those of us who said we stand with Israel, we ought to lock arms on a bipartisan basis and reaffirm their right to exist and their right to make choices for their nation and their people, and we ought to support them as they go through what has to be a horrible experience for Israel.

It is not just Hamas. Again, as the Presiding Officer knows and we know, in Lebanon, in the northern part of Israel, Hezbollah—another proxy for Iran—is shooting into Israel and attacking Israeli Defense Forces. We know that Houthi rebels in Yemen are also supported by Iran. Iran is the octopus. Hamas, Hezbollah, and the Houthis are the tentacles or the proxies they use to do their evil. Then there are the Shia militias who have attacked American troops hundreds of times in Iraq and Syria.

There should not be any confusion about this. There is the right side and the wrong side. There is the good, and there is the evil. America stands with Israel. The vast majority of Americans feel exactly as I do. We should trust the people of Israel to make decisions, certainly, about their own leaders.

I mean, we don't like it when foreign countries try to interfere with our elections. What is the speech of the majority leader but an attempt by a leader of a foreign government to interfere with their elections? We need to maintain our position that Israel has a right to defend itself against Hamas, against Hezbollah, against any Iranian proxy or any entity or country or group that wants to destroy the Jewish State.

So I regret the fact that this has become, it seems, like a partisan issue. This is the last thing that our Israeli friends and allies would want. They don't want this to be partisan politics because we know what happens here when things become partisan. One side supports an action, and the other side reflexively opposes that action. We can't afford to play politics with the U.S.-Israel alliance. Our support for Israel must remain unwavering regardless of whom they choose for their own leaders. We must support democracy. We must support sovereignty. We must support the enduring bond and the common values shared between our two countries.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes, followed by Senator TESTER for up to 10 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall votes.

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

S.J. RES. 62

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, in November of 2023, the Biden administration released a new rule to allow for beef imports from Paraguay, a country that has historically struggled to contain outbreaks of foot-and-mouth disease in their cattle herds.

The United States has been blocking beef imports from Paraguay since 1997. Paraguay last reported cases of foot-and-mouth disease in 2012. The USDA's decision to resume Paraguayan imports relies on an analysis that was completed in 2018, but American inspectors have not conducted a site visit to Paraguay since 2014.

American producers work tirelessly to produce the safest, highest quality, and most affordable beef in the entire world. Our consumers should be able to confidently feed their families beef that has met the rigorous standards required within the United States. The United States has not had a case of foot-and-mouth disease since 1929. We want to keep it that way by reversing this rule until a working group has had an opportunity to evaluate the threat to food safety and animal health posed

by Paraguayan beef with an updated analysis.

In other words, what we are asking for is for the Department of Ag here to protect our food supply for consumers by making certain that they use the most updated information possible before they allow Paraguay to begin importing beef here.

Foot-and-mouth disease is something that we have literally eradicated, but if it ever gets back into the country, it can be transferred to human beings, and it can be transferred to human beings back to livestock. It is contagious. We just simply ask that they update this study before they allow this to occur.

Today, we have two votes in a row. The first vote is not on this particular issue, but the second vote is. I would ask my colleagues for an affirmative vote to delay this rule—to stop this rule and delay it—until such time as we have an appropriate and timely review.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I first want to express my appreciation to the good Senator from South Dakota, Senator ROUNDS.

You know, Senator ROUNDS comes from South Dakota, and I come from Montana. These are both States where we raise a lot of beef. If you come from a State like that, you understand how catastrophic lifting the ban on Paraguayan beef is. It is not a good idea. In our States, lifting this ban is not supported by Democrats, and it is not supported by Republicans. The reason is pretty simple. The impacts that lifting this ban have on operations—ranching operations—and on our food security is real, and it is very, very, very serious.

This Congressional Review Act vote that we are going to take—the second one in this order—will overturn the Biden administration's decision to lift that longstanding ban on beef imports from Paraguay. The truth is, the administration butchered this decision. I have serious concerns if Paraguay does not currently meet the animal health standards that are in place to warrant access to our markets. Congress must step in and stop this decision in order to protect the American producer and the American consumer.

Our ranchers in this country—I like to say our Montana ranchers—raise the best beef in the world. In fact, there is a bumper sticker that says, ''Montana makes beef, and beef makes Montana,'' and that is a fact. And it is true all over this country. Our ranchers do it by holding themselves to the strictest standards when it comes to managing and maintaining their herds. Paraguay simply doesn't meet those same high standards. They have a history of foot-and-mouth disease, and lifting this ban poses a real threat to our food supply.

Look, while the chances of a foot-and-mouth disease outbreak to some may appear low, the effects of just one outbreak can be devastating. The cost to ranchers for our economy is estimated to be as high as $200 billion. And you say: Why could that happen? I mean, how could it happen? It is just a little bit of meat coming into the United States. Well, the fact is, this is highly contagious. What happens if a cow contracts this disease is—it is like pouring acid over their nose, over their udders, over their feet; it blisters the mouth, the feet, the udders; and, quite frankly, it goes through a herd like wildfire. It puts people out of business, and it impacts our food security.

Senator ROUNDS talked about this, but the USDA has to get more recent data and thorough data to show that Paraguayan beef is safe and healthy. It should be available behind the meat counter with the information that we have now because, as Senator ROUNDS pointed out, we haven't had inspectors there in 10 years, and there were only four there when they were there. Things change.

Look, this isn't about one single country. The fact is, I know Paraguay is a great ally, and I think the State Department is having a lot of influence on this decision because of that ally. I appreciate countries that have the same values as us, but the fact is, we do not have the animal health standard in place—it is a broken process—and we need to have better standards if we are going to be bringing beef from anywhere. This is about keeping our consumers safe. It is about protecting America's cattle herds so that ranchers don't have to fear an outbreak of this disease because, if it happens, they are done: generational ranchers, done; our food supply, put at risk.

If you want to know who is supporting this Congressional Review Act, they are folks who typically don't always get along together—the NCBA, U.S. Cattlemen, R-CALF USA, the Livestock Marketing Association, the National Farmers Union, and the American Farm Bureau. This shows the kind of broad-based support for the CRA that Senator ROUNDS and I are doing on this issue. Rural America sees this as a real problem. This united front shows just how important protecting our cattle herds and our food supply is to American farmers and ranchers.

I want to be clear: I share my colleague's concerns about what is going on in China and Russia right now. I understand the importance of strengthening alliances with partners all over the world, including Paraguay, but I am telling you we shouldn't do it on the backs of hard-working American ranchers. We shouldn't do it on the backs of threatening our food security.

I understand that many folks back here have never gone through a calving season; they have never had to fix a fence; they have never had to manage grass; they have never had to butcher a cow. But I am going to tell you, I see firsthand every day the kind of work these folks put in, and they don't need something that is totally out of their control putting them out of business and putting our food supply at risk. That is why this is critical. Congress needs to step up, do the oversight, pass this Congressional Review Act, and put the ban back on Paraguayan beef. It is really important. I would urge all of my colleagues to support this common-sense solution to protect our Nation's food supply and do right by American ranchers.

In closing, I will just say this: The way we adjudicate animal health standards in foreign countries that want to export beef to us—that system is broken. It is broken. Congress has an opportunity today to provide real oversight and jump-start the conversation about how much we need on these reforms, and it starts with this Congressional Review Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the scheduled vote occur immediately.

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

VOTE ON RODRIGUEZ NOMINATION

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

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, 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 legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 48, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 100 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—48

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

Thune	Tuberville	Wicker
Tillis	Vance	Young

NOT VOTING—2

Capito	Mullin

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). 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.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session for the consideration of S.J. Res. 62, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 62) 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''.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to proceed is agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the joint resolution pass?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT).

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 25, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 101 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Baldwin	Cornyn	Graham
Barrasso	Cortez Masto	Grassley
Blackburn	Cotton	Hassan
Blumenthal	Cramer	Hawley
Boozman	Crapo	Hickenlooper
Braun	Cruz	Hirono
Britt	Daines	Hoeven
Brown	Ernst	Hyde-Smith
Budd	Fetterman	Johnson
Cantwell	Fischer	Kennedy
Collins	Gillibrand	King
Klobuchar	Reed	Smith
Lankford	Ricketts	Tester
Lummis	Risch	Thune
Manchin	Romney	Tillis
Marshall	Rosen	Tuberville
McConnell	Rounds	Vance
Merkley	Rubio	Warren
Moran	Sanders	Whitehouse
Murkowski	Schatz	Wicker
Murray	Schumer	Wyden
Ossoff	Scott (FL)	Young
Padilla	Scott (SC)	
Peters	Sinema	

NAYS—25

Bennet	Durbin	Shaheen
Booker	Heinrich	Stabenow
Butler	Kaine	Sullivan
Cardin	Kelly	Van Hollen
Carper	Luján	Warner
Casey	Markey	Warnock
Cassidy	Menendez	Welch
Coons	Murphy	
Duckworth	Paul	

NOT VOTING—5

Capito	Lee	Schmitt
Hagerty	Mullin	

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 62) was passed, as follows:

S.J. RES. 62

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 Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service relating to ''Importation of Fresh Beef From Paraguay'' (88 Fed. Reg. 77883 (November 14, 2023)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

(Mr. BOOKER assumed the Chair.)

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FETTERMAN). Under the previous order, the Senate will resume executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leon Schydlower, of Texas, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Texas.

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

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

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, today, I rise to honor Women's History Month and to once again bring attention to the destructive practice of book banning taking place all across our Nation.

At this time, I am also going to be joined by my esteemed colleague, Senator TINA SMITH from Minnesota.

Our Nation's literature serves as a mirror, a window, and a door to endless possibilities, fueling our imagination, fostering empathy, and challenging us to think critically about our beliefs and values. To many young Americans, opening a book with characters who resemble them and their lived experiences is the very essence of our Nation's commitment to freedom of thought. These stories highlight the voices of everyday Americans who often go unheard.

Let me put the horrors of these book bans in context. PEN America provides a comprehensive overview of the increase in book bans across U.S. schools during the 2021 to 2022 school year. It reveals a significant rise in instances of censorship, with over 2,500 cases affecting nearly 1,650 unique titles. Most of these bans are driven by organized groups targeting books that explore LGBTQ+ themes and racial issues.

Adding on to this, in 2022, the American Library Association documented 1,269 demands to censor library books and resources, marking the highest number of attempted book bans in over 20 years and nearly doubling the count from 2021. A significant 38-percent increase was observed in the number of unique titles targeted, with the majority concerning LGBTQIA+ topics or authored by individuals from diverse racial backgrounds.

The worst part is that these challenges are increasingly initiated by groups rather than individuals, with a shift toward targeting multiple titles at once. It is the new veneer by which historical revisionists intend to erode the history of our people.

I am all but obligated to ensure that all forms of expression remain unrestrained. Just as rivers carve the landscapes of America, literature has the profound capacity to shape the minds and lives of America's youth. These stories flow through their consciousness, eroding old biases, watering seeds of new ideas, and guiding them along the path of self-discovery. In navigating these waters, young people learn to understand and embrace their identities, recognize their place in a larger narrative, and appreciate the diversity of the human experience.

Literature, in its boundless forms, acts as a river—constantly moving, shaping, and transforming the selfhood of our youth, guiding them toward the vast ocean of their potential.

Growing up in rural Mississippi and as the descendant of sharecroppers, my journey echoes the narratives of resilience and perseverance that are deeply rooted in American history, and so I found solace reading the words of the great Maya Angelou—one of our Nation's quintessential civil rights leaders and one of its most prolific writers. With her profound literary and societal contributions, Angelou left an indelible mark across America.

Angelou's voice, particularly through her autobiography ''I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings,'' offers deep insights into the human condition, advocating for civil rights and female empowerment. Yet, proponents of book banning do not believe that her story and her perspective have a place in our national narrative.

''I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings'' is set against the backdrop of the rural South, providing a poignant exploration of Angelou's own experiences growing up as a Black girl in America during the Great Depression of the 1930s and 1940s. Her words encapsulate the essence of American beauty.

It is not just the triumphs but also the struggles that shape us, guiding our paths to becoming who we are meant to be. ''I Know Why the Caged Bird Sings'' is a testament to the human spirit's capacity for resilience, for transformation, and for triumph over adversity, making it a timeless and essential piece of literature. Every child in this Nation should have the opportunity to read it if they are truly to understand the history of the United States.

In her writing, Maya Angelou offers:

Without willing it, I had gone from being ignorant of being ignorant to being aware of being aware. And the worst part of my awareness was that I didn't know what I was aware of. I knew very little, but I was certain that the things I had yet to learn wouldn't be taught to me at George Washington High School. I began to cut classes, to walk in Golden Gate Park or wander along the shiny counter of the Emporium Department Store. When Mother discovered that I was playing truant, she told me that if I didn't want to go to school one day, if there were no tests being held, and if my school work was up to standard, all I had to do was tell her and I could stay home. She said that she didn't want some white woman calling her up to tell her something about her child that she didn't know. And she didn't want to be put in the position of lying to a white woman because I wasn't woman enough to speak up. That put an end to my truancy, but nothing appeared to lighten the long gloomy day that going to school became. To be left alone on the tightrope of youthful unknowing is to experience the excruciating beauty of full freedom and the threat of eternal indecision.

Few, if any, survive their teens. Most surrender to the vague but murderous pressure of adult conformity. It becomes easier to die and avoid conflicts than to maintain a constant battle with the superior forces of maturity. Until recently each generation found it more expedient to plead guilty to the charge of being young and ignorant, easier to take the punishment meted out by the older generation (which had itself confessed to the same crime short years before).

The command to grow up at once was more bearable than the faceless horror of wavering purpose, which was youth. The bright hours when the young rebelled against the descending sun had to give way to twenty-four-hour periods called ''days'' that were named as well as numbered. The Black female is assaulted in her tender years by all those common forces of nature at the same time that she is caught in the tripartite crossfire of masculine prejudice, white illogical hate and Black lack of power. The fact that the adult American Negro female emerges a formidable character is often met with amazement, distaste, and even belligerence. It is seldom accepted as an inevitable outcome of the struggle won by survivors and deserves respect if not enthusiastic acceptance.

To those advancing the banning of books, I ask you to pause and reflect on a moment when a book truly spoke to you. Let that memory guide you to understand the power of literature, not just as a mirror of society but as a builder of empathy and understanding across diverse experiences. Consider the richness these narratives bring to our collective understanding and the importance of keeping that diversity accessible for all.

Literature, like rivers carving landscape, shapes the minds and lives of our youth, guiding them toward self-discovery and empowering them to embrace their identities.

Maya Angelou's work exemplifies the resilience and strength of marginalized communities—of the community of Black women—offering profound insights into the human experience.

I urge my colleagues to reflect on the transformative power of literature and to join me on the Senate floor to read an excerpt from a banned book that changed their lives but has since been banned from the lives of others.

May we continue to strive for a future where every voice is heard and every story is valued. May America read freely.

Now I turn to my colleague, Senator SMITH from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to speak out about the absurd book bannings that are happening in schools across our country. I want to thank Senator BUTLER for inviting me to speak today about this issue.

You know, I was reflecting, as I was listening to Senator BUTLER speak in the beginning, about what reading meant to me when I was a young person and when I was first understanding what it felt like to be immersed in a book that I loved—that feeling of learning, of being able to imagine myself living different lives, being able to think about what different experiences would be like, and understanding that my life was not everybody's life, that there is such diversity of life in this world, and being exposed to that through reading was so exciting to me.

Also, as I was seeing how I was not like everybody else, I was also able to see myself in the people whom I read about—both my own struggles as well as triumphs in the stories that I read—and that is the gift of reading. So to think about the absurdity of trying to block that gift from people because of one's own views about what is OK and what is not OK is, I think, what is at issue here.

So I appreciate very much having the opportunity to read into the RECORD incredible authors whose works have been unfairly banned.

To my colleagues, I think it is interesting that, just last week, the American Library Association released new data documenting how prevalent this is. They are documenting book challenges that are happening throughout the United States, and they found a huge surge in these challenges—a 65-percent increase in challenges to books just in 2023. It is the highest level the ALA has ever recorded.

Among the books that were banned last year is a book called ''And Tango Makes Three.'' This is a book by Justin Richardson and Peter Parnell. It is a demonstration of the absurdity of banning books—this book in particular. It is based on the real story of two penguins in the Central Park Zoo who create a family and raise a chick together. Both of these penguins were male, and so a Florida school district banned the book because of their State's ''don't say gay'' law. Now I am going to read a bit of the text because I think it shows so much. Here we go.

[C]hildren and their parents aren't the only families at the zoo. The animals make families of their own. There are red panda bear families, with mothers and fathers and furry red panda bear cubs. There are monkey dads and monkey moms raising noisy monkey babies. There are toad families, and toucan families, and cotton-top tamarin families too.

And in the penguin house there are penguin families. Every year at the very same time, the girl penguins start noticing the boy penguins. And the boy penguins start noticing the girls. When the right girl and the right boy find each other, they become a couple.

Two penguins in the penguin house were a little bit different. One was named Roy, the other was named Silo. Roy and Silo were both boys. But they did everything together.

They bowed to each other. And they walked together. They sang to each other. And [they] swam together.

They didn't spend much time with the girl penguins, and the girl penguins didn't spend much time with them. Instead, Roy and Silo wound their necks around each other. Their keeper Mr. Gramzay noticed the two penguins and thought to himself, ''They must be in love.''

Now, I have four grandchildren, and I think that reading a story like this to them—reading this story to them—is exactly what should be happening as children and people of all ages really think about what it means to love one another, what it means to be a family, and how we can come together in that idea rather than being driven apart.

I hope and will do everything I can to make sure that my four grandchildren live in a future where books that affirm that families can come in all different forms and in all different shapes and sizes aren't considered worth banning.

I thank Senator BUTLER for organizing this discussion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to use a prop during my remarks.

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

RECOGNIZING THE INDIANS OF MILAN HIGH 1954 BASKETBALL CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, you might be surprised by the guest book of a museum in a small town in Indiana. Inside it are names of visitors from all 50 States and from much farther away—other countries, other continents, places like Italy, France, Japan, and New Zealand.

They have made their way to Milan—Milan, IN. And they have done so because here is where the heart of Hoosier Hysteria lives. It is the greatest basketball story ever that has taken place. It happened there 70 years ago this week, March 20, 1954, at the Fieldhouse on the campus of Butler University in Indianapolis: the finals of the

Indiana High School Basketball Tournament, the Indians of Milan High, enrollment 161, versus the Bearcats of Muncie Central, enrollment 1,660. Fifteen thousand fans are in the bleachers, with thousands more Hoosiers listening over the radio. It is the fourth quarter. The game is tied at 30; 18 seconds on the clock. Milan inbounds. Senior Bobby Plump gets the ball. He fakes left, dribbles right, pulls up, knocks down a 14-foot jump shot just as the clock expires. The nets come down. The celebration starts.

The next morning, the new State companions headed home. They are in a fleet of Cadillacs along Indiana's county roads. There was no interstate or highway connecting Indianapolis to Cincinnati, the closest city to Milan.

Hoosiers were awaiting along the way in Greensburg, in Shelbyville. They were holding signs. They were waving. State Road 101, which led back home, was lined with cars and cheering fans for 13 miles. And 40,000 people were waiting in little Milan, IN, even though at the time, the town had only 1,100 residents. This is Hoosier Hysteria. This is what the people of Indiana are so excited about every March.

That year, in 1954, as the players from Milan rolled into town, two members of the team, Ray Craft and Kenny Wendelman, hopped on the roof of their Cadillac with the championship trophy between them. The procession ended near Milan High. That is where that trophy remains today.

The next morning, the crowd was gone. The small town, its quiet had gradually returned. In the days that followed, members of the team graduated. They went off to college, pursued careers. They drifted apart. Coach Marvin Wood took a job up in New Castle.

The passage of time brought other changes—not all of them welcome, of course. Little Milan, like so many towns across the country—it is facing challenges. And the single class basketball tournament system that gave small town teams like Milan a shot at the title is no more.

Some of the schools that played in the 1954 tournament are gone. Milan, it hasn't won another championship. Though, it must be said they made it to the semi-State back in 1973.

Despite this—or possibly because of it—the Milan Miracle is as inspiring as ever. Yes, it is the tale of the little guy, the underdog, David versus Goliath, the smallest school to ever win the single class tournament. Literally, in fact, Muncie Central's average height was 6-foot-4. Milan was 5-foot-11.

This story is so much bigger than that, so much bigger than basketball or even Indiana, for that matter.

Milan's players always note that their championship run in 1954 wasn't a lightning strike. It wasn't even a stroke of good luck. No, the Indians made it to the final four the previous year. Most of the players had known and practiced with each other since grade school. They played tough. They were coached well. Perhaps most importantly, they had faith—faith in their teammates, faith in one another, faith in that community that they represented, faith that merit and hard work would be rewarded, faith that, just maybe, their dreams would be satisfied.

Bobby Plump's last shot is still talked about around the country, really, but certainly, back home in Indiana. That is the moment we remember. But it was the culmination of a lot of hard work, dedication, and teamwork. And it happened because of the support of families, friends, and neighbors.

Milan was a place where, when a student needed a winter coat, locals—they took up a collection at the drugstore. They bought that coat. It is the place where the kids who didn't have a lot of money could eat for free at Rosie's. The ones from nearby Pierceville who often had to walk to school, they could count on rides from friends.

In a different era, when the world seemed so much smaller, the local basketball team was, at least for the month of March, the world—the world—every one of these teams, the celebration of your togetherness, your community, your opportunity to show your stuff.

Even a water shortage in the spring of 1954 didn't dampen Milan's or Ripley County's excitement for the Indians. In fact, as an area newspaper reported: ''water or no water, Ripleyians want Milan to bring home the crown.''

Apart from what happened on the hardwood at Hinkle Fieldhouse, the memory of Milan lasts because—because their team and town symbolizes what keeps all of our communities together, what lifts our hopes and fuels our dreams, even when it feels like hopes and dreams are all we have.

That trophy that I mentioned, that trophy in the newly refurbished lobby of Milan High's gymnasium, today is a symbol of more than just a State championship. Oh, it is so much more.

You see, it is proof of how much we all can achieve when we work together towards a common goal and resolve to hold our own, no matter the odds, no matter how insignificant others might say we are or think we are. It is an inspiration still across small towns and struggling places waiting on their own miracle, where the basketball team brings people together and makes them feel proud of the places they call home. This—this is why we still celebrate little Milan beating mighty Muncie Central 70 years on. It is why we will, I believe, for the next 70 years too.

Of course, for those who haven't already figured it out, this is the story that inspired ''Hoosiers,'' a beloved movie written and directed by a pair of Hoosiers.

You see, visitors regularly come to Indiana in search of the movie's fictional Hickory, hoping to find the small town epicenter of Hoosier Hysteria. But what they are really searching for is right there in Ripley County. It is an actual town with a real history and a tradition to be proud of and, dare I say, replicated.

They will recognize it by the basketball goals in driveways, the backboards on barns, the black water tower with white lettering, prominently reading: ''STATE CHAMPS 1954''—it is still there. I have seen it many times, the historical marker commemorating the Milan miracle and that museum that celebrates it right there in the center of town.

As a newspaper declared back in 1954:

In basketball, Little Milan is the new capital of Indiana.

I think that is about right. Well, 70 years later, it is still the capital, and the Indians will always be champions.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I want to compliment my colleague from Indiana on those wonderful remarks and reflection on history.

I will reflect, in the present day, North Carolina has three teams in March Madness.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3237

Mr. President, I am here for, actually, a serious subject. At the end of my comments, I am going to ask unanimous consent.

I want to talk about a bill that my office sponsored—actually, something I thought of several months ago. It is S. 3237, the Patriot Bill of Rights.

My office was very much involved in the PACT Act drafting. By that, I mean that we were primarily responsible for leading the language that led to the Camp Lejeune toxic act. There was also a TEAM Act in there, but I am here to talk Camp Lejeune toxics.

In full disclosure, when that bill went to the floor, I voted against it, which was a very difficult decision for me to make. I was one of only about nine people who voted against it. It wasn't because I was opposed to the bill; it was because I was opposed to whether or not it was ready to come out of the oven; that there were things that we needed to work on. That has actually proven to be true.

We have got a lot of work to do, because I think we went just a little bit too soon. I know we did on the Camp Lejeune toxic act. There is probably not a person in the United States who has ever watched the TV or listened to radio who has not seen the advertisements right now for: If you worked or lived in and around Camp Lejeune for more than 30 days, call this hotline.

That hotline, in many cases, is not even a lawyer. It is an aggregator. It is somebody who is advertising, trying to convince a veteran to call this hotline so that they can help you get the benefits you deserve.

The fact of the matter is, the Senate voted to make sure that veterans got the benefit that they deserved if they were exposed to a toxic substance down in Camp Lejeune. It is in my State, down in the eastern part of the State.

What they don't tell you is that if you were a veteran and served in and around Camp Lejeune, there are a variety of ways that you could get compensation without ever talking to a lawyer. Now we have ads where we have, literally, a cottage industry of people harvesting potential veterans, getting them to sign retainers, charging them double-digit fees in many cases, at the expense of all that money, all the money that a veteran is entitled to, going to the veteran.

So I was a bit frustrated with the way the ads were going in this cottage industry and the millions of dollars that are not actually going to the veteran. But it was a hearing about a year ago about veteran suicide that made me think that maybe we have a wonderful opportunity to fix something.

This morning, I looked up the number of days that I have been here. I was sworn in on January 6, 2015. And I learned a startling number today. The number is 67,240. That is the number of veterans who have taken their life through suicide since the day I was sworn in here. That was in 2015—67,240. To give you a concept of what that is, that would fill Bank of America Stadium, where the Panthers play. That would actually—we would have 7,000 people waiting in line to get into Soldier Field. That is how many veterans have committed suicide since I entered office—about an average of 20 a day.

Now, why does that matter? Because we are constantly trying to find ways to connect veterans to the VA. And there is another sad statistic with those 67,240 veterans who have taken their life over the last little more than 9 years. Two-thirds of them are not connected to the VA. That means they have never applied for any sort of service through the VA. Two-thirds of those 67,240 people who have taken their life are not connected to the VA.

So I came up with an idea. I said: Why don't we actually kill two birds with one stone. Let's not cap fees or whatever on attorney's fees. Some of these cases are complex; they are very expensive. So we won't cap fees, but why don't we at least make sure that before a veteran signs a retainer agreement with an attorney, they understand what their rights are.

My office processes thousands of veterans' cases every year. We love processing veterans' cases. So I thought maybe we just have a bill of rights so that before that lawyer can actually get you to sign a retainer agreement, you have to know what your rights are.

Did you know that you can call your Senator, your State Congressman, that you have a variety of no-cost options to see if your case is one where you don't even need an attorney? You can call the VA. You can call the Department of the Navy. Let's get them all these contacts and say: Before you sign this retainer agreement, maybe you need to call them.

Now, part of it was to make sure that the simple cases people were not paying money for. A lot of the people who are calling these attorneys think that is the only way they can get this benefit.

So the idea was a simple document—that, incidentally, is endorsed by the VFW—that lets them know what their rights are. And maybe—just maybe—these thousands of people who are calling attorneys today will call the VA and get connected; and if they are connected, maybe they are one who is otherwise going to be in crisis and commit suicide. So it achieves two objectives at the same time. It, hopefully, prevents them, the veteran, from paying money that they don't need to, to get a benefit that we all believe that they deserve; and, as importantly, it potentially connects somebody who is at risk of committing suicide to the VA, to a crisis line, to possibly give them a lifesaving intervention.

I can't imagine what is wrong with it. Guess what. It can't be cost because it doesn't cost us anything. The CBO said it is negligible. It holds the legal profession accountable if they are charging exorbitant fees for simple cases. And it maybe provides a lifesaving connection point from the servicemember to the VA.

So that is my motivation for coming down to the floor. People who are watching this may not know: Unanimous consent means that any Member can come to the floor and say—and I will in a moment—''I request consent to move this out of this Chamber'' and then hopefully have the House pick it up.

I am doing this today, and I probably will start doing it every week for the remainder of time between now and August when this enrollment period is still going on because every week another 140 servicemembers are going to die, and I have to believe, if some of them were connected to the VA, they may not. But I promised the VFW and I promised veterans groups when we had a hearing a couple of weeks ago that I was going to bring this to the floor.

We have addressed the concerns in the bill. And I believe, if we get it to the House, we can get it passed into law. So that is some background on why I make the following request.

Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 3237 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any objections?

The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me say at the outset that Senator TILLIS, though we may disagree on this particular issue, is a respected colleague, a friend, and a member of the committee which I chair. I value him on the committee. I thank him for his friendship. Though we may disagree today, I hope we find room to agree tomorrow.

Mr. President, this bipartisan bill, the Camp Lejeune Justice Act, was signed into law in August of 2022, almost 2 years ago. It was part of what was known as the PACT Act. This was an important bill to provide a day in court, finally, for U.S. marines and others who were poisoned by contaminated water in Camp Lejeune, NC.

For over three decades, from 1953 to 1987, marines, their families, and others working and living in Camp Lejeune were exposed to a toxic mix of industrial solvents and other chemicals in their drinking water. As a result, as many as 1 million people are at an increased risk of cancer, Parkinson's, and other debilitating diseases.

Had these individuals suffered the same harm in another place, they would have been able to go to court and seek compensation for their injuries, but unfortunately hurdles in the law locked servicemembers and their families out of the judicial system. For decades, they suffered without any ability to have their day in court, despite their injuries.

That changed with the Camp Lejeune Justice Act, which was led by Senator TILLIS—and I thank him for that—as well as Senator BLUMENTHAL, Senator Burr, and Senator PETERS. It finally allowed marines the opportunity, after literally decades of waiting, to seek justice by filing a lawsuit in Federal court if an administrative claims process did not reach a satisfactory resolution.

Now, there have been some problems with the implementation of this bill. I will be the first to admit that. We need to work—and I am happy to work with Senator TILLIS—on a bipartisan basis to address these problems just as we did with the Camp Lejeune Justice Act.

The bill was proposed by the Senators from North Carolina. The one he proposes aims to help veterans, but unfortunately it has several serious shortcomings. First, it would require attorneys to provide Camp Lejeune victims a written acknowledgement that they are required to sign. This acknowledgement would state that the victim—plaintiff—understands that they may seek guidance free of charge from veterans service organizations, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, their congressional representatives, and the Department of the Navy.

But this acknowledgement won't be accurate in all the cases. For example, not all the Camp Lejeune claimants are veterans. Many are civilians who worked at the camp. For these individuals, it is inaccurate to say, as this bill does, that they get free guidance from veterans service organizations or the Veterans' Administration.

Second, the bill would require attorneys to submit a second written acknowledgement with the Secretary of the Navy stating that the client understands that legal representation by an

attorney is not required to file an action pursuing a Camp Lejeune claim. This is technically correct.

Depending on the facts and circumstances of the case, legal representation may be needed to have any chance at successfully pursuing your claim. Just look at the experience to date. Remember, this bill was passed 2 years ago almost. To date, almost no Camp Lejeune claims have been paid by the Navy. As of the end of February, 1,530 Camp Lejeune claims have been filed in the Eastern District of North Carolina, and 170,502 administrative claims are on file with the Navy. Of all those thousands of claims, only 48 cases have been determined to meet the government's criteria for settlement based on submitted documentation. Even there, the process for uploading what are known as the ''substantiation documents'' has been extremely difficult for families to understand.

And for cases that will ultimately be litigated, the process can be lengthy, complicated, and expensive. Toxic exposure cases are not easy to prepare or prove, particularly when they relate to conduct that happened decades ago. Victims will need to go through ''discovery.'' For many of them, it will be the first time they have heard the word in that context. And they may need to retain expert witnesses to demonstrate causation.

While all of this can technically be done without an attorney, it is practically impossible to do so and have your claim succeed. So steering victims away from legal representation may eliminate any chance of recovery.

Finally, this bill contains a provision stating that a law firm that receives ''veteran data'' from an advertising agency must reduce their legal fee in an amount equal to the cost incurred to receive that data. It is unclear to me, in reading this bill, what the term ''veteran data'' even means. Additionally, this requirement would discourage attorneys from reaching out to potential plaintiffs who may have worked at Camp Lejeune years in the past and may not even know they are eligible for compensation.

After fighting so hard to make sure those poisoned by the water at Camp Lejeune can finally have their day in court, we should not now close the courtroom door all over again.

Let me be clear. If there are unscrupulous lawyers or nonlawyers who are deceiving veterans or running scam solicitations, I want to join in a bipartisan effort to crack down on them.

There is a bill, the GUARD VA Benefits Act, which has 42 bipartisan cosponsors, that is properly scoped to do just that. Current law prohibits individuals or businesses from assisting a veteran in preparation, presentation, or prosecution of a VA claim unless they are accredited by the Veterans' Administration. They are also prohibited from charging fees for this assistance before the VA makes a decision on the claim.

However, the VA and other Agencies are limited in their ability to enforce the law because criminal penalties were eliminated from the statute about 20 years ago. The GUARD VA Benefits Act would reinstate those criminal penalties.

This bill is a top priority for veterans organizations that have been working for years to combat predatory practices of unaccredited entities who charge unauthorized fees while purporting to help veterans with their disability claims. These are the types of reforms that will actually help veterans from Camp Lejeune and others as they seek compensation benefits.

I will be happy to work with the Senator from North Carolina to make sure that veterans are protected from unscrupulous actors while ensuring that we don't inhibit quality advocates from helping veterans finally get their day in court, but I cannot support the bill in its current form, and I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, just briefly, again, I appreciate Senator DURBIN as the chairman of the Judiciary Committee. We have had many opportunities to work together.

First off, I would just like to point out—and I will because I do intend to do unanimous consent for this—there is a burning platform issue here between now and August. These ads are going on and on. Veterans are making a phone call. I am looking at ways to get to these veterans, and I am told that this will make a connection. So that is something separate from some of the substance that Chairman DURBIN talked about.

We have processed about 12,000 cases since I have been here, since 2015. We referred a number to veterans service organizations. Veterans service organizations are approved by the VA and do have attorneys. They can triage cases. And one thing that they do very well is say: This is an easy case; we can help you with this one. This is not an easy case; you need to seek legal representation.

As a matter of fact, we do that as standard operating procedure in my office. I am not saying that many of these cases may need them, but I know a lot of them don't, and I suspect many of them don't. And every dime that you pay an attorney is a dime that is not going to the veteran.

So what I am trying to do here is just to make sure they understand that they have these resources available. It is amazing to me how surprised people are that I have 25 people in the State dedicated to casework, full-time people dedicated to veterans work, a great relationship with VSOs. All of those are free, highly skilled options for veterans that these ads on TV are not making clear to veterans.

We have to do right by veterans. Like I said, I am disappointed with the objection today, but we will have plenty of time to talk about this every week that we are in session between now and August.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

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

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOSEPH SUINA

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Dr. Joseph Suina for his service to our Nation.

Dr. Suina is a former Cochiti Pueblo Governor, a University of New Mexico professor emeritus, and a Vietnam and Marine Corps veteran. Recognition of Dr. Suina's service is long overdue.

But before I speak about his military service, I want to take a moment to recognize what Dr. Suina's decades of leadership have meant for Cochiti Pueblo and for New Mexico as a whole.

Over the course of his life, Dr. Suina has served as a Governor for his Pueblo and a Tribal council member. He also served as the president and CEO of the Cochiti Community Development Corporation and as the chair of the Cochiti Language Revival Committee.

But before all of that, Dr. Suina grew up in Cochiti Pueblo, within the adobe walls of his grandmother's home. He has recounted the nights she would sing to him in their native language and tell him stories of her childhood, well before electricity and cars had made their way to the Pueblo.

As a young boy, he was shunned by his teachers for speaking his native language at school and experienced the stark contrast between the teachings of his grandmother and those of his nonnative teachers.

Through it all, Dr. Suina found strength in his culture, later leading him to become a champion for keeping indigenous language and culture at the center of Native American education policy.

Dr. Suina worked for decades as a professor in the University of New Mexico's College of Education, and he directed the Institute for American Indian Education, serving Tribes across the Southwest. His scholarship focused on how maintaining connection to tradition, culture, and language improves educational outcomes for Native students.

He also developed new methods for assessing student learning and training programs for educators who teach Native students. And over the years, Dr. Suina has mentored countless teachers whose work continues to make a difference for New Mexico's children and children throughout the entire Southwest.

You can see the results of his work in so many communities, but especially in his home community of Cochiti Pueblo and at the Keres Children's Learning Center. The center is an indigenous language revitalization school that has become one of the very best early childhood and primary education centers in the entire country. It

is a living testament to Dr. Suina's visionary leadership and education.

The legacy of Dr. Suina's life of service to Cochiti Pueblo, to New Mexico, and to our Nation will be felt for generations to come.

And, today, I would also like to recognize Dr. Suina's service to our Nation as a marine.

In the early 1960s, just 3 days out of high school, Dr. Suina enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps. He went on to serve two tours of duty in Vietnam, in 1964 and in 1966. He was wounded in his second tour and earned a Purple Heart on March 22, 1966. He was honorably discharged with the rank of sergeant.

Tomorrow, Dr. Suina's friends and family members are gathering together at the New Mexico Veterans Memorial in Albuquerque to recognize his service to the Nation, and I am honored to have helped play a role in retrieving the medals that Dr. Suina earned as a marine and that he will receive at that gathering.

You see, back in the 1970s, Dr. Suina's house was broken into and his service medals were stolen.

As I mentioned earlier, Dr. Suina earned the Purple Heart Medal, which was one of the Nation's oldest and most distinguished medals. The Purple Heart is awarded to U.S. servicemembers who have been wounded or killed as a result of enemy action.

Dr. Suina also earned the following awards: the Combat Action Ribbon, the Marine Corps Good Combat Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, the Vietnam Service Medal, the Rifle Sharpshooters Badge, the Pistol Expert Badge. And he also earned a Gallantry Cross Medal from the Republic of Vietnam.

I was deeply honored to help retrieve these medals that recognize Dr. Suina's incredible bravery and sacrifices.

And, before I finish, I also want to commend Dr. Suina for the ways that he has raised the visibility of the physical and often invisible wounds that impact veterans with PTSD.

In recent years, Dr. Suina has spoken about how he saw these wounds in himself, in his fellow Vietnam veterans, and in the veterans of his father's generation who served in World War II. Many of these veterans have come home with trauma that went unrecognized. And I am so appreciative that Dr. Suina is working to bring recognition and healing to himself and to his fellow veterans.

And on behalf of so many New Mexicans and so many Americans, I want to express just how profoundly grateful we are for Dr. Suina's lifetime of courage and of service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here for what is No. 30 in my series of ''Scheme'' speeches, about the scheme to capture the Supreme Court. And I thought this would be a good time to give sort of a quick overview of where we have been since most of my speeches have been rifle-shot speeches at individual issues that the Court has caused us to have to face up to.

So the fundamental problem here is that we have a Supreme Court that has been captured by rightwing special interests, and we see this in decision after decision after decision. And it is affecting the lives of ordinary Americans all over.

When I say that this is a Court that has been captured by rightwing special interests, what do I mean? Well, there is considerable research out there and considerable literature out there about a phenomenon that is sometimes called Agency capture, and it is sometimes called regulatory capture. It is the same thing. It is the capture of regulatory Agencies. And you can look it up in your library. You can look it up on the internet, and you can get a sense of the extent to which this is recognized in the economic literature, recognized in the administrative law literature. And it is a frequent avenue, unfortunately, of corruption into government decision making.

And if you want an example to think about, you could imagine a railroad commission whose job is to set rates for the railroad, back in the era of the railroad barons, and the railroad barons have chosen who is on the railroad commission. So the railroad commission isn't serving the public. It is doing exactly what the railroad barons want. That, in a nutshell, is what ''Agency for regulatory capture'' is all about.

And one of the things that we have discovered in the course of this is that the effort to capture the Court has been a very expensive effort. This is no small or casual thing.

True North Research has done a lot of this research. And so far, they are up to finding $580 million that have been spent on this Court capture operation. It is not always easy to figure out because the money flows from one place to another through indirect sources and into entities that obscure who the original donor is. It is complicated. But $580 million is a lot of money, and even very, very, very rich rightwing billionaires aren't going spend that much money on a whim. They are going to spend that kind of money because they are going to get a return on their $580 million investment.

So that is the fundamental problem we are facing—a Court captured by special interests in the same way that, in the old days, Agencies and Commissions were captured. But that technique jumped the rails and was applied to our Supreme Court and with a very, very robust scheme behind it, with at least $580 million spent to accomplish these goals.

So there you go. You have got your captured Court. You have spent your $580 million. But can you really expect the judges that you helped put on the Court to remember exactly what it is they are supposed to do in every case? No. That is pretty hard, even for very bright judges.

So the next thing you have to do is figure out how you get the Court to do what it is told and pass on the message of what it is that you want. You have captured a Court. How are you going to tell it what the outcome is that you want?

So this is a Court that is doing what it is told, and the manner in which it is told is actually fairly plain view, in some respects, because what happens is that the dark money billionaires fund groups that file briefs. And it is not just one brief. They file briefs in little flotillas. Usually the number is 10 or 12. In a case really important to them, we have seen the number get as high as 50. But that is pretty rare. So amici curiae—Latin for ''friends of the court''—are groups that are allowed to file briefs in the Supreme Court, even though they are not a party to the case.

And they come in. And let's say that there is a dozen of them. They are coordinated. They send the same common message, and that way the Justices who have been put on the Court through this Court capture scheme are kept up to date on precisely what it is that their big donors want.

Now, when I say ''fake amici,'' I mean that these are groups that don't very well disclose who is behind them. It doesn't say: We are here from Koch Industries. We are here from ExxonMobil.

It is intermediating groups that have mysterious sounding names. I will give you one example right here. This is a group of organizations managed by a guy named Leonard Leo, who was basically the fixer—the factotum—of the rightwing billionaires who spent the $580 million to capture the Court.

You need an organizer. You need the orchestrator. You need a guy who runs around and does this stuff, and Leonard Leo is the guy. And he has his own little group up here of companies that report to him and pay him. This is how he gets money out of this scheme.

But down here, he has this array of front groups that he and his allies control. So 85 Fund and Concord Fund actually exist. They are corporate entities under Virginia corporate law.

These other entities—Judicial Education Project, Honest Elections Project, Free to Learn, Free to Learn Action, Honest Elections Project Action, and the Judicial Crisis Network—actually don't exist. What they are, under Virginia law, is fictitious names. That is the legal term for what they are—fictitious names for these entities.

So in one of the cases in which these phony front group amici appeared to tell the captured Justices what it was that their donors wanted, Honest Elections Project filed the brief.

It did not identify itself in its brief as being a mere fictitious name. It did not identify itself as being a mere fictitious name of this 85 Fund group. It did not identify that 85 Fund group as a

corporate twin to this Concord Fund group. The 85 Fund is what is called a 501(c)(3) group. The Concord Fund is a 501(c)(4) group. It is customary in political influence operations to have a twin 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) sharing office space, sharing personnel, sharing donors, sharing board members. It is very hard to find a corporate veil between the two that is actually real.

What they also did not disclose is that the ''Honest Elections Project,'' as a fictitious name of the 85 Fund, tied it to the Concord Fund, which operates under the fictitious name ''Judicial Crisis Network.'' It is through this fictitious name that the billionaires spent huge amounts of money on TV advertising to stop the nomination of Judge Merrick Garland to the Supreme Court and to push for the confirmation of Justices Gorsuch and then Kavanaugh and then Barrett under the Supreme Court, with individual checks written to support the campaign as big as $15 million and $17 million.

These are serious people who are writing serious checks to try to have a serious effect on the Court, and they have, but it is hidden. Judicial Crisis Network ran ads for Justices who were reading Honest Elections Project briefs without explaining the connection between the two. So the whole thing is very slippery, and that is why I use the word ''fake'' about it.

Here is another thing about it. This is the appendix that I added to a brief that I wrote in the Seila Law v. Consumer Financial Protection Bureau case. It shows individual entities that filed amicus briefs in that case, and it showed their funders. If you look at it, it is basically one big blob through which billionaires send money from these entities into these entities.

Donors Trust has really no purpose in life other than to hide the identity of donors. It is an identity laundering machine to give to all of these things so that the Court doesn't know and the public doesn't know that, in effect, it is the same people behind this array of front groups. It makes it look like there are a whole bunch of different things.

New Civil Liberties Alliance and the Buckeye Institute and the Southeastern Legal Foundation, Pacific Legal Foundation—oh my gosh, they must be from all over the country. Not so much. They are fund groups for the funders who run money through these outfits to prop up these outfits.

So you have your captured Court, and you have your front groups to tell the captured Court what it is to do. What you end up with is that these fake amici propose a whole lot of factual findings for the Court, and you end up with fake factfinding.

If you look at some of the worst decisions that the Supreme Court has rendered—Citizens United and Shelby County—both of them stood on fake factfinding. They asserted things to be true that were not true, and those things were essential to the logic of the decision. The Court couldn't have gotten to the outcome it wanted to get to without those pylons, if you will, of fake fact.

They have opened up a whole new arena for fake factinding with a new so-called history and tradition analysis they brought to bear in Dobbs on reproductive rights cases and in Bruen on gun rights cases, because you can fake your way through history and tradition very easily. You just go back into history, and you cherry-pick the facts you like. Real historians will come in and say ''Well, that was ridiculous,'' but it doesn't matter—you got what you wanted. The ability to do that fake factfinding is going to get worse, not better.

Citizens United and Shelby County are the worst of all. These two decisions have really hammered our democracy—Citizens United by letting unlimited amounts of dark money into our elections. We are up to $1 billion in dark money now. Don't tell me those people are spending money just for the sake of the goodness of the country. No. They have specific things they want out of politics, and they are willing to spend $1 billion to get them and ordinary citizens be damned.

Shelby County basically gutted the key enforcement provision of the Voting Rights Act, and a flood of legislation in formerly protected States flowed through, shutting down access to the ballot on behalf of mostly minority voters—in fact, in one case, targeting minority voters with what the Court said was surgical precision.

What are we doing about all that? That is a hell of a problem set. What are we doing to try to get to the bottom of that? Well, we are doing a couple of things.

First, we are trying to educate the public. We are trying to let people know what is going on. This is not a normal Court. This is not the way courts ordinarily behave, and this is certainly not the way the Supreme Court should be behaving.

Second, we are trying to investigate, trying to figure out what the heck is going on, to get to the bottom of this mess. How did this happen, and what are the problems?

Third, we are legislating. My bill to clean up the mess at the Supreme Court has cleared the Judiciary Committee, and we are hoping for a vote on that in this Congress. I doubt it will get much support on that side, but I think it is very important to have a recorded vote that shows who is on the side of the billionaires behind the Court capture operation and who would like to have a little bit of clarity and transparency and have Justices meet the same ethics standards that other Federal judges meet. It is not a peculiar standard; it is what is required of other Federal judges.

So the education piece is working tolerably well, I would say. People get it. I think we are down to 18 percent of Americans who have real confidence in the integrity of the Court.

I put a lot of work out there to document what is going on, and if anybody is interested, you can look up my name as an author in the Harvard Law & Policy Review and find my article there. You can look up my article that the American Constitution Society published. You can look up my Harvard Journal on Legislation article. You can look up my Yale Law Journal article. My most recent one was in the Ohio State Law Journal on this whole scheme of fake factfinding propping up Supreme Court cases and how they violated the rules of factfinding in order to violate factfinding.

There is a lot of research out there. These are all publications that get reviewed. They have all been cleared by the publisher, so it is not like I am making crazy stuff up. These have been out there in some cases for years, and everybody who wants to criticize them has had every chance. They seem to have stood up very well on their facts.

What are we doing on investigation? Well, the Finance and Judiciary Committees are looking into the problems with the Court.

Chairman WYDEN of the Finance Committee has developed evidence that the motor coach loan to Justice Thomas was never paid back. In fact, not a dollar of principal was ever paid on that loan. For a period of time, Justice Thomas paid interest to the individual who made the quarter-of-a-million-dollar loan to him, and then he stopped paying interest, and he never paid any principal. So we are looking into what that means. What does that mean from the point of view of Justice Thomas's disclosure about gifts and income? What does that mean with respect to his tax filings because under American law, the forgiveness of a debt is income that needs to be declared. Was that done? That is what the investigation is looking to find out.

The second has to do with Harlan Crow's yacht—also famous from Justice Thomas's vacations. This is the yacht that took Thomas around Indonesia for 10 days or so in what has been valued at a quarter-of-a-million-dollar vacation. Not bad.

Well, it turns out that the Crow yacht has been going around the world declaring itself to be a pleasure yacht in some places and in other places, declaring itself to be a yacht for charter. Well, the difference between a pleasure yacht and a yacht for charter is that a yacht for charter gets to deduct expenses. Sure enough, it looks like Mr. CROW has deducted $8 million—$8 million—in tax deductions off what he often says and what the boat's shell corporation often says is just a pleasure yacht. You don't get to deduct the expense of your pleasure yacht. So it is an important distinction. They say both things, and we are investigating which is true and whether false statements were made.

Then in the Judiciary Committee, under the leadership of Senator DURBIN, we had the authority to obtain

subpoenas. We were able to subpoena the shell corporation that owns the yacht. We were able to subpoena the shell corporation that owns the private jet. We were able to subpoena the shell corporation that owns the Adirondack estate where that famous painting was made of Harlan Crow, Justice Thomas, Leonard Leo, and the rest of the little crew hanging out together.

So that is all under active investigation, and that is not going to stop, I can assure you.

As I mentioned, the legislation passed the committee. It passed it on July 20, 2023. We are looking forward to having a robust discussion about Supreme Court ethics when this is brought up on the Senate floor for a vote in Congress.

Finally, we have had an interesting set of successes, I guess I would call them, at this point with the Judicial Conference. The Judicial Conference is the body that runs the judicial branch of government. It is its own sort of board of directors. It is made up of the chief judges of all the different circuit courts of appeals and a chief judge from a district court in each circuit. It is a very august body.

Here are some of the things they looked at. They looked at what I call the ''Scalia trick.'' The ''Scalia trick'' was to get someone to tell a resort owner to invite Scalia on a free vacation with a personal invitation on the free vacation and then not disclose it as a gift because it was ''personal hospitality.''

Well, when that was pointed out to the Judicial Conference, they blew that scheme to smithereens because it is obvious that arranging a personal invitation to a resort owned by somebody you don't even know does not amount to the kind of personal hospitality—like family trips—that is the basis for allowing nondisclosure of big gifts.

The question before them now is, when they did that, was that a clarification of the law or was that a new rule? It took Scalia's lawyers about a nanosecond to jump in and say: Oh, this is a new rule, and we are going to comply with it.

He doesn't usually talk about this stuff, so you think about, why did the lawyers pop up with that? Well, the reason they popped up with that is they wanted to say it was a new rule because if it was a clarification, which is what the Judicial Conference said it was, they would have to go back and amend all his previous filings that were filed in violation. That would be a fine mess.

So Justice Thomas has a lot at stake in that determination, and that determination is before the Judicial Conference right now.

You are looking at this problem of fake amici that I described. They have agreed that the rule is inadequate and that it is not appropriate for parties and the public not to know who is really in the courtroom but to have these masks—these front groups, these fakes—showing up without disclosing who is really behind them.

They are still investigating what I call Thomas-Crow 2.0. There was a first round of billionaire gifts from Harlan Crow to Justice Thomas back in sort of 2009, 2010, 2011 for yacht and jet travel. That was investigated by the Judicial Conference, and then the matter was closed. Then he went back and did it all over again. So they are still investigating the Thomas gifts from Harlan Crow, second round, 2.0.

Then I have asked them to look at something Justice Alito did, which was to offer an opinion in the Wall Street Journal editorial page about a matter that was not only likely to come before the Court but was virtually certainly headed to the Court. He offered an opinion, which is something they say in their confirmation hearings they are not allowed to do, but he did.

Worse still, it wasn't just about some free-range topic; it was about a specific dispute, an ongoing dispute. He took sides in an ongoing dispute. Worse still, he took sides in that ongoing dispute at the behest of a lawyer on the other side in that dispute. By the way, that lawyer represented his friend Leonard Leo, so there was a personal connection, and the gravamen of the dispute was our ability to find out about free gifts of travel to Justice Alito. So at the end of the day, his improper opinion protected him from public scrutiny for gifts he should not have been receiving.

So all of that is before the Judicial Conference. I want to express my appreciation to the Judicial Conference for their diligence in doing this. Obviously, this is not the way they would like to spend their time, but the Supreme Court has not given them much choice by continuing to engage in all of this bad behavior, and it is all related, and it is all part of the scheme.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

NOMINATION OF ADEEL ABDULLAH MANGI

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about an exceptional American, Adeel Mangi, who is a nominee for the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. He is eminently, extraordinarily, very impressively qualified.

He has degrees from Oxford University and Harvard Law School. For over 20 years, he has been a highly respected complex litigation attorney in one of our country's premier law firms, where he has become a star, a star in the legal profession as one of the very best trial attorneys in our country.

Beyond finding success after success professionally for his clients, he has spent countless hours providing pro bono services for causes fundamental to our American ideals of freedom, liberty, and justice.

The support of Adeel Mangi has inspired, for his nomination, incredible support. It has seen support across the ideological spectrum and speaks to the character and integrity of the man. Dozens of prominent State and national organizations, ranging from civil rights groups, law enforcement associations, anti-hate groups, professional legal groups, all have endorsed his nomination, including so many from New Jersey and of course the New Jersey State and Federal bar associations. Mr. Mangi has received the highest possible rating for judicial nominees from the American Bar Association.

A bipartisan—bipartisan—group of former State attorneys general have written in support of his nomination, writing:

> It is our collective judgment that Mr. Mangi is eminently qualified to sit on the Court. Mr. Mangi's legal career has been exemplary of a commitment to the rule of law and upholding constitutional principles.

Folks from the left, folks from the right, law enforcement, civil rights groups, and more—he has not only earned this nomination from the President of the United States, but his qualifications from that have been celebrated by groups all across our political spectrum and people in charge of our public safety in New Jersey.

Despite all of this though, what is outrageous to me, disappointing, and disheartening is that he is facing unimaginable attacks, not on anything that he has said or written, not on any of the cases that he has successfully tried, but he is facing attacks on his character.

And these attacks are recalling some of the darkest chapters of our Nation's history. The attacks on him are unwarranted. They are untruthful. They have no basis in fact. And, sadly, they smack of bigotry.

They intend to exploit people's fears. They intend to exploit people's fears of his faith. They are attacks on his character and his reputation, attempts to smear, attempts at fear.

I was blown away when the Republican leader came to the floor today and said something I never imagined I would hear on this floor about a man of such character.

He said that Mr. Mangi has ''anti-Semitic affiliations.'' Now, I know how people here feel when someone calls someone else racist or a bigot or makes accusations of hate, but the Republican leader said he has ''anti-Semitic affiliations.''

He said Mr. Mangi ''has repeatedly chosen . . . to mingle with supporters of terrorists and cop killers.''

That is a staggering charge, and yet it is the pattern that we have seen against Mr. Mangi—attacks not on his writings, not on his legal work, not on anything he has said, one quote that has come from his mouth. They are making an accusation that he mingles with supporters of terrorism, people who want to threaten the lives of Americans.

This is a continuation of what he faced in his confirmation hearing.

I read to you the interrogation that was given to him by the junior Senator

from Texas. When asked if he would condemn an event by the Center for Security and Race at Rutgers Law, which had an event with a panelist who had been convicted once before of terrorism—an attempt to make an association, a trial of his character based on no association—Mr. Mangi responded: I never heard of this event prior to today. It was never brought to the advisory board, which met once a year to discuss.

You see, he was on the advisory board of this organization at Rutgers Law that met once a year to evaluate scholarly writings to be included in an academic journal.

And so Senator CRUZ read a 2021 letter from the Center for Security, Race and Rights at Rutgers Law School related to the Israel-Gaza conflict. Mr. Mangi, again, explained that he had never seen the letter before. He was continuing to press that the letter—and repeatedly interrupted as Mr. Mangi tried to answer again and again.

Mr. Mangi: ''Senator, I said this earlier, but let me repeat it because I think it is critical.''

He is interrupted by Senator CRUZ and asked a question that had never been asked before to any nominee—ever—before the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. CRUZ: ''Do you condemn the atrocities of Hamas terrorists?''

Mr. Mangi immediately, ''Yes. That was what I wanted to address.''

Mr. CRUZ: ''Is there any indication of those atrocities?''

Again, a question never asked before.

''Senator, I will repeat myself,'' Mr. Mangi says.

Interrupting him, ''I am going to ask you again, is there any justification for those [horrors]?''

Mr. Mangi: ''This was going to be my next sentence, Senator, which is I have no patience, none, for any attempts to justify or defend those events. Senator, I don't think anyone feels more strongly than me.''

And the Senator asked him whether he supported the 9/11 attacks—a question posed to no other American before our committee—the attacks of 2001.

Mr. Mangi: ''Senator, I don't think anyone feels more strongly about what happened on 9/11 than someone who was there, who saw with my own eyes the smoke billowing from the towers.''

What American is asked such questions? What American has to defend their condemnation for the 9/11 attacks? What American has to declare that they don't support terrorism? What American? Adeel Mangi, who happens to be a Muslim American.

This is disgusting. This reeks of sort of old-style attacks to appeal to fear in order to smear someone's character based upon who they are, based upon their faith.

And an accusation by our Republican leader that Mr. Mangi somehow mingles with supporters of terrorists and cop killers, while the Anti-Defamation League—the preeminent American organization that fights against anti-Semitism, the preeminent organization that investigates anti-Semitism, the preeminent organization that time and time again condemns anti-Semitism—sprang to Mr. Mangi's defense.

I quote from their letter:

> Mr. Mangi was subjected to aggressive questioning unrelated to his professional expertise or qualifications. Rather, he was forced to provide responses to a wide range of inquiries regarding his views on global strategic considerations in a manner that inappropriately politicized these issues and raised serious questions regarding pretext and bias.
>
> Just as associating Jewish Americans with certain views or beliefs regarding Israeli government actions would be deemed antisemitic, berating the first American Muslim federal appellate judicial nominee with endless questions that appear to have been motivated by bias towards his religion is profoundly wrong.

The ADL then called on Senators to offer Mr. Mangi a fair vote, based on his qualifications, his fitness for the job, his legal acumen, his sense of fairness.

But the ADL wasn't alone in responding to these attacks on his character. As the Republican leader said, ''mingling with supporters of terrorists and cop killers,'' ''anti-Semitic affiliations,'' Jewish groups jumped to his defense. The American Jewish Committee, the National Council for Jewish Women, a coalition of 15 Jewish organizations, representing more than a million Jewish Americans, have also voiced their condemnation of this line of attack and their support for Mr. Mangi.

In Mr. Mangi's hearings, my colleagues asked the unbelievable that any American would be insulted to be asked: Was there any justification for 9/11?

Was there any justification for 9/11?

Never before asked to any other appellate nominee, but a Muslim American has to endure such questioning. This is unique and insidious to be directed to the first Muslim ever nominated by a President.

And yet, even so, Mr. Mangi sat there in that hearing with grace and dignity and unequivocally affirmed his patriotism, unequivocally affirmed his condemnation of terrorism. With dignity and grace and a calm voice, he rejected anti-Semitism outright. He said there is no justification for terrorist attacks like 9/11; there is no justification for the horrors of October 7; and he reaffirmed his belief in the right for Israel to exist. This is all on the record.

Mr. Mangi has faced accusations that tried to smear his character, to whip up fear against him, to turn him into something he is not. But this isn't the only angle of unfounded attack. Mr. Mangi is said to be—and I quote again—''he is said to be mingling with cop killers.'' ''Mingling with cop killers''—the absurdity of that statement, the falsity of it is extraordinary. It is extraordinary in the face of all the law enforcement groups in my State that support him. It is extraordinary in the face of all the legal leaders and the law enforcement leaders in my State who support him.

And where does this accusation even come from? What could possibly fuel such an accusation? It is because he served on an advisory board for a nonprofit called the Alliance of Families For Justice. What does this organization do? It supports formerly incarcerated individuals and their families through reentry services, legal support, and political advocacy. That is the organization.

And how did he get affiliated with this organization? Well, as a pro bono case, he chose to represent the family of an inmate in New York State prison, a man who had disabilities, mental disabilities, who was murdered by correctional officers. And as is a tradition in our legal system, he provided that family not with criminal support but in a civil case. And he won that civil case. Not only did he win that civil case showing it was a wrongful death, but he won the biggest settlement for the family.

Pastor Julia Ramsay-Nobles sent a letter to the Senate about this case. It captures the truth about Mr. Mangi's work with the Alliance For Families of Justice. It says:

> Dear Chairman DURBIN and Ranking Member GRAHAM:
>
> My name is Julia Ramsay-Nobles. I am a Pastor who lives in upstate New York. I recently learned that my attorney, Adeel A. Mangi, has been nominated to serve as a Circuit Judge for the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. I was so happy and proud to hear the news. I wanted to send you a letter to help you know Adeel as I know him.
>
> In April of 2015, I received the worst possible news: my brother, Karl Taylor, who was incarcerated in an upstate New York prison, had died. Karl suffered from serious mental health challenges. The prison officials told me that he was ''code blue,'' but did not explain what that meant. I could not get any answers. I felt so powerless and helpless.
>
> Several months later, a community group introduced me to Adeel and his team of lawyers . . . While I was hopeful—I never give up hope—I also felt skeptical. Why would these people care about what happened to my brother? Would they care about me?
>
> Over the following five years, I came to know Adeel as a man of integrity and an extraordinary lawyer. He and his team spent five years investigating my brother's death and holding the powerful to account. They delivered the answers that I was seeking, horrific as they were. While we are from very different backgrounds, we formed a close bond that I cherish to this day.

A Christian pastor, a Muslim lawyer, working together for American justice. And that affiliation with this organization focused on helping families of incarcerated people, an advisory board that he sat on that never had a meeting, where he just agreed to accept cases, that is the affiliation which has earned him to be called by one of the most powerful people in our country ''someone who mingles with supporters of cop killers.''

That is a lie. It is a lie. It is smearing the character of an American who

stood up for the powerless. It is a lie, an attack on a man because of who he is.

Never before has a judicial nominee before the Judiciary Committee been asked to renounce terror, never before has a nominee before the Judiciary Committee been accused of such baseless attacks.

This is the world's most deliberative body, but we have not brought the world's most deliberative body to the point where we are not evaluating the character or the fitness of a supremely well-qualified nominee to serve in our judiciary. But what has this room become now? A place where ad hominem, salacious attacks that have no basis in fact, in fact, twist the truth, which is: This is a man who stands up for our shared values and our shared ideals, who stands for the honor of our flag and country. It is character assassination. It is guilt by association. It is a cancer on our society.

We deserve better. Mr. Mangi deserves better. This is a man whose parents left their home country, yearning for a better future. They worked hard to put him through the best schools they could. They came to the United States because they believed in this Nation; they believed in our ideals. They had hope for the future that America would bring. They are proud Americans.

He studied at Harvard Law School to pursue a legal career to uphold the ideals of justice that we swear to, the ideals of liberty and justice for all. He reached the heights of his profession. And because at the heights of his profession, he made a decision to serve his country, he is before us as a nominee by the President of the United States, the first Muslim-American nominee to the Federal Appeals Court. This should be a great American story. It should be something we celebrate. And yet he is attacked not because of what he has written, not because of what he has said, not because of cases he has taken, not because of an interview, not because of a college law school or grad school paper. He is being attacked by made-up charges that have been debunked time and time again by the facts.

And how would any of us feel if we were applying for a position to serve our country—be it on the bench, be it in the military, be it in administration—and be subjected to this type of attack and accusation?

Think about what they are going through now as a family. When you Google ''Adeel Mangi,'' when his children do or his grandchildren do, do you know what comes up? The Washington Times article which published an image that superimposed the green Hamas flag onto his face. When his children or grandchildren Google him, what will come up? The Judicial Crisis Network, a rightwing front group dedicated to attacking President Biden's judicial nominees. They have spent tens of thousands of dollars running an ad calling him ''Anti-Semite Adeel,'' complete with video of planes crashing into the Twin Towers on 9/11.

It pains me to repeat those words into this historical record, but there is no other way to express how debasingly low groups have gone to attack him. It is grotesque.

When Muslim Americans or any American that has their faith that might be different looks to the highest deliberative body in the land and what did they do when the first Muslim tried to reach for the appeals court to serve as a judge? What happened to him? This is the story that will be told. This is toxic. This is dangerous. This is cancerous.

The attacks recall some of the darkest chapters of our history. It speaks back to the time when loyal Americans were sent to internment camps, not because of their beliefs, loyal Americans were sent to internment camps not because of things they said or they wrote; loyal Americans were sent to internment camps just because they were Japanese. It goes back to the dark chapters of our country, the Red Scare that led to the blacklisting, the persecution, the loss of jobs, the loss of reputation because of the Red Scare that was spread.

There was a courageous Republican who stood on this floor during that time of the Red Scare, a courageous Republican. I want to read Margaret Chase Smith's words, perhaps to wake up the echoes of this body of how horrible and dark this moment is to maybe cast some light.

Margaret Chase Smith, in the time of the Red Scare, spoke from this floor:

> I think that it is high time that we remembered that we have sworn to uphold and defend the Constitution. I think it is high time that we remembered that the Constitution, as amended, speaks not only of the freedom of speech but also of trial by jury instead of trial by accusation.
>
> Whether it be a criminal prosecution in court or a character prosecution [here] in the Senate, there is little practical distinction when the life of a person has been ruined.

Margaret Chase Smith continues:

> Those of us who shout the loudest about Americanism in making character assassinations are all too frequently those who, by our own words and acts, ignore some of the basic principles of Americanism.
>
> The exercise of [our] rights should not cost one single American . . . his reputation or his right to a livelihood nor should he be in danger of losing his reputation or livelihood merely because [of what happens to be his beliefs or, I add, his faith.]

As a warning to a Republican leader that accuses a good American of mingling with supporters of terrorists and cop killers, of saying that he has anti-Semitic affiliations, I read these final words of Margaret Chase Smith:

> I do not want to see the Republican party ride to political victory on the Four Horseman of Calumny—Fear, Ignorance, Bigotry, and Smear.

I doubt if the Republican party could, simply because I don't believe the American people will uphold any political party that puts political exploitation above national interest.

Adeel Mangi is a great American. Adeel Mangi has served his nation. Adeel Mangi has risen to the top of his profession. Adeel Mangi has dared to represent the poor against the powerful. Adeel Mangi has become the first in our country's history to be nominated by a President of the United States to the highest court—to the highest appeals court.

What has he been greeted with? A fair evaluation of his character? A fair evaluation of his body of work? A fair evaluation of his writings? A fair evaluation of his speeches? A fair evaluation of his temperament? No. He has been accused of mingling with terrorists and cop killers. He has been accused of being anti-Semitic. Why? Is it because he is Muslim?

I heard a speech against him reading all the groups that stand against him. I read some of the supporters: the AFL–CIO; the SEIU; the Association of the Federal Bar of New Jersey; the Asian Pacific American Lawyers of New Jersey; the Capital Area Muslim Bar Association; Muslim American Judicial Advisory Council; Muslim Bar Association of New York; New Jersey Muslim Lawyer's Association; National LGBTQ+ Bar Association; New Jersey State Bar Association; South Asian Bar Association of New Jersey; South Asian Bar Association of North America; former attorneys general, Republican and Democrat, and U.S. attorneys, Republican and Democrat, of New Jersey; a group of New Jersey sheriffs; Hispanic American Law Enforcement Association; New Jersey Asian American Law Enforcement Officers Association; LGBTQ Law Enforcement Liaison of New Jersey; Muslim American Law Enforcement Association; the National Black State Troopers Coalition; NOBLE of New Jersey; NOBLE, Region 1; the National Organization of Black Women in Law Enforcement; the American Association of Jewish Lawyers and Jurists; the American Jewish Committee; the Anti-Defamation League; the Alliance for Jewish Renewal; Bend the Arc; Jewish Action; Carolina Jews for Justice; Jewish Community Action; Jewish Democratic Council of America; Jewish Women International; National Council of Jewish Women; New York Jewish Agenda; Society for Humanistic Judaism; T'ruah: The Rabbinic Call for Human Rights; the Shalom Center; the Workers Circle; Zioness; Alliance for Justice; the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights; the National Women's Law Center; the NAACP Legal Defense Fund; the NAACP of Hunterdon County; People for the American Way; American Indivisible; Muslim Advocates; Muslims for Progressive Values; the Republican-appointed Honorable Timothy K. Lewis, former judge, U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit and the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania; members of New Jersey's local leadership; former colleagues from a joint defense group;

Partners of Jewish Faith; the letter I read from Pastor Julia Ramsay-Nobles; and the list goes on.

Mr. President, I beg your indulgence because this is one of the sadder days I have had in the U.S. Senate. I believe in this place. I believe in these values. But I see this moment that we are about to take a step to break a barrier in this country. Even the State of Israel has had Muslims on their supreme court. But as soon as we try to elevate a Muslim man to our court of appeals, he gets attacked by the words of the Republican leader for ''mingling with terrorists and cop killers,'' for being an anti-Semite, denounced by Jewish groups, but yet those charges will forever be a part of this RECORD, that this deliberative body made those allegations against this man.

Yes, I am sad, and yes, this is personal because my parents told me as a little boy, when I was the first one just to go to grade school, my brother and I, the first Black children to cross the threshold and go to a school—my parents told me: Stand proudly, and pledge allegiance to that flag because this country stands for you even though your skin color is different. This country's values are your values even though you go to a different church in town; that, yes, you may face discrimination by people who are cultivating in their baseness of values, but don't stop believing in love and community and peace and justice. That will light your way—good people from all backgrounds. You may be the only Black boy in your class, but it is an American classroom, and this country stands for justice and liberty and peace.

Those values and that faith and that hope have driven me every single day to try to make this Nation better and more real. And then 10 years into my Senate career, I sit proudly as our President does something never done before—to nominate a Muslim for the court of appeals. And I see what happens to him. I see him slandered and maligned, dragged through the mud and accused of the most heinous things, having to defend his beliefs, having to say over and over again that he condemns 9/11.

So I want to take this moment to say this is a great American. No matter what happens to his nomination, this is a great American who should be proud of his work. We should celebrate him whether we vote for him or not. We should cherish a moment like this that makes history.

For all of those children in our country who have parents like mine who say ''You may be different. You may look different. You may pray different. Your family may come from a different corner of the globe. But this is still the country for you,'' I tell those children ''Don't give up even though this ugly example hangs in the air. Don't give up even though this man has been trashed and smeared and maligned. Don't give up on this country.'' Do you know why? Because Adeel Mangi has not given up.

You can write him down in history with your bitter, twisted lies, but no matter what you do to guys like him or me or everyone who loves this country, we will rise. Nothing you can do will ever, ever impinge the character of this great American. Nothing you can do will ever dim his love for this Nation.

This is a sad time in the U.S. Senate. More people should be on this floor condemning what is happening to this man.

But, today, I say ''God bless America'' because our truth, no matter what others do to it, I promise you, will go marching on.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KAINE). The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, with me today is Mr. Matt Turner, one of my colleagues in my Senate office.

Mr. President, I want to talk about one of President Biden's nominees to be on the Federal Bench, but first I want to digress for a moment.

I love animals, and I especially love dogs. If only people had the hearts of dogs, the world would be better off.

The Presiding Officer and I, of course, are in the same profession—politics. Politics takes a big heart and a lot of wind and a thick skin. I try not to worry too much about what anybody thinks of me—except dogs. I really like dogs.

I used to have a beagle. His name was Roger. I loved Roger to death. We lost him a few years ago to cancer.

Roger was a stray. Actually, Roger was raised to hunt rabbits. If you know anything about beagles, when a beagle gets on a scent, the beagle is oblivious to everything else. They just follow that scent. Roger got on the scent and got lost and showed up at my house, so Becky and I took Roger in.

Roger was a rascal. He was a rascal. He loved us, but he couldn't help himself. Whenever there was a small crack in the door, Roger was gone. He was out and gone, and he stayed gone 2 or 3 days. I would worry incessantly. Oh, is he hurt? Will he come back? I love Roger.

He would always come back. But about half of the time when Roger would come back, he would come back dragging roadkill. I wouldn't let him inside with his roadkill, so he would go in the backyard, and he would hide his roadkill—he didn't think I was watching—Roger would hide his roadkill under the back porch.

I miss Roger.

Sometimes—not always but sometimes—the nomination process that the White House uses to select Federal judges—the nomination process is what I am talking about—looks to me like something Roger was hiding under my back porch. I just don't understand it. I don't understand the criteria or the process the Biden White House uses to put people on our Federal bench.

Now, I am not suggesting that President Biden hasn't made some good nominations because he has, and I voted for his nominations who I thought were qualified. But I think it is also—any fairminded person would have to conclude that over the past several years, President Biden has nominated some people to the Federal bench who, quite frankly, are not qualified to judge a pie contest. That is just a fact. That is my opinion, but if you go look at the testimony of all of those nominees, I think you will see I am right.

With respect, the President's pick of Mr. Adeel Mangi is, frankly, one of his worst.

Mr. Mangi is affiliated with an organization that calls itself the Alliance of Families for Justice—the Alliance of Families for Justice. In fact, Mr. Mangi is not just affiliated with this group; he is on its advisory board.

One of the Alliance's founders was a member of a domestic terrorist organization. What does that mean? One of the Alliance's founders was convicted of murdering police officers in cold blood. He killed cops.

Now, the Alliance of Families for Justice on whose board Mr. Mangi sits—or at least sat—advocates for the release of people who kill cops. Let me say that again. I didn't know such organizations existed. The organization on whose advisory board Mr. Mangi sits or sat advocates for the release of people who kill cops.

This organization has even called people who kill police officers freedom fighters. Freedom fighters. Why? I know that sounds crazy. That is because it is. It is also why so many law enforcement organizations have sent all of us on the Judiciary Committee letters opposing Mr. Mangi's nomination. I have never gotten so many letters or phone calls from law enforcement supporting or opposing—in this case, opposing—a nomination.

For example—I am not going to read all of them. I would be here the rest of the evening. For example, take the National Sheriffs' Association. I think most of us have heard of them. The National Sheriffs' Association wrote to all members of the Judiciary Committee, and here is what they said. I am quoting now. These are not my words but the sheriffs' words. ''Mr. Mangi's association . . . with an organization advocating the release of convicted cop-killers is seriously disturbing.'' That is coming from the sheriffs.

According to the National Sheriffs' Association, the Alliance's position—on whose advisory board Mr. Mangi sat or sits—according to the sheriffs, the Alliance's position ''is not only tone-deaf to the sacrifices made by law enforcement [officials], but also disrespectful to the victims of heinous crimes, as well as the family and friends of officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice.''

We also heard from the National Association of Police Organizations. I think most people have heard of them.

They said this about Mr. Mangi's nomination: Mr. Mangi's ''conscious work with the Alliance shows an anti-victim and anti-police bias that would certainly cloud his decisionmaking as a judge.'' That came from the police. Those aren't my words; those are law enforcement's words.

By itself, Mr. Mangi's work for and with this organization that I refer to as ''the Alliance'' should be disqualifying, but there is more. There is a lot more.

From 2019 to 2023—4 years—Mr. Mangi also served on the advisory board of another group, and this group calls itself the Center for Security, Race and Rights—the Center for Security, Race and Rights. This organization is steeped in hatred and anti-Semitism. I don't know any other way to put it. I think any reasonable person who looked at the center's work would agree with me, at least as to my description.

Now, every single American I know—and I will bet this is true for the Presiding Officer too—every single American I know remembers where they were on September 11, 2001. We call it 9/11. We don't even have to explain ourselves anymore; we just say ''9/11,'' and every American knows what you are talking about.

On the 20th anniversary of 9/11, Mr. Mangi's Center for Security, Race and Rights, on whose advisory board Mr. Mangi either sits or sat, sponsored an event. Here is the title of their event: ''Whose narrative? 20 years since September 11, 2001.'' The purpose of this event was to blame America and blame Americans for 9/11. That is why they held the event. This event and the speakers there blamed ''U.S. imperialism''—not the terrorists; ''U.S. imperialism''—for the 9/11 attacks that killed thousands of innocent American citizens.

The event featured some of the most despicable speakers that even the most fertile imagination would be challenged to come up with. One of those speakers was Mr. Sami Al-Arian. Mr. Al-Arian was convicted of providing support to the Palestinian Islamic Jihad. Another speaker, Mr. Rabab Abulhadi, has ties to terrorist hijackers. A third speaker, Mr. Hatem Bazian, publicly called for an intifada in the United States. Hard men. Rough words. American imperialism.

Mr. Mangi claims that he didn't know about this event—that is what he told the Senate committee—but his center has a long, long history of sponsoring vile, hate-filled events, and that is just a fact. That is not rhetoric; that is just a fact. Are we really expected to believe that Mr. Mangi had no idea what the center was up to? He sat on its advisory board, for God's sake.

Now let's talk about the director of this center on whose advisory board Mr. Mangi sat. The director also has a vile history of bad behavior. In 2021, the director of this organization on whose board Mr. Mangi sat signed a letter. That letter is posted on the Alliance's website. So far as I know, you can go to it and read it right now.

In the letter, the director says that she is ''in awe''—''in awe''—''of the Palestinian struggle to resist violent occupation, removal, erasure, and the expansion of Israeli settler colonialism''—''Israeli settler colonialism.''

Hamas murdered, raped, maimed Jewish men, Jewish women, little Jewish children, and according to Mr. Mangi's organization's director, it is Israel's fault.

The center's director describes himself as being in respectful awe. I think the vast majority of Americans would describe themselves as being nauseated.

The center's director, of whom I speak, also personally recruited Mr. Mangi to serve on the center's advisory board.

Again, are we really expected to believe that Mr. Mangi didn't know about the director's vile behavior? Did Mr. Mangi not even run a single Google search on this person?

On top of all of that, I do not believe—this is one person's opinion—I do not believe that Mr. Mangi told me the truth in our Judiciary hearing. When I asked him about his involvement with this radical organization, Mr. Mangi told me he only provided ''advice on academic areas of research.'' That is what he told me. He said: My only involvement is ''advice on academic areas of research.''

Those aren't my words; those are Mr. Mangi's words. But it turns out he was also funneling money to the organization—tens of thousands of dollars from himself and from his law firm. I didn't know that at the time of the hearing. I wish that I had.

With these facts in mind—and I have tried just to stick to the facts—I find it very hard to believe that anyone can in good faith—no. Strike that.

I find it hard to believe that a fair-minded, objective person who is not involved in this nomination can defend Mr. Mangi's nomination. Some of my Senate colleagues are doing that. That is OK. Sometimes people disagree, and that is a good thing. I believe in having two sides, opposing sides, come together in a dialectic. Sometimes that is how you find the truth. But it has gotten kind of personal. I regret that.

Some people—not all people; the Presiding Officer doesn't do this—some people, when they are losing an argument, tend to rely on epithets, you know—''You are a racist'' or ''You are a sexist'' or ''You are a misogynist'' or ''You are a Nazi'' or ''You are a bigot'' or, as in this case, ''You are Islamophobic.'' Some of the Members of this body have made that suggestion. They have suggested that all of the people who are opposing Mr. Mangi's nomination based on the facts that I have just tried to describe as fairly as I could—some Senators have suggested that asking Mr. Mangi questions about his involvement with these organizations is Islamophobic.

One of my colleagues—which, again, is his right—came down to the Senate floor, and he said that certain Republican members of the committee ''believed that he,'' referring to Mr. Mangi, ''must be a terrorist because he is a Muslim.'' Wow. That got my attention. That is not true.

I believe that Mr. Mangi is not qualified to be a Federal judge because he supports organizations that celebrate people who kill law enforcement officers; he supports organizations that hate Americans; and he supports organizations that hate Jews.

When President Biden, as I said earlier, has nominated qualified people to serve on the Federal bench, I have supported them regardless of their race, regardless of their gender, regardless of their religion.

I confess to asking tough questions in committee. That is my job. When you are put on the Federal bench, you are there for life—for life. You are unelected, and you are there for life, and you have the full power of the United States of America, the most powerful country in all of human history, behind you, so you had better get it right.

Just a few years ago, for example, I voted to confirm one of President Biden's nominees, Mr.—now judge—Zahid Quraishi. Mr. Quraishi happened to be at the time the first Muslim-American Federal judge. I voted for him. He is doing a great job. Unlike Mr. Mangi, Judge Quraishi was not on the board of an organization that celebrates and advocates for the release of cop killers. He was not on the board of an organization that sponsors anti-American events and blames 9/11 on American imperialism. Judge Quraishi was qualified and is qualified to serve on the Federal bench. Mr. Mangi is not. He is just not. That is not Islamophobia; that is just a fact. And I think anyone who is being honest with themselves—particularly if you go look at the confirmation hearings and read the evidence—I think any person who is being honest with themselves would agree.

So, for these reasons, I ask my colleagues to oppose Mr. Mangi's nomination, and I urge President Biden to withdraw it.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

REMEMBERING PHIL HOWE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, today, I rise to honor the life and mourn the loss, the passing, of a fellow Kansan, Phil Howe.

Mr. Howe lived most of his life in Manhattan, KS, and he loved his hometown. He was an active member of the community, a local businessowner, and a proud Kansas State University Wildcat.

The only place he may have loved more than Manhattan was his family's farm. During his younger years, Phil spent time at that farm. The farm was near Chapman and Solomon, where he enjoyed farming and fishing.

Phil attended Sacred Heart Academy and graduated in 1950. Afterward, he attended Kansas State University and completed a degree in business administration. Phil was also an active member of Beta Theta Pi Fraternity.

After graduating from Kansas State University, Phil married his wife, Margaret, and they were married for 57 years, until Margaret's passing 10 years ago.

Phil's career started at the Union National Bank, where he worked as a consumer loan officer. With years of banking experience, Phil decided to charter his own bank, to go out on his own, and, in 1969, the Kansas State Bank was opened. It was chartered and opened in a trailer home and now has grown to a nearly $1 billion enterprise.

His interests in business did not stop with banking. Phil was elected to serve as president of the Griffith Oil Company and founded both Master Medical Company and Baystone Financial Group.

Years later, Phil served on the board of St. Mary's Hospital. He was an active member of the Manhattan Chamber of Commerce and sat on the dean's business advisory council for Kansas State University.

Phil established foundations to help people across the Manhattan community and across our State of Kansas. Through the Greater Manhattan Community Foundation and the foundation's Youth Empowerment for Success Fund, he helped impact many, many lives, especially young people.

I would see Phil at Manhattan Rotary Club meetings. And I know I speak for many when I say Phil will be greatly and sadly missed.

Robba and I are praying for his family, his friends, and loved ones during this time. Robba attended the services this morning at Seven Dolors Catholic Church in Manhattan.

Mr. Howe was a respected businessman and community leader, the kind of person every community in Kansas wishes there were just more like him. More importantly, Phil was a kind and caring man of character and of faith—just what our State, our Nation, and world so desperately need today.

I offer these remarks with the greatest amount of respect and gratitude for a life well lived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

PUBLIC DEFENDER FUNDING

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, our judicial system is vital, and every player has an important role—from the judge to the prosecutor, to the public defender, to the bailiffs, to the jurors. Cuts to our Federal public defender program have caused real difficulties in meeting the constitutional obligation of the role that public defenders play in our justice system.

Every day, across the country, public defenders work to ensure that the Constitution is applied fairly and evenly to all, regardless of whether you are the richest or the poorest person in the courtroom. By doing so, public defenders safeguard our democratic values, providing a necessary check and balance in our judicial system.

As the Senate's only former public defender, this is very personal to me, but it really is vital to all of us. I spent some of my first years after law school serving as a public defender in White River Junction, VT, and I saw firsthand how many people who find themselves in our criminal justice system are struggling with substance abuse or misuse, mental health challenges, and oftentimes both. And I saw how absolutely important it is that every person who comes into the courtroom gets as good a lawyer as those who walk in with a high-priced attorney.

The principles that public defenders represent are vital to what we believe in our Constitution: fidelity to due process and fidelity to equal treatment under the law. Those have been engrained in our country since its founding.

Mr. President, as I think you well know, John Adams—hardly a supporter of England—chose to represent British troops after the Boston Massacre. Why? Because he believed in the right to counsel, and he believed in the presumption of innocence, and that they were indispensable to our democracy. He had so much confidence in acting on those principles that it showed the confidence he had in the future of our country.

Public defenders are the direct descendants of those founding principles that underpin the rule of law so vital to our well-being.

As the Supreme Court recognized in 1938, when it required appointed counsel for Federal defendants, access to a competent lawyer is an ''essential barrier against the arbitrary or unjust depravation of human rights.'' That led the Court to realize, 25 years later, in the case of Gideon v. Wainwright, that the right to counsel is one of the fundamental rights for all of us who live in the United States. The Court's words then are as true today as they were before:

> The right of one charged with crime to counsel may not be deemed fundamental and essential to fair trials in some countries, but it is in ours.

That is a confident country. It can live with the rule of law, and the rule of law requires representation. We will provide it, and we will make ourselves stronger for it.

For months, I have been talking to many of my colleagues, highlighting that there was a funding shortfall facing Federal public defenders. Six months ago, it looked like Federal defender offices across the country were going to have 10 percent personnel cuts. Those are very painful cuts, and really it was going to affect the quality of representation.

Instead, Congress acted, and Congress has basically corrected the shortfall in the final appropriations package released today. I understand that these Federal funding levels will allow the Federal defenders to avoid layoffs this year and end what had been a proposed and very harsh hiring freeze.

I am so grateful. I am so grateful to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: Chair PATTY MURRAY, Vice Chair SUSAN COLLINS, Chair CHRIS VAN HOLLEN, Ranking Member BILL HAGERTY, along with the chair of our Judiciary Committee, DICK DURBIN. All have worked diligently on this issue.

And I really want to thank the hardworking Appropriations staff for supporting the important role public defenders play in protecting our Constitution and our democracy and working as staff members to get the job done, with the leadership of their Senate leaders.

I ask that this budget cycle be a reminder and a lesson that we don't repeat this next year. The Constitution guarantees indigent criminal defendants the right to counsel, and it is our obligation to make certain that they are there, just as we pay for the salaries of prosecutors. The Administrative Office of the Courts has already submitted a budget request for next year that would allow us to honor this obligation.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to support public defenders throughout the next budget cycle.

This decision by this Congress in this budget to uphold and strengthen all of the people who play such a vital role in our justice system is an act of commitment and renewal to our constitutional principles, and it is an act of confidence in the future of our democracy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO MARY JANE COBB

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate Mary Jane Cobb for her career as executive director of the Iowa State Education Association. She began her distinguished career in education in 1994. After serving in a number of positions working with students across the country, Mary Jane came to Iowa in 2008. In her role with ISEA, she has worked with teachers and schools around the State on many issues affecting our students. Mary Jane had an impact on the education of hundreds of thousands of our students in Iowa. I congratulate her on her career and wish her a happy retirement.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF CHARLESTON, ARKANSAS

● Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of Charleston, AR.

This city in western Arkansas, incorporated in 1874, has a rich history as an education, business, and government hub.

Located within the former territorial area acquired by the United States in the Louisiana Purchase, the community was eventually named for one of its first settlers, Charles R. Kellum, who moved to Arkansas from Massachusetts. He operated a general store, organized a Baptist church, and was appointed as Charleston's first postmaster.

In the decades that followed, Charleston became a stop along the Butterfield Overland Mail Company route and served as a home to many businesses. Its first school was established in 1855 and soon had more than 100 students.

During the Civil War, skirmishes between Union and Confederate soldiers resulted in a tragic consequence when most of the city's buildings and homes were burned. This didn't stop the resolve of Charleston residents. When the war ended, citizens returned to rebuild and laid out a new community.

Because Franklin County was divided in half by the Arkansas River, the State legislature created a second county seat in Charleston to serve the southern portion of the county in 1885. The community was an important stop for the railroad and flourished with cotton, coal, and eventually natural gas.

World War II brought new opportunities to Charleston with the creation of Camp Chaffee less than a mile from the city limits. The new Army fort brought jobs and helped develop a strong economic and cultural bond between the city and military members.

Charleston is also noted as the first school district in Arkansas to desegregate after the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Board of Education. Just days after the ruling, the schoolboard voted to enroll 11 Black students in the Charleston School System.

The community is proud of its native son, Dale Bumpers, who was the 38th Governor of Arkansas before being elected to the U.S. Senate, where he served for 24 years. Bumpers was a soldier and a statesman who was born and raised in Charleston. He was known as the Senate's best orator. In his decades of service, one role he held was the chairman of the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, which led him to promote agriculture in Arkansas tirelessly. The results of his advocacy continue to impact farming and rural support programs in the State today.

His story is just one of many that help define the city's growth and progress over more than a century.

Congratulations to the entire community on this 150th anniversary. Charleston continues to be a place people are proud to call home. I am excited to recognize this milestone and look forward to continuing to work with area leaders to support this great Arkansas city and its bright future.●

RECOGNIZING IDAHO'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES

● Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my colleagues Senator JIM RISCH, Representative MIKE SIMPSON and Representative RUSS FULCHER, we once again honor Idaho's community colleges in recognition of April as Community College Month. We thank them for their important work to equip Idahoans for success.

Community colleges across the Gem State are incubators for ideas and catalysts to Idahoans achieving their goals. These academic institutions provide vital hands-on training and high-quality education best suited to support Idaho's workforce, small businesses, and economy. These community hubs are preparing Idahoans for a successful future, whether that be advancing their education or entering the workforce.

With more than 26,000 students enrolled in Idaho community colleges in the fall of 2023, these educational institutions offer significant opportunity for students of all ages and walks of life.

This year's theme for Community College Month is ''Cultivating Skills for the Future.'' Idaho's community colleges truly embody this theme in their efforts to cultivate important on-the-job skills and developing our communities next leaders.

Thank you to Idaho's community colleges for your dedication to continued education. We are blessed to have you in our communities backing Idaho innovation with skills, knowledge, and experience.●

TRIBUTE TO CARL CHALFANT

● Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, today, I want to recognize a lifelong Kansan who dedicated nearly 40 years of his life to volunteering in his community. Carl Chalfant has led, served, and provided for his community and family as a dad, grandfather, first responder, and city administrator. Carl was born on a dairy farm near Lancaster and attended Cloud County Community College where he met his wife of 48 years, Vickie. Together, they have two daughters and five grandchildren.

Lots of boys and young men dream of having the heroic job of a police officer, firefighter, or paramedic when they grow up. Carl didn't just settle for one of those jobs; he did all three. It is important to note that in rural states like Kansas, many communities don't have the resources to staff and maintain full-time first responders. Instead, most rural communities will purchase equipment, like a fire truck or ambulance, and members of the community will volunteer to be trained as first responders and serve as an on-call, volunteer EMT or firefighter. This is how neighbors look out for each in rural communities and how Carl came to be a hero for many of his neighbors and friends.

I want to share a brief history of Carl's service as a first responder, mostly in volunteer capacities.

EMT—starting in 1986, Carl served as an EMT in Marshall County, Jefferson County, and recently retired from being an EMT in Washington County.

Firefighter—Carl started volunteering for the local fire department in 1976. He served as the assistant chief in Marshall County until 1990, at which time he moved and served as the volunteer fire chief in McLouth. He retired from firefighting in 2013.

Police—Carl worked as part-time police officer for Marshall and Jefferson Counties for a little more than 10 years.

His daughter recalls how his many volunteer activities earned him the title of a ''weekend warrior.'' And these were just Carl's volunteer or part-time jobs. Carl has worked in a number of positions for communities across Kansas and is currently the city administrator for Washington, KS.

For many folks across Kansas, Carl has been the one to shop when things were scary or dangerous. He has saved countless lives through his service to the community. Serving others is a way of life for Carl and a character trait he has passed on to his two daughters and five grandchildren. Whether helping students at 4H events, girl scouts, or the local theatre, you can often find Carl and his whole family pitching in to help out.

After decades of service, Carl has retired from being an EMT, but nevertheless is still an active member of the community. He sits on the Kansas Rural Water Association as a board member and is an active member of the Masons. Carl's decades of service, commitment, and leadership have impacted hundreds of lives. He is an inspiration to others, a hero to his family, and brings a smile out of everyone he meets.

Thank you, Carl, for your contributions to your community and the State of Kansas. I hope you enjoy retirement and spending more time with your loved ones.●

REMEMBERING DONALD OVERTON NEAGLE

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise to honor the passing of a great Kentuckian, Donald Overton Neagle. He passed away on February 20, 2024, at the age of 86.

Don was born on November 3, 1937, in Green County, KY. While Don accomplished many things in his life, it was his 65-year career in radio that made him a well-known name across South

Central Kentucky. His storied career brought him to radio stations across the Commonwealth, from Greensburg to Harrodsburg, and Bowling Green, before settling in Russellville in 1958 with WRUS Radio Station. During his six decades with WRUS, he became part owner of the station and hosted and directed multiple programs.

He was best known for his program ''Feedback,'' where he interviewed politicians, listeners of the show, and other notable figures. I had the privilege of being regularly interviewed on his show and always enjoyed the chance to speak with him and his audience. My wife Kelley is a Russellville native and grew up listening to Don's shows. He has been a household name for both the Pauls and the Ashbys, and he will be greatly missed.

While we share in the sadness of his passing, it is with great joy we look back at his life, his many accomplishments, and the positive impact he had on his community and Kentuckians across the Commonwealth. We honor Don and his family, and may he rest in peace.●

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.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT TOGETHER WITH THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISORS—PM 45

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Joint Economic Committee:

To the Congress of the United States:

When I was elected President, a pandemic was raging and our economy was reeling, and trickle-down economics had undermined our nation's growth long-term. I was determined to rebuild from the middle out and bottom up, not the top down, because when the middle class does well, we all do well. We can give everyone a fair shot and leave no one behind. Our plan has brought transformational progress.

In the near term, my Administration moved quickly to help hardworking families and businesses make it through the pandemic, with a historic rescue plan that vaccinated the nation, delivered immediate economic relief to people in need, and sent funding to states and cities to keep essential services going. We worked with the private sector and labor unions to ease bottlenecks and shortages in our supply chains, getting goods flowing again and making our economy more resilient for the future. Today, America is in the midst of the strongest recovery of any advanced economy in the world.

Along the way, we've achieved one of the most successful legislative records in generations, bringing new opportunities to communities of all sizes nationwide. We're tackling years of underinvestment in public infrastructure, clean energy, and advanced manufacturing, making sure the future is made in America by American workers. We're making the biggest investment in American infrastructure in generations, including over $400 billion for 46,000 projects in 4,500 communities to date. These projects are rebuilding the nation's roads, bridges, railroads, ports, airports, public transit, water systems, high-speed internet, and more, in every part of the country. We're also making the most significant investment in fighting climate change in history—advancing breakthroughs in clean technology, boosting energy independence, lowering electricity costs for hardworking families, and revitalizing fence-line communities smothered by a legacy of pollution. At the same time, we're working with the private sector to strengthen America's semiconductor and advanced manufacturing industries as well, empowering workers and small businesses to share in the benefits.

Already, my Investing in America agenda has attracted $650 billion in private investment from companies that are building factories here in America. We've ignited a manufacturing boom, a semiconductor boom, a battery boom, an electric-vehicle boom, and more. My agenda is creating hundreds of thousands of good-paying jobs, so folks never have to leave their hometowns to find work they can raise a family on. Today, America once again has the strongest economy in the world. A record 15 million jobs have been created on my watch, giving 15 million more Americans the dignity and peace of mind that comes with a steady paycheck. The unemployment rate has been below 4 percent for the longest stretch in over 50 years, and we've seen the lowest unemployment rate for Black Americans on record. Economic growth is strong. Wages are rising faster than prices. Inflation is down by two-thirds. We have more to do, but folks are starting to feel the results. Real income and household wealth are higher now than they were before the pandemic, and consumer sentiment has surged more in recent months than any time in decades. Americans have filed a record 16 million new business applications since I took office, and each one of them is an act of hope.

Importantly, we're paying for many of these historic investments by making our tax system fairer. We've cut the deficit by $1 trillion since I took office, one of the biggest reductions in history, and I've signed legislation to cut it by $1 trillion more over the next 10 years, in part by raising the corporate minimum tax to 15 percent and making the wealthy and big corporations start paying their fair share.

It's clear that we're making tremendous progress for the American people, but we have more to do to finish the job. My Administration is going to keep fighting to lower costs for hardworking families, on everything from prescription drugs, to housing, childcare, and student loans. Folks in Washington have tried to reduce prescription drug costs for decades; our historic Inflation Reduction Act is getting it done. It for example caps the cost of insulin for seniors at $35 a month, down from as much as $400; and starting next year, no senior on Medicare will pay more than $2,000 a year in total out-of-pocket drug costs, even for expensive medications that can cost many times more. It also protects and expands the Affordable Care Act; as a result, more Americans have health insurance today than ever.

We're also making real gains in expanding access to housing: More families own homes today than did before the pandemic, rents are easing, and a record of around 1.7 million housing units are under construction nationwide. We'll keep working to lower housing costs and boost supply, by expanding rental assistance; speeding builders' access to federal financing to build more affordable homes; and reducing mortgage payments for first-time homebuyers. Meanwhile, we're standing up for workers and consumers, and cracking down on unfair hidden ''junk fees'' that companies like airlines, banks, and insurers slip onto people's bills.

At the same time, we're working to get every child in America the strong start they need to thrive. The American Rescue Plan expanded the Child Tax Credit, cutting child poverty nearly in half in 2021. We'll keep fighting to restore it, and to guarantee the vast majority of American families access to high-quality childcare for no more than $10 a day. Our rescue plan also made the biggest investment in public education in American history; today, we're pushing to further boost funding to schools in need, to expand tutoring and afterschool programs, and to ease teacher shortages. I'm keeping my promise to ease the crushing burden of student debt as well. Despite legal challenges, we've canceled $138 billion in student loans for nearly 3.9 million Americans, including more than 750,000 teachers, nurses, firefighters, social workers, and other public servants. Such widespread debt cancellation is freeing people to finally consider buying a home, having a child, or starting the small business they always dreamed of. In all, our agenda is making the promise of America real for

many millions more Americans than ever before.

The story of America is one of progress and resilience, of always moving forward and never giving up. It is a story unique among nations—we are the only country that has emerged from every crisis stronger than we went in. That is what's happening across America today. There is still work to do, but I've never been more optimistic about our future. We are the United States of America, and there is nothing beyond our capacity when we do it together.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 21, 2024.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:59 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 bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1121. An act to prohibit a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing.

H.R. 6009. An act to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw the proposed rule relating to fluid mineral leases and leasing process, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7520. An act to prohibit data brokers from transferring personally identifiable sensitive data of United States individuals to foreign adversaries, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY) announced that on today, March 21, 2024, she had signed the following enrolled bill, previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 992. An act to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate the Texas and New Mexico portions of the future Interstate designated segments of the Port-to-Plains Corridor as Interstate Route 27, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1121. An act to prohibit a moratorium on the use of hydraulic fracturing; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 6009. An act to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw the proposed rule relating to fluid mineral leases and leasing process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 7520. An act to prohibit data brokers from transferring personally identifiable sensitive data of United States individuals to foreign adversaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 7024. An act to make improvements to the child tax credit, to provide tax incentives to promote economic growth, to provide special rules for the taxation of certain residents of Taiwan with income from sources within the United States, to provide tax relief with respect to certain Federal disasters, to make improvements to the low-income housing tax credit, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 21, 2024, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 992. An act to amend the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 to designate the Texas and New Mexico portions of the future Interstate-designated segments of the Port-to-Plains Corridor as Interstate Route 27, and for other purposes.

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–3818. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Credit Card Penalty Fees (Regulation Z)'' (RIN3170–AB15) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3819. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Exception to Restrictions on Private Transfer Fee Covenants for Loans Meeting Certain Duty to Serve Shared Equity Loan Program Requirements'' (RIN2590–AB30) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3820. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13536 with respect to Somalia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3821. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the continuation of the national emergency with respect to Ethiopia that was declared in Executive Order 14046 of September 17, 2021; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3822. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13848 with respect to the threat of foreign interference in or undermining public confidence in United States elections; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3823. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 14024 with respect to specified harmful foreign activities of the Government of the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3824. 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 ''Updating contact information and grammatical terminology in OFAC regulations'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3825. 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 ''Amendments to the Darfur Sanctions Regulations'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 12, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3826. A communication from the President and Chair of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) for the Bank's Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2025, and the Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2023; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3827. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Financial Market Utilities'' (RIN7100–AG40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–3828. A communication from the Director of the Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Program for Surface Mobile Equipment'' (RIN1219–AB91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3829. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''National Public Health Strategy to Prevent and Control Vector-Borne Diseases in People Report to Congress''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3830. A communication from the Regulatory Policy Analyst, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Devices; Technical Amendments'' (Docket No. FDA–2024–N–1052) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 18, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3831. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Procedures Governing the Filing and Processing of Prohibited Transaction Exemption Applications'' (RIN1210–AC05) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 19, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3832. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Preschool Development Grant Birth Through Five (PDG B–5) Report to Congress with Grantee Highlights Covering 2019–2021''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3833. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2022 Annual Progress Report on the C.W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program and National Cord Blood Inventory Program''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3834. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of

Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Fiscal Year 2022 Report to Congress on Community Services Block Grant Discretionary Activities - Community Economic Development and Rural Community Development Programs''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3835. A communication from the Regulatory Policy Analyst, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''User Fees; Technical Amendment'' (Docket No. FDA–2012–N–0920) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3836. A communication from the Regulatory Policy Analyst, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medical Devices; Quality System Regulation Amendments'' (RIN0910–AH99) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3837. A communication from the Regulatory Policy Analyst, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Biologics License Applications and Master Files'' (Docket No. FDA–2019–N–1363) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3838. A communication from the Regulatory Policy Analyst, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Advisory Committee; Digital Health Advisory Committee; Addition to List of Standing Committees'' (Docket No. FDA–2024–N–0017) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3839. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Administration for Children and Families, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Improving Child Care Access, Affordability, and Stability in the Child Care and Development Fund'' (RIN0970–AD02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 5, 2024; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3840. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''State Performance and Best Practices for the Prevention and Reduction of Underage Drinking Report''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3841. A communication from the Inspector General of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Congressional Budget Justification for fiscal year 2025; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3842. A communication from the Board Members of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Congressional Justification of Budget Estimates Report for fiscal year 2025; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–3843. A communication from the Administrator, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the cost of response and recovery efforts for FEMA–3598-EM in the State of Maine having exceeded the $5,000,000 limit for a single emergency declaration; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3844. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2025 Congressional Budget Justification, the Annual Performance Plan for fiscal year 2025, and the Annual Performance Report for fiscal year 2023; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3845. A communication from the Secretary of the Board of Governors, United States Postal Service, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's annual report relative to its compliance with Section 3686(c) of the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act of 2006; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3846. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25–411, ''Secure DC Omnibus Amendment Act of 2024''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC–3847. A communication from the Acting Chief Financial Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Performance Plan for fiscal years 2023–2025, and the Annual Performance Report for fiscal years 2023–2025; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REED for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Melissa Griffin Dalton, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Navy nomination of Capt. Tuan Nguyen, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Navy nominations beginning with Capt. Douglas J. Adams and ending with Capt. Peter D. Small, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on January 8, 2024.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Paul R. Fast, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. AnnMarie K. Anthony, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Trent C. Davis, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brig. Gen. Joseph A. Ricciardi and ending with Col. Charles R. Bell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 27, 2024.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. (lh) Dion D. English, to be Rear Admiral.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Susan BryerJoyner and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Ralph R. Smith III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 27, 2024.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Elizabeth S. Okano and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Kurt J. Rothenhaus, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 27, 2024.

Navy nominations beginning with Rear Adm. (lh) Mark D. Behning and ending with Rear Adm. (lh) Carlos A. Sardiello, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 27, 2024.

Air Force nomination of Col. Todd D. Miller, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. David W. Kelley, to be Brigadier General.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Ronnie D. Anderson, Jr. and ending with Col. Kevin J. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2024.

Army nominations beginning with Col. Charles M. Causey and ending with Col. Urbi N. Lewis, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 28, 2024.

*Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Derek C. France, to be Lieutenant General.

*Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Eric E. Austin, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

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

Army nominations beginning with Benjamin J. Allison and ending with Patrick R. Wiggins, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 19, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Lloyd G. Abigania and ending with 0002926605, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 19, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Brennan R. Abrahamson and ending with 0002325489, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 19, 2023.

Army nominations beginning with Jerel Q. Abas and ending with 0002765821, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on October 19, 2023.

Army nomination of Andrew C. Oddo, to be Major.

Army nomination of Andrew J. Acosta, to be Major.

Army nomination of Colby S. Miller, to be Major.

Army nomination of Seth M. Williams, to be Major.

Army nomination of Aaron R. Monkman, to be Major.

Army nomination of Joseph R. Cotton, to be Major.

Army nomination of Juan C. Gongora, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Matthew A. Dugard and ending with James R. Johnson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 29, 2024.

Army nomination of Arnold J. Steinlage III, to be Major.

Army nomination of Arlene Johnson, to be Major.

Army nomination of Darim C. Nessler, to be Major.

Army nomination of Brandi N. Hicks, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Nathan A. Bennington and ending with Andrew S. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 29, 2024.

Army nomination of Sandeep R. N. Rahangdale, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Wendi J. Dick, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Benjamin J. Grass, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Thomas C. Farrington II, to be Colonel.

Marine Corps nomination of Yuliya Omarov, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Navy nomination of Megan M. Grubbs, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of John O. Wilson, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Brackery L. Battle, to be Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Daniel J. Baldor and ending with Matthew A. Wagner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on February 29, 2024.

Navy nomination of William J. Roy, Jr., to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Colette B. Lazenka, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Nikolaos Sidiropoulos, to be Captain.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

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. MORAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 4009. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to offer annual preventative health evaluations to veterans with a spinal cord injury or disorder and increase access to assistive technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 4010. A bill to establish radiofrequency licensing authority for certain operations involving certain earth stations and gateway stations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. VANCE):

S. 4011. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to end the tax-free treatment of certain corporate reorganizations that involve large corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4012. A bill to provide economic empowerment opportunities in the United States through the modernization of public housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 4013. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the Firefighter PFAS Injury Compensation Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO:

S. 4014. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that income received by a regulated investment company from precious metals shall be treated as qualifying income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. CORTEZ MASTO (for herself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. MANCHIN, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 4015. A bill to temporarily suspend duties on imports of titanium sponge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. KELLY, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. PADILLA, and Ms. BUTLER):

S. 4016. A bill to amend the Boulder Canyon Project Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expend amounts in the Colorado River Dam fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 4017. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to impose a tax on the net value of assets of a taxpayer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 4018. A bill to amend the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 to reauthorize the Commission on Farm Transitions-Needs for 2050, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4019. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide regular updates to Livestock Indemnity Program payment rates to reflect market prices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. FETTERMAN (for himself, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 4020. A bill to amend the Energy Policy and Conservation Act to prohibit the export or sale of petroleum products from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to certain entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 4021. A bill to place restrictions on the official display of flags, seals, or emblems other than the United States flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 4022. A bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to make improvements to that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 4023. A bill to further protect patients and improve the accuracy of provider directory information by eliminating ghost networks; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. DAINES):

S. 4024. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to enable secure and trustworthy technology through other transaction contracting authority; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. COONS, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 4025. A bill to include the identification of countries that are significant sources of xylazine in the annual International Narcotics Control Strategy Report; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4026. A bill to require a report on the state of economic integration between the United States and the People's Republic of China and the risks of that integration to the national security of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 4027. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue permits for the construction and modification of national interest high-impact transmission facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CASEY, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. BUTLER, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 4028. A bill to increase the participation of historically underrepresented demographic groups in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics education and industry; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 4029. A bill to prohibit the Department of Defense from offering services through, or maintaining a business relationship with, Tutor.com; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. 4030. A bill to reauthorize the recovery housing program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 4031. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration to award grants to expand or create health care provider pipeline programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, Mr. CASEY, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4032. A bill to authorize magistrate judges to issue arrest warrants for certain criminal aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4033. A bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to strengthen enforcement with respect to violations of that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S. 4034. A bill to withhold certain United Nations funding until the United Nations Human Rights Council mandates a body to investigate human rights abuses in the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 4035. A bill to require the Director of the Office of Personnel Management to take certain actions with respect to the health insurance program carried out under chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. 4036. A bill to establish a Government Spending Oversight Committee within the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. COONS (for himself and Mr. LEE):

S. 4037. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify delayed notice requirements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

S. 4038. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to strengthen the provisions relating to child labor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 4039. A bill to establish the Federal Labor-Management Partnership Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4040. A bill to establish a new nonimmigrant visa for mobile entertainment workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TESTER, and Ms. HASSAN):

S. 4041. A bill to support local educational agencies in addressing the student mental health crisis; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 4042. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to reform the management of Federal records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 4043. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make executive agency telework policies transparent, to track executive agency use of telework, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 4044. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide for the consideration of the human rights records of recipients of support of special operations to combat terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. VANCE (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FETTERMAN, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 4045. A bill to require a study on public health impacts as a consequence of the February 3, 2023, train derailment in East Palestine, Ohio; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. BUTLER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 4046. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the collective bargaining of employees in the Veterans Health Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. MORAN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 4047. A bill to increase, effective as of December 1, 2024, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CRAPO, Ms. SMITH, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 4048. A bill to reauthorize the North American Wetlands Conservation Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. DAINES (for himself, Mr. WICKER, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 4049. A bill to appropriate more funds for the Federal Communication Commission's ''rip and replace'' program, to require a spectrum auction, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. 4050. A bill to extend the deadline to commence construction of certain hydroelectric projects on the Red River; considered and passed.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S.J. Res. 66. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval of the proposed foreign military sale to the Government of Bahrain of certain defense articles and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. REED, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. Res. 606. A resolution to recognize the 203rd anniversary of the independence of Greece and celebrating democracy in Greece and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. CRAMER):

S. Res. 607. A resolution condemning the Nicaraguan Government's unjust imprisonment of individuals affiliated with Mountain Gateway Order, Inc; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BRAUN, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. Res. 608. A resolution denouncing the Biden Administration's immigration policies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. WELCH):

S. Res. 609. A resolution recognizing April 4, 2024, as the International Day for Mine Awareness and Assistance in Mine Action, and reaffirming the leadership of the United States in eliminating landmines and unexploded ordnance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 610. A resolution honoring Dr. Jane Goodall and her legacy as an ethologist, conservationist, and activist; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO):

S. Res. 611. A resolution expressing support for the designation of March 22, 2024, as ''National Inland Waterways Workers Safety Awareness Day'' and supporting the goals and ideals of ''National Inland Waterways Workers Safety Awareness Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 612. A resolution recognizing the importance of maple syrup production to the State of Maine and designating March 24, 2024, as ''Maine Maple Sunday''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 613. A resolution supporting the designation of the week of April 15 through April 19, 2024, as ''National Work Zone Awareness Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S. Res. 614. A resolution to authorize testimony, documents, and representation in United States v. Miller; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 615. A resolution designating April 5, 2024, as ''Gold Star Wives Day''; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 16

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to prohibit the award of Federal funds to an institution of higher education that hosts or is affiliated with a student-based service site that provides abortion drugs or abortions to students of the institution or to employees of the institution or site, and for other purposes.

S. 133

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to extend the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 134

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 134, a bill to require an annual budget estimate for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to reports and recommendations made under the National Alzheimer's Project Act.

S. 160

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) 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. 204

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 204, a bill to amend title

18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

S. 617

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 617, a bill to amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act to permanently prohibit the conduct of offshore drilling on the outer Continental Shelf in the Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, North Atlantic, and Straits of Florida planning areas.

S. 740

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 740, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate criminal penalties for persons charging veterans unauthorized fees relating to claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to prepare an annual report on suicide prevention, and for other purposes.

S. 1186

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1186, a bill to restrict the first-use strike of nuclear weapons.

S. 1367

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1367, a bill to amend XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 1384

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1384, a bill to promote and protect from discrimination living organ donors.

S. 1845

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1845, a bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to provide for the testing of a community-based palliative care model.

S. 2372

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2372, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to streamline enrollment under the Medicaid program of certain providers across State lines, and for other purposes.

S. 2897

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2897, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to molecularly targeted pediatric cancer investigations, and for other purposes.

S. 3060

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. 3060, a bill to establish a Youth Mental Health Research Initiative in the National Institutes of Health for purposes of encouraging collaborative research to improve youth mental health.

S. 3356

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3356, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify the role and duties of United States Postal Service police officers, and for other purposes.

S. 3459

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an above-the-line deduction for attorney fees and costs in connection with consumer claim awards.

S. 3490

At the request of Mr. TUBERVILLE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3490, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Veterans Affairs from providing health care to, or engaging in claims processing for health care for, any individual unlawfully present in the United States who is not eligible for health care under the laws administered by the Secretary.

S. 3502

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) 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. 3666

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) 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. 3775

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 3775, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the BOLD Infrastructure for Alzheimer's Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3791

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 3791, a bill to reauthorize the America's Conservation Enhancement Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3919

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3919, a bill to render State or local governments with certain bail and pretrial detention policies ineligible to receive funds under the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program.

S. 3933

At the request of Mrs. BRITT, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) was added as a cosponsor 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. 3992

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 3992, a bill to prohibit the Administrator of the Small Business Administration from directly making loans under the 7(a) loan program, and for other purposes.

S. 4002

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4002, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 5

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 5, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 540

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) and the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 540, a resolution requesting information on Azerbaijan's human rights practices pursuant to section 502B(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. RES. 589

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of 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.

S. RES. 591

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 591, a resolution reaffirming the deep and steadfast partnership between, and the ties that bind, the United States and Canada in support of economic and national security.

S. RES. 595

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 595, a resolution recognizing the contributions of AmeriCorps members and alumni and AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers in the lives of the people and communities of the United States.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 606—TO RECOGNIZE THE 203RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE AND CELEBRATING DEMOCRACY IN GREECE AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. REED, Mr. BENNET, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. MARKEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 606

Whereas the people of ancient Greece developed the concept of democracy, in which the supreme power to govern was vested in the people;

Whereas the founding fathers of the United States, many of whom read Greek political philosophy in the original Greek language, drew heavily on the political experience and philosophy of ancient Greece in forming the representative democracy of the United States;

Whereas Petros Mavromichalis, the former Commander-in-Chief of Greece and a founder of the modern Greek state, said to the citizens of the United States in 1821, ''It is in your land that liberty has fixed her abode and. . .imitating you, we shall imitate our ancestors and be thought worthy of them if we succeed in resembling you.'';

Whereas, in an October 21, 1823, letter to Greek scholar Adamantios Koraes discussing the ongoing Greek struggle for independence, Thomas Jefferson wrote that ''[n]o people sympathise more feelingly than ours with the sufferings of your countrymen, none offer more sincere and ardent prayers to heaven for their success'';

Whereas, on January 19, 1824, in a speech in support of his resolution to send an American envoy to Greece amid its struggle for independence, then-Congressman Daniel Webster recognized ''the struggle of an interesting and gallant people. . .contending against fearful odds, for being, and for the common privilege of human nature'';

Whereas individual American Philhellenes, including future abolitionist Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, future abolitionist Jonathan Peckham Miller, and George Jarvis, traveled to Greece to fight alongside and provide aid to the Greek people in their struggle for independence;

Whereas the people of the United States generously sent humanitarian assistance to the people of Greece during their struggle for independence, often through philhellene committees;

Whereas Greece heroically resisted Axis forces at a crucial moment in World War II, forcing Adolf Hitler to change his timeline and delaying the attack on Russia;

Whereas Winston Churchill said that ''if there had not been the virtue and courage of the Greeks, we do not know which the outcome of World War II would have been'' and ''no longer will we say that Greeks fight like heroes, but that heroes fight like Greeks'';

Whereas hundreds of thousands of Greeks were killed during World War II;

Whereas Greece consistently allied with the United States in major international conflicts throughout its history as a modern state;

Whereas the United States has demonstrated its support for the trilateral partnership of Greece, Israel, and Cyprus by enacting into law the Eastern Mediterranean Security and Energy Partnership Act of 2019 (title II of division J of Public Law 116–94) and through joint engagement with Greece, Israel, and Cyprus in the ''3+1'' format;

Whereas this support was bolstered in the United States-Greece Defense and Interparliamentary Partnership Act of 2021 (subtitle B of title XIII of Public Law 117–81), establishing a 3+1 Interparliamentary Group to discuss the expansion of co-operation in other areas of common concern;

Whereas the United States and Greece's commitment to security cooperation led to the conclusion of a Mutual Defense Cooperation Agreement, which was updated in 2021, in order to enhance defense ties between the two countries and promote stability in the broader region;

Whereas the ongoing United States-Greece Strategic Dialogue reflects Greece's importance to the United States as a geostrategic partner, especially in the Eastern Mediterranean and Balkans, and as an important NATO ally;

Whereas, on November 13, 2023, the United States Agency for International Development and Greece signed a memorandum of understanding to advance energy security and cooperation in the Western Balkans;

Whereas Secretary of State Antony Blinken traveled to Greece in January 2024 and met with Prime Minister of Greece Kyriakos Mitsotakis, and in February 2024, Foreign Minister of Greece George Gerapetritis visited Washington, D.C., for the fifth United States-Greece Strategic Dialogue and along with Secretary Blinken, reaffirmed the importance of the United States-Greece relationship and pledged to continue and increase cooperation based on shared values and interests;

Whereas, in the framework of the fifth United States-Greece Strategic Dialogue, on February 9, 2024, Greece became the 35th country to sign onto the Artemis Accords, affirming its commitment to a peaceful, sustainable, and transparent cooperation in space;

Whereas Greece and the United States have joined their democratic allies in standing in support of Ukraine following Russia's unprovoked invasion and in March 2024, from Odessa, Ukraine, Prime Minister of Greece Kyriakos Mitsotakis said Greece ''has consistently maintained from the very first moment, because in the 21st century no war can bleed the heart of Europe, nor can violate the defined borders and territorial integrity of an independent country'';

Whereas the Government and people of Greece actively participate in peacekeeping and peace-building operations conducted by international organizations, including the United Nations, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the European Union, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe;

Whereas Greece remains an integral part of the European Union;

Whereas the Greek-American community has greatly contributed to American society and has helped forge the strong ties between the United States and Greece;

Whereas the Governments and people of Greece and the United States are at the forefront of efforts to advance freedom, democracy, peace, stability, and human rights;

Whereas those efforts and similar ideals have forged a close bond between the peoples of Greece and the United States; and

Whereas it is proper and desirable for the United States to celebrate March 25, 2024, Greek Independence Day, with the people of Greece and to reaffirm the democratic principles from which those two great countries were founded: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) extends sincere congratulations and best wishes to the people of Greece as they celebrate the 203rd anniversary of the independence of Greece;

(2) expresses support for the principles of democratic governance to which the people of Greece are committed;

(3) commends the Greek-American community for its contributions to the United States and its role as a bridge between the two countries;

(4) notes the important role that Greece has played in the wider European region and in the community of nations since gaining its independence 203 years ago;

(5) appreciates the ever-stronger bilateral relationship, based on shared values and interests, including the important energy partnership that exists between the United States and Greece, and the important role that Greece plays in bolstering European energy security; and

(6) commends Greece's support for the people of Ukraine in their fight for freedom against Russian aggression.

SENATE RESOLUTION 607—CONDEMNING THE NICARAGUAN GOVERNMENT'S UNJUST IMPRISONMENT OF INDIVIDUALS AFFILIATED WITH MOUNTAIN GATEWAY ORDER, INC

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. CRAMER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 607

Whereas, in December, 2023, 11 individuals affiliated with Mountain Gateway Order, Inc. were arrested by the Government of Nicaragua, namely: Marcos Sergio Hernández Jirón; Harry Lening Rios Bravo; Manuel de Jesús Ríos Flores; José Luis Orozco Urrutia; Álvaro Daniel Escobar Caldera; Juan Carlos Chavarría Zapata; Juan Luis Moncada; Orvin Alexis Moncada Castellano, César Facundo Burgalin Miranda, Walner Omier Blandón Ochoa, and Marisela de Fátima Mejía Ruiz;

Whereas there is concern that the Government of Nicaragua has charged each of these

individuals for crimes on baseless claims of money laundering and organized crime;

Whereas the accused individuals do not have adequate access to legal counsel;

Whereas there is concern that United States citizens affiliated with Mountain Gateway Order, Inc. are being targeted for arrest and extradition by the Government of Nicaragua;

Whereas this follows a pattern by the Government of Nicaragua to quell the free speech and religious rights of Christians and other nongovernmental organizations in Nicaragua;

Whereas on November 30, 2022, in accordance with the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6401 et seq.), the Secretary of State designated Nicaragua as a ''Country of Particular Concern'' for having engaged in or tolerated particularly severe violations of religious freedom;

Whereas the Government of Nicaragua's actions are another example of an extreme intolerance of religious organizations; and

Whereas Congress has a vested interest in upholding international religious freedom and human rights: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the targeting and imprisonment of individuals affiliated with Mountain Gateway Order, Inc. without due process of law; and

(2) calls on the Government of Nicaragua to take prompt action to address these violations of religious freedom and international human rights.

SENATE RESOLUTION 608—DENOUNCING THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION'S IMMIGRATION POLICIES

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. BRAUN, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 608

Whereas President Joe Biden and Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas have created the worst border security crisis in the history of the United States;

Whereas President Biden, beginning on day one of his administration, systematically dismantled effective border security measures and interior immigration enforcement;

Whereas the Biden Administration's open-borders policies have incentivized nearly 9,300,000 illegal aliens from all around the world, including criminal aliens and suspected terrorists, to arrive at the southwest border;

Whereas the Biden Administration has allowed at least 6,300,000 illegal aliens from the southwest border to travel to communities within the United States;

Whereas current immigration law allows for the United States to enter into asylum cooperative agreements with other countries to allow for the removal of certain aliens seeking asylum in the United States;

Whereas asylum cooperative agreements provide the United States with another tool to reduce the incentives for illegal immigration;

Whereas asylum cooperative agreements increase cooperation with United States allies in the Western Hemisphere and around the world and promote shared responsibility;

Whereas the previous administration announced asylum cooperative agreements with El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras;

Whereas the Biden Administration suspended and terminated these asylum cooperative agreements as part of its open-borders agenda that has encouraged mass illegal immigration at the southwest border;

Whereas the Biden Administration retains the ability to negotiate asylum cooperative agreements with El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras but has refused to do so, despite historic illegal immigration at the southwest border;

Whereas clauses (ii) and (iii)(IV) of section 235(b)(1)(B) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(B)) require the Secretary of Homeland Security to detain inadmissible aliens arriving in the United States who indicate either an intention to apply for asylum under section 208 of that Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) or a fear of persecution;

Whereas the Immigration and Nationality Act provides for the Secretary of Homeland Security to detain, during removal proceedings, aliens who arrive at the border and are found to be inadmissible;

Whereas the Biden Administration has purposely violated United States immigration law by refusing to detain inadmissible aliens arriving at the border;

Whereas the Biden Administration could comply with the mandatory detention statutes of the Immigration and Nationality Act;

Whereas the Biden Administration's purposeful violation of the mandatory detention statutes of the Immigration and Nationality Act has resulted in the mass release of millions of illegal aliens into United States communities;

Whereas current immigration law allows for inadmissible aliens to be expeditiously removed from the United States once encountered at the border unless they establish a credible fear of persecution;

Whereas the Biden Administration has released millions of illegal aliens into the United States without even processing them for expedited removal to be screened for asylum eligibility;

Whereas only 6.8 percent of the 5,600,000 illegal alien encounters from January 20, 2021, through August 31, 2023, resulted in the Department of Homeland Security placing the illegal alien into expedited removal proceedings to even be screened for asylum eligibility;

Whereas roughly 40 percent of the illegal aliens who were not found to have a credible fear of persecution were not removed and remained in the United States as of August 31, 2023;

Whereas nearly a third of the illegal aliens who were processed for expedited removal and who did not even attempt to make a claim for asylum cannot be confirmed by the Biden Administration as having been removed from the United States;

Whereas the Biden Administration could expand expedited removal to more quickly remove illegal aliens at the border and screen more illegal aliens for asylum eligibility instead of mass releasing them into the United States;

Whereas the Biden Administration's limited use of expedited removal only incentivizes illegal immigration and worsens the border crisis;

Whereas the Biden Administration terminated the Migrant Protection Protocols despite their effectiveness;

Whereas the Biden Administration has purposely violated United States immigration law by abusing discretionary case-by-case authority and other parole authorities to mass parole illegal aliens who would otherwise have no legal basis to enter and remain in the United States;

Whereas the Biden Administration's proposed solution to the border crisis failed to address catch-and-release valves such as the Flores Settlement Agreement and the William Wilberforce Trafficking Victims Protection Reauthorization Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–457; 122 Stat. 5044) that incentivize surges of unaccompanied alien children and adults arriving with children to come to the southwest border, putting children's lives at risk;

Whereas the Biden Administration could end its catch-and-release policies;

Whereas the Biden Administration's proposed solutions to the border crisis did nothing to end catch-and-release but instead mandated mass release of illegal aliens at the southwest border;

Whereas parks, schools, police stations, recreation centers, hotels, and airports have been repurposed for use as shelters for illegal aliens;

Whereas the Biden Administration's open-borders policies have strained State and local social services resources as the millions of illegal aliens who have entered since January 20, 2021, compete with United States citizens and legal immigrants for those resources;

Whereas section 212(f) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(f)) empowers the President to ''suspend the entry of all aliens or any class of aliens . . . or impose on the entry of aliens any restrictions he may deem to be appropriate''. . . ''[w]henever the President finds that the entry of any aliens or of any class of aliens into the United States would be detrimental to the interests of the United States'';

Whereas, in Trump v. Hawaii, 138 S. Ct. 2392 (2018), the Supreme Court described the President's suspension of entry authority as an authority that ''exudes deference to the President in every clause'';

Whereas President Biden has cited his suspension of entry authority in other instances but has refused to use that authority to address the border crisis;

Whereas President Biden retains the power to use his suspension of entry authority to address the border crisis;

Whereas President Biden's refusal to use his suspension of entry authority ensures that the border stays open, endangers the United States, and encourages illegal immigration; and

Whereas President Biden has claimed he is powerless to address the border crisis through executive action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) affirms that, in order to help control the crisis at the border that it has created, the Biden Administration has the authority to—

(A) end the catch-and-release policy;

(B) reinstate the Migrant Protection Protocols;

(C) enter into asylum cooperative agreements;

(D) end abuses of parole authority;

(E) detain inadmissible aliens;

(F) use expedited removal authority; and

(G) rein in taxpayer-funded benefits for illegal aliens;

(2) affirms that the Biden Administration is refusing to use such authorities; and

(3) urges the Biden Administration to immediately begin using such authorities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 609—RECOGNIZING APRIL 4, 2024, AS THE INTERNATIONAL DAY FOR MINE AWARENESS AND ASSISTANCE IN MINE ACTION, AND REAFFIRMING THE LEADERSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES IN ELIMINATING LANDMINES AND UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE

Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. WELCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 609

Whereas landmines and unexploded ordnance threaten the safety, health, and lives of civilian populations and create humanitarian and development challenges that have serious and lasting social, economic, and security consequences for effected populations;

Whereas demining and clearance of unexploded ordnance enables displaced people to return to their homes and has a direct impact on development outcomes such as food security, school attendance, and economic development;

Whereas people in at least 60 countries and other areas are at risk from mines and unexploded ordnance in their communities;

Whereas more than 135,000 deaths and injuries resulting from anti-personnel or anti-vehicle mines and other explosive remnants of war have been recorded in the Landmine Monitor database since 2001, and thousands more individuals around the world are killed and injured by such mines and remnants each year;

Whereas, over the past 3 decades, the United States has been the global leader in supporting efforts to clear mine-contaminated areas around the world, dedicating more than $4,600,000,000 for demining and related programs in 120 countries and territories since 1993;

Whereas, since 1989, the United States Agency for International Development has allocated more than $337,000,000 through the Leahy War Victims Fund in more than 50 countries to provide artificial limbs, wheelchairs, rehabilitation, vocational training, and other assistance to survivors of accidents caused by landmines and unexploded ordnance;

Whereas the United States Government expressed its support for the Maputo +15 declaration of June 27, 2014, which established the goal ''to destroy all stockpiled anti-personnel mines and clear all mined areas as soon as possible'';

Whereas there are 164 States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction, done at the Oslo Landmine Conference, September 18, 1997;

Whereas the recent use of landmines, cluster bombs, and other munitions, particularly in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Burma, and Ukraine, has created new humanitarian priorities and funding requirements for demining, while legacy mine contamination remains an urgent challenge impacting millions of people globally;

Whereas Russia's aggression in Ukraine has resulted in an estimated one third of the territory being contaminated with landmines and unexploded ordnance, creating a massive need for clearance operations as a prerequisite for Ukraine's recovery;

Whereas these needs in Ukraine do not diminish the similarly urgent need for humanitarian demining in other parts of the world;

Whereas additional resources for demining will be needed to achieve a world free of the threat of landmines and other explosive hazards; and

Whereas, on December 8, 2005, the United Nations General Assembly declared that April 4th of each year shall be observed as the International Day for Mine Awareness and Assistance in Mine Action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to support international humanitarian efforts to eliminate landmines and unexploded ordnance;

(2) recognizes those individuals in numerous countries who, at great risk to their personal safety, work to locate and remove anti-personnel landmines and unexploded ordnance;

(3) affirms its support for the goal, as expressed by the Maputo +15 declaration of June 27, 2014, to intensify efforts to clear mined areas to the fullest extent possible by 2025;

(4) calls upon the United States Government—

(A) to continue providing the funding necessary to support international humanitarian demining activities;

(B) to maintain its international leadership role in seeking to rid the world of areas contaminated by landmines and unexploded ordnance; and

(C) to rededicate itself to addressing legacy mine contamination as an urgent humanitarian priority; and

(5) reaffirms the goals of the International Day for Mine Awareness and Assistance in Mine Action.

SENATE RESOLUTION 610—HONORING DR. JANE GOODALL AND HER LEGACY AS AN ETHOLOGIST, CONSERVATIONIST, AND ACTIVIST

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 610

Whereas Dr. Jane Goodall, born Valerie Jane Morris-Goodall on April 3, 1934, is a world-renowned ethologist, conservationist, and activist;

Whereas Dr. Goodall immersed herself in the study of chimpanzees in their natural habitat within Gombe Stream National Park in Gombe, Tanzania;

Whereas Dr. Goodall was one of the first female wildlife field researchers, inspiring countless other women to follow in her footsteps;

Whereas Dr. Goodall's findings on the toolmaking practices of chimpanzees revolutionized the field of primatology and forever changed the way animals are perceived and studied;

Whereas the Jane Goodall Institute, established in 1977 by Dr. Goodall, spearheads the world's longest-running field research into great apes, supports the protection and restoration of the natural world, is an innovative leader in advancing community led conservation, and promotes environmental education;

Whereas Dr. Goodall, through the Jane Goodall Institute, has provided over 300 scholarships to young women to support their education and has paved the way for women in science;

Whereas the Tchimpounga Rehabilitation Center was established by the Jane Goodall Institute in the Republic of Congo in 1991 to care for chimpanzees orphaned by the illegal commercial bushmeat and pet trades and has cared for over 200 chimpanzees in its 30-year existence;

Whereas Dr. Goodall was named a United Nations Messenger of Peace in 2002, the highest honor of the United Nations, to recognize her peace building work through the Roots & Shoots youth program;

Whereas the Roots & Shoots youth program has inspired over 1,470,000 young people in over 65 countries to engage in activities that make a difference in their communities;

Whereas Dr. Goodall transformed traditional conservation through the Lake Tanganyika Catchment Reforestation and Education (TACARE) program, which prioritizes community-centered conservation in designing the future;

Whereas Dr. Goodall has become a beacon of hope through her numerous books and documentaries, inspiring individuals of all ages to work towards a brighter future; and

Whereas Dr. Goodall has built a legacy of environmental activism, humanity, and infectious compassion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) uses April 3, 2024, to commemorate the birth of Dr. Jane Goodall and to celebrate the extraordinary contributions of Dr. Goodall and the impact she has had on the world;

(2) proclaims April 3, 2024, as ''Jane Goodall Day'' across the country; and

(3) expresses gratitude to Dr. Goodall for her unwavering dedication to the well-being of animals, conservation, and the planet as a whole.

SENATE RESOLUTION 611—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MARCH 22, 2024, AS ''NATIONAL INLAND WATERWAYS WORKERS SAFETY AWARENESS DAY'' AND SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF ''NATIONAL INLAND WATERWAYS WORKERS SAFETY AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mrs. CAPITO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 64

Whereas workers in the national inland waterways system play a crucial role, navigating ships, barges, and tugboats through the navigable waters of the United States, loading and unloading barges and transport vessels, and cleaning and caring for vessels and shipyards;

Whereas the United States needs to reduce transportation-vessel and shipyard-related incidents, fatalities, and injuries, continue to improve the safe transportation of domestic cargo by towboat, tugboat, and barge, and prevent employee fatalities;

Whereas, in 2022, there were 4 fatalities and 101 injuries amongst towing vessel crew and related employees;

Whereas the safety and well-being of deckhands, engineers, masters and mates, and shoreside workers are of the utmost importance, and it is crucial to equip them with the necessary knowledge and resources to perform their duties effectively;

Whereas towboat, tugboat, and barge transportation are among the safest and most efficient modes of domestic freight transportation in the United States;

Whereas the Coast Guard-American Waterways Operators Safety Partnership represents a unique public-private partnership to improve vessel safety; and

Whereas the establishment and enforcement of safety standards in the towing vessel

industry has significantly reduced fatalities and injuries in the operation of towing vessels: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 22, 2024, as ''National Inland Waterways Workers Safety Awareness Day'';

(2) encourages relevant Federal, State, and local authorities in addition to related industry and worker groups to observe the day with appropriate programs and activities, with the goal of increasing safety awareness in and around towing-vessel employment;

(3) recognizes the need for deckhands, engineers, masters and mates, shoreside workers, and other employees to remain safe while on the jobsite;

(4) applauds and supports the efforts that the Coast Guard, American Waterways Operators, Maritime Trades Department, and other groups have taken to reduce the incidents of workplace injuries and fatalities in and around towing vessels; and

(5) praises the companies and employers that operate safely and care for the health and safety of their workers.

SENATE RESOLUTION 612—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF MAPLE SYRUP PRODUCTION TO THE STATE OF MAINE AND DESIGNATING MARCH 24, 2024, AS ''MAINE MAPLE SUNDAY''

Mr. KING (for himself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 612

Whereas the art of making sugar and syrup from the sap of the maple tree (also known as acr saccharinum) was developed by Native Americans of the Northeastern United States;

Whereas the production of maple syrup in the State of Maine has a seasonal window between January and May, which is when temperatures drop below freezing at night and rise above freezing during the day;

Whereas the State of Maine accounts for 17 percent of production of maple syrup in the United States and is the third largest producer among the States;

Whereas maple syrup producers in the State of Maine make more than 470,000 gallons of syrup annually, generating more than $55,000,000 for the economy of the State of Maine;

Whereas maple syrup production in the State of Maine supports more than 560 full-time and part-time jobs that generate more than $17,300,000 in wages;

Whereas Maine Maple Sunday has been observed for 41 years, with more than 100 sugarhouses participating from Aroostook to York County, Maine, and attracting thousands of visitors annually;

Whereas Maine Maple Sunday is always observed on the fourth Sunday in March; and

Whereas on March 24, 2024, maple syrup producers in the State of Maine will host the 41st annual Maine Maple Sunday: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates March 24, 2024, as ''Maine Maple Sunday''; and

(2) recognizes the contribution and importance of maple syrup producers and their families in the State of Maine.

SENATE RESOLUTION 613—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF APRIL 15 THROUGH APRIL 19, 2024, AS ''NATIONAL WORK ZONE AWARENESS WEEK''

Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 613

Whereas 956 work zone fatalities occurred in 2021, according to the Federal Highway Administration (referred to in this preamble as ''FHWA'') and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (referred to in this preamble as ''NHTSA''), under the Department of Transportation (referred to in this preamble as ''DOT'');

Whereas, of the 956 work zone fatalities that occurred in 2021—

(1) 778 fatalities were motor vehicle drivers or passengers;

(2) 173 fatalities were persons on foot or bicyclists; and

(3) 5 fatalities were listed as occupants of a motor vehicle not in transport, unknown occupant type in a motor vehicle in transport, or device and person on personal conveyances;

Whereas, according to DOT data from 2021 on work zone fatal traffic crashes by type—

(1) 206 crashes involved a rear-end collision;

(2) 291 involved a commercial motor vehicle; and

(3) 278 fatalities occurred where speeding was a factor;

Whereas 164 pedestrian fatalities occurred in work zones in 2021, according to DOT data;

Whereas, of the 164 pedestrian fatalities that occurred in work zones in 2021—

(1) 34 fatalities were a construction, maintenance, utility, or transportation worker; and

(2) 130 fatalities were pedestrians other than a construction, maintenance, utility, or transportation worker;

Whereas the DOT reported that 42,151 people were injured due to work zone crashes in 2021;

Whereas, according to DOT data from 2021, a total of 108 worker occupational fatalities in road construction sites occurred;

Whereas the DOT reported that between 2020 and 2021, work zone fatalities increased by 10.8 percent while overall roadway fatalities increased by 10.3 percent;

Whereas, according to FHWA and NHTSA, while work zones play a critical role in maintaining and upgrading our roads, work zones can also be a major cause of congestion, delay, and traveler dissatisfaction;

Whereas, according to the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, trucks and buses have limited maneuverability and large blind spots that make operating in work zone areas more challenging, leading to a disproportionate number of work zone crashes involving trucks and buses;

Whereas enforcement of work zone speed limits is shown to significantly reduce speeding, aggressive driving, fatalities, and injuries;

Whereas work zone crashes and fatalities deeply impact family, friends, and communities;

Whereas being under the influence of intoxicating substances while being behind the wheel of a motor vehicle increases the likelihood of intrusions into work zones; and

Whereas work zone fatalities are at the highest level since 2006: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of the week of April 15 through April 19, 2024, as ''National Work Zone Awareness Week'';

(2) encourages individuals to educate themselves on the value of training and the importance of best practices with respect to work zone safety;

(3) encourages individuals to practice work zone safety by—

(A) researching their routes ahead of time to avoid work zones when possible;

(B) avoiding distractions while driving;

(C) obeying road crew flaggers and being aware of and obeying all signs throughout work zones that indicate reduced speeds, lane changes, and other vital information;

(D) slowing down when entering a work zone and being aware of road workers;

(E) merging into an open lane when instructed to do so when lane closures are present and slowing down and merging over for first responders;

(F) maintaining a space cushion when driving behind other vehicles to avoid rear-end crashes; and

(G) providing towing and recovery professionals room to facilitate the process of clearing crashes;

(4) encourages infrastructure owners and operators to deploy work zone protections and technologies such as the Work Zone Data Exchange to make travel on public roads safer for workers and road users; and

(5) supports the goals and ideals of a ''National Work Zone Awareness Week'' to bring further awareness to worker and driver safety while maneuvering a motor vehicle in work zones.

SENATE RESOLUTION 614—TO AUTHORIZE TESTIMONY, DOCUMENTS, AND REPRESENTATION IN UNITED STATES V. MILLER

Mr. SCHUMER (for himself and Mr. MCCONNELL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 614

Whereas, in the case of *United States v. Miller*, No. 2:23-cr-00221, pending in the United States District Court for the District of Nevada, the prosecution has requested the production of documents from the offices of Senators Jacky Rosen and Catherine Cortez Masto and also has requested testimony from employees in those offices;

Whereas, pursuant to sections 703(a) and 704(a)(2) of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, 2 U.S.C. §§288b(a) and 288c(a)(2), the Senate may direct its counsel to represent current and former employees of the Senate with respect to any subpoena, order, or request for testimony or documents relating to their official responsibilities;

Whereas, by the privileges of the Senate of the United States and Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, no evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may, by the judicial or administrative process, be taken from such control or possession but by permission of the Senate; and

Whereas, when it appears that evidence under the control or in the possession of the Senate may promote the administration of justice, the Senate will take such action as will promote the ends of justice consistent with the privileges of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the office of Senator Jacky Rosen is authorized to produce documents and that Dara Cohen, John Fossum, and Carlos Lara, employees in that office, are authorized to testify in the case of *United States v. Miller*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 2. That the office of Senator Catherine Cortez Masto is authorized to produce documents and that employees of that office

from whom relevant evidence may be needed are authorized to testify in the case of *United States v. Miller*, except concerning matters for which a privilege should be asserted.

SEC. 3. The Senate Legal Counsel is authorized to represent the employees of Senator Rosen's and Senator Cortez Masto's offices in connection with the production of evidence and testimony authorized in sections one and two of this resolution.

SENATE RESOLUTION 615—DESIGNATING APRIL 5, 2024, AS ''GOLD STAR WIVES DAY''

Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 615

Whereas the Senate honors the sacrifices made by the surviving spouses and families of the fallen members of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. represents the surviving spouses and families of the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States who have died on active duty or as a result of a service-connected disability;

Whereas the primary mission of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. is to provide services, support, and friendship to the surviving spouses and children of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas, in 1945, Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. was organized with the help of Eleanor Roosevelt to assist the families left behind by the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States;

Whereas the first meeting of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. was held on April 5, 1945;

Whereas April 5, 2024, marks the 79th anniversary of the first meeting of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc.;

Whereas the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States bear the burden of protecting the freedom of the people of the United States; and

Whereas the sacrifices of the families of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States should never be forgotten: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates April 5, 2024, as ''Gold Star Wives Day'';

(2) honors and recognizes—

(A) the contributions of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc.; and

(B) the dedication of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. to the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe Gold Star Wives Day to promote awareness of—

(A) the contributions and dedication of the members of Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. to the members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States; and

(B) the important role that Gold Star Wives of America, Inc. plays in the lives of the surviving spouses and families of the fallen members and veterans of the Armed Forces of the United States.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1695. Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1696. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1697. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1698. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1699. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1700. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1701. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1702. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1703. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1704. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1705. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1706. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1707. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1708. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1709. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1710. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1711. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1712. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1713. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1714. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1715. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1716. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1717. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1718. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1719. Mr. TUBERVILLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1720. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1721. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. SINEMA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1722. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1723. Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1724. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1725. Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. CRAMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1726. Mr. TUBERVILLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1727. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1728. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1729. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1730. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1731. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1732. Mr. RICKETTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1733. Mr. BUDD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1734. Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1735. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1736. Ms. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1737. Ms. LUMMIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1738. Mr. SCHMITT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1739. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1740. Mr. BUDD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1741. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1742. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1743. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1744. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1745. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1746. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1747. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1748. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1749. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1750. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1751. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1752. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1753. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1754. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1755. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1756. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1757. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1758. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1759. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1760. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1761. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1762. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1763. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1764. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1765. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1766. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1767. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1768. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1769. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1770. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1771. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1772. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1773. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1774. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1775. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1776. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1777. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1778. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1779. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1780. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1695. Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) This section may be cited as the ''Credit Card Competition Act of 2024''.

(b) Section 921 of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693o–2) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) as paragraphs (3), (4), and (5), respectively; and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) COMPETITION IN CREDIT CARD TRANSACTIONS.—

''(A) NO EXCLUSIVE NETWORK.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Credit Card Competition Act of 2024, the Board shall prescribe regulations providing that a covered card issuer or payment card network shall not directly or through any agent, processor, or licensed member of a payment card network, by contract, requirement, condition, penalty, technological specification, or otherwise, restrict the number of payment card networks on which an electronic credit transaction may be processed to—

''(I) 1 such network;

''(II) 2 or more such networks, if—

''(aa) each such network is owned, controlled, or otherwise operated by—

''(AA) affiliated persons; or

''(BB) networks affiliated with such issuer; or

''(bb) any such network is identified on the list established and updated under subparagraph (D); or

''(III) subject to clause (ii), the 2 such networks that hold the 2 largest market shares with respect to the number of credit cards issued in the United States by licensed members of such networks (and enabled to be processed through such networks), as determined by the Board on the date on which the Board prescribes the regulations.

''(ii) DETERMINATIONS BY BOARD.—

''(I) IN GENERAL.—The Board, not later than 3 years after the date on which the regulations prescribed under clause (i) take effect, and not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter, shall determine whether the 2 networks identified under clause (i)(III) have changed, as compared with the most recent such determination by the Board.

''(II) EFFECT OF DETERMINATION.—If the Board, under subclause (I), determines that the 2 networks described in clause (i)(III) have changed (as compared with the most recent such determination by the Board), clause (i)(III) shall no longer have any force or effect.

''(B) NO ROUTING RESTRICTIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Credit Card Competition Act of 2024, the Board shall prescribe regulations providing that a covered card issuer or payment card network shall not—

''(i) directly or through any agent, processor, or licensed member of the network, by contract, requirement, condition, penalty, or otherwise—

''(I) inhibit the ability of any person who accepts credit cards for payments to direct the routing of electronic credit transactions for processing over any payment card network that—

''(aa) may process such transactions; and

''(bb) is not on the list established and updated by the Board under subparagraph (D);

''(II) require any person who accepts credit cards for payments to exclusively use, for transactions associated with a particular credit card, an authentication, tokenization, or other security technology that cannot be used by all of the payment card networks that may process electronic credit transactions for that particular credit card; or

''(III) inhibit the ability of another payment card network to handle or process electronic credit transactions using an authentication, tokenization, or other security technology for the processing of those electronic credit transactions; or

''(ii) impose any penalty or disadvantage, financial or otherwise, on any person for—

''(I) choosing to direct the routing of an electronic credit transaction over any payment card network on which the electronic credit transaction may be processed; or

''(II) failing to ensure that a certain number, or aggregate dollar amount, of electronic credit transactions are handled by a particular payment card network.

''(C) APPLICABILITY.—The regulations prescribed under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall not apply to a credit card issued in a 3-party payment system model.

''(D) DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL SECURITY RISKS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Credit Card Competition Act of 2024, the Board, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe regulations to establish a public list of any payment card network—

''(I) the processing of electronic credit transactions by which is determined by the Board to pose a risk to the national security of the United States; or

''(II) that is owned, operated, or sponsored by a foreign state entity.

''(ii) UPDATING OF LIST.—Not less frequently than once every 2 years after the date on which the Board establishes the public list required under clause (i), the Board, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, shall update that list.

''(E) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph—

''(i) the terms 'card issuer' and 'creditor' have the meanings given the terms in section 103 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602);

''(ii) the term 'covered card issuer' means a card issuer that, together with the affiliates of the card issuer, has assets of more than $100,000,000,000;

''(iii) the term 'credit card issued in a 3-party payment system model' means a credit card issued by a card issuer that is—

''(I) the payment card network with respect to the credit card; or

''(II) under common ownership with the payment card network with respect to the credit card;

''(iv) the term 'electronic credit transaction'—

''(I) means a transaction in which a person uses a credit card; and

''(II) includes a transaction in which a person does not physically present a credit card for payment, including a transaction involving the entry of credit card information onto, or use of credit card information in conjunction with, a website interface or a mobile telephone application; and

''(v) the term 'licensed member' includes, with respect to a payment card network—

''(I) a creditor or card issuer that is authorized to issue credit cards bearing any logo of the payment card network; and

''(II) any person, including any financial institution and any person that may be referred to as an 'acquirer', that is authorized to—

''(aa) screen and accept any person into any program under which that person may accept, for payment for goods or services, a credit card bearing any logo of the payment card network;

''(bb) process transactions on behalf of any person who accepts credit cards for payments; and

''(cc) complete financial settlement of any transaction on behalf of a person who accepts credit cards for payments.''; and

(2) in subsection (d)(1), by inserting '', except that the Bureau shall not have authority to enforce the requirements of this section or any regulations prescribed by the Board under this section'' after ''section 918''.

(c) Each set of regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System under paragraph (2) of section 921(b) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693o–2(b)), as amended by subsection (b) of this section, shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date on which the Board prescribes the final version of that set of regulations.

SA 1696. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by any division of this Act may be used for surgical procedures or hormone therapies for the purpose of gender affirming care.

SA 1697. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF CERTAIN FORMS OF IDENTIFICATION BY ALIENS.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the Transportation Security Administration may be obligated or expended to enforce any rule or program that permits an alien (as defined in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101)) to use any of the following as a valid identification document for the purpose of boarding an aircraft in the United States:

(1) The CBP One Mobile Application.

(2) Department of Homeland Security Form I–385, Notice to Report.

(3) Department of Homeland Security Form I–862, Notice to Appear.

SA 1698. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES.—The term ''flag of the United States'' has the meaning given the term in section 700(b) of title 18, United States Code.

(2) PUBLIC BUILDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ''public building'' has the meaning given the term in section 3301(a) of title 40, United States Code.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term ''public building'' includes—

(i) a military installation (as defined in section 2801(c) of title 10, United States Code); and

(ii) any embassy or consulate of the United States.

(b) PROHIBITIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and except as provided in subsection (c), no flag that is not the flag of the United States may be flown, draped, or otherwise displayed—

(1) on the exterior of a public building; or

(2) in the hallway of a public building.

(c) EXCEPTIONS.—The prohibitions under subsection (b) shall not apply to—

(1) a National League of Families POW/MIA flag (as designated by section 902 of title 36, United States Code);

(2) any flag that represents the nation of a visiting diplomat;

(3) the State flag of the State represented by a member of Congress, outside or within the office of the member;

(4) in the case of a military installation, any flag that represents a unit or branch of the Armed Forces;

(5) any flag that represents an Indian Tribe (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 5304));

(6) any flag that represents the State, territory, county, city, or local jurisdiction in which the public building is located;

(7) a historical flag on display in a historical area of a public building;

(8) any flag that represents a State or territory in a public building located in the District of Columbia; or

(9) the service or leadership flag of a Federal agency.

SA 1699. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division _____, add the following:

SEC. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, none of the funds appropriated or made available by this division for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention or any other agency of the Department of Health and Human Services for fiscal year 2024 shall be used to enforce a mask mandate in response to COVID–19.

SEC. _____. Nothing in this division or any other division of this Act may be construed to prevent a hospital, public health center, outpatient medical facility, rehabilitation facility, facility for long-term care, or medical facility, as those terms are defined in section 1624 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 300s–3), from requiring employees to wear masks in response to the COVID–19 virus.

SA 1700. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division _____, add the following:

SEC. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of this division, none of the funds appropriated or made available by this division for the Transportation Security Administration or any other agency of the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year

2024 shall be used to enforce a mask mandate in response to COVID–19.

SA 1701. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION _____—BAN STOCK TRADING FOR GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS ACT OF 2024

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Ban Stock Trading for Government Officials Act of 2024''.

TITLE I—ELIMINATING EXECUTIVE BRANCH INSIDER CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Eliminating Executive Branch Insider Conflicts of Interest Act''.

SEC. 102. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that executive branch officials should not have a personal financial interest in the outcome of Government policy decisions.

SEC. 103. BANNING CONFLICTED INTERESTS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Subchapter IV—Banning Conflicted Interests in the Executive Branch

''§ 13151. Definitions

''In this subchapter:

''(1) ADJACENT INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'adjacent individual' means—

''(A) each officer or employee in the executive branch holding a Senior Executive Service position, as defined under section 3132(a)(2) of title 5;

''(B) each member of a uniformed service whose pay grade is at or in excess of O–7 under section 201 of title 37;

''(C) each officer or employee in any other position determined by the Special Counsel of the United States, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, to be of equal classification to a position described in subparagraph (A) or (B); or

''(D) the spouse or dependent child of any individual described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C).

''(2) COVERED FINANCIAL INTEREST.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered financial interest' means—

''(i) any investment in—

''(I) a security (as defined in section 3(a) of Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)));

''(II) a security future (as defined in that section); or

''(III) a commodity (as defined in section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a)); or

''(ii) any economic interest comparable to an interest described in clause (i) that is acquired through synthetic means, such as the use of a derivative, including an option, warrant, or other similar means.

''(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'covered financial interest' does not include—

''(i) a diversified mutual fund;

''(ii) a diversified exchange-traded fund;

''(iii) a United States Treasury bill, note, or bond;

''(iv) compensation from the primary occupation of a covered individual or adjacent individual; or

''(v) any financial interest exempted under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 208(b) of title 18.

''(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual' means—

''(A) the President;

''(B) the Vice President; or

''(C) the spouse or dependent child of any individual described in subparagraph (A) or (B).

''(4) DEPENDENT CHILD.—The term dependent child has the meaning given the term in section 13101.

''§ 13152. Prohibition on certain transactions and holdings involving covered financial interests

''(a) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a covered individual or an adjacent individual may not, during the term of service of the covered individual or adjacent individual, or during the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the service of such covered individual or adjacent individual is terminated, hold, purchase, sell, or conduct any type of transaction with respect to a covered financial interest.

''(b) EXCEPTIONS.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply to a sale by a covered individual or an adjacent individual that is completed by the date that is—

''(1) for a covered individual or an adjacent individual serving on the date of enactment of this section, 180 days after the date of enactment; and

''(2) for a covered individual or an adjacent individual who commences service as a covered individual after the date of enactment of this section, 180 days after the first date of the term of service.

''(c) ADJACENT INDIVIDUALS.—With respect to adjacent individuals—

''(1) this section shall be supplementary in nature to section 208 of title 18; and

''(2) nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the application of section 208 of title 18.

''(d) PENALTIES.—

''(1) DISGORGEMENT.—A covered individual or adjacent individual shall disgorge to the Treasury of the United States any profit from a transaction or holding involving a covered financial interest that is conducted in violation of this section.

''(2) FINES.—A covered individual or an adjacent individual who holds, purchases, sells, or conducts a transaction involving a covered financial interest in violation of this section—

''(A) shall be assessed a fine by the Office of the Special Counsel, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, of not more than $10,000 or the amount of compensation, if any, that the covered individual or adjacent individual received for the prohibited conduct, whichever is greater; and

''(B) may be referred to the Department of Justice and assessed a civil fine pursuant to section 13153 if the Office of the Special Counsel, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, find such case comparatively substantial in monetary value or extraordinary in nature.

''§ 13153. Civil penalties

''(a) CIVIL ACTION.—The Attorney General may bring a civil action in any appropriate United States district court against any covered individual or adjacent individual who violates any provision of section 13152.

''(b) CIVIL PENALTY.—The court in which any action is brought under subsection (a) may assess against a covered individual or an adjacent individual a civil penalty of not more than the amount recommended by the Attorney General.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SUBCHAPTER IV—BANNING CONFLICTED INTERESTS IN THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

''13151. Definitions.

''13152. Prohibition on certain transactions and holdings involving covered financial interests.

''13153. Civil penalties.''.

TITLE II—STOCK ACT 2.0

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''STOCK Act 2.0''.

SEC. 202. REPORTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR, OR RECEIPT OF, PAYMENTS FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 13103 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(i) REPORTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR, OR RECEIPT OF, PAYMENTS FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) COVERED PAYMENT.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered payment' means a payment of money or any other item of value made, or promised to be made, by the Federal Government.

''(ii) INCLUSIONS.—The term 'covered payment' includes—

''(I) a loan agreement, contract, or grant made, or promised to be made, by the Federal Government; and

''(II) such other types of payment of money or items of value as the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, may establish, by regulation.

''(iii) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'covered payment' does not include—

''(I) any salary or compensation for service performed as, or reimbursement of personal outlay by, an officer or employee of the Federal Government; or

''(II) any tax refund (including a refundable tax credit).

''(B) COVERED PERSON.—The term 'covered person' means a person described in any of paragraphs (1) through (10) of section 13105(l).

''(2) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a notice of any application for, or receipt of, a covered payment by a covered person, the spouse of the covered person, or a dependent child of the covered person (including any business owned and controlled by the covered person or spouse or dependent child of the covered person), but in no case later than 45 days after the date on which the covered payment is made or promised to be made, the covered person shall submit to the applicable supervising ethics office a report describing the covered payment.

''(3) FINE FOR FAILURE TO REPORT.—Notwithstanding section 13106(d), a covered person shall be assessed a fine, pursuant to regulations issued by the applicable supervising ethics office, of $500 in each case in which the covered person fails to file a report required under this subsection.''.

(b) REPORT CONTENTS.—Section 13104 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) PAYMENTS FROM FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—Each report filed pursuant to subsection (i) of section 13103 shall include—

''(1) an identification of each type of payment or item of value applied for, or received, from the Federal Government;

''(2)(A) the name of each recipient of each payment or item of value identified under paragraph (1); and

''(B) the relationship of each recipient named under subparagraph (A) to the person filing the report;

''(3) a description of the date on which, as applicable—

''(A) an application for a payment or other item of value was submitted to the Federal Government; and

''(B) the payment or item of value was received from the Federal Government; and

''(4) a description of the amount of each applicable payment or item of value.''.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) PERSONS REQUIRED TO FILE.—Section 13103(f) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (9), by striking ''as defined in section 13101'';

(B) in paragraph (10), by striking ''as defined in section 13101'';

(C) in paragraph (11), by striking ''as defined in section 13101''; and

(D) in paragraph (12), by striking ''as defined in section 13101''.

(2) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—Section 13104(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking ''section 13103(d) and (e)'' and inserting ''subsection (d) or (e) of section 13103''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to relevant applications submitted to, and payments made or promised to be made by, the Federal Government on or after the date that is 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 203. PENALTY FOR STOCK ACT NONCOMPLIANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The STOCK Act (Public Law 112–105; 126 Stat. 291; 126 Stat. 1310; 127 Stat. 438; 132 Stat. 4167) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 20. FINES FOR FAILURE TO REPORT.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (including regulations), an individual shall be assessed a fine, pursuant to regulations issued by the applicable supervising ethics office (including the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, as applicable), of $500 in each case in which the individual fails to file a transaction report required under this Act.

''(b) DEPOSIT IN TREASURY.—The fines paid under this section shall be deposited in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.''.

(b) RULES, REGULATIONS, GUIDANCE, AND DOCUMENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, each supervising ethics office (as defined in section 2 of the STOCK Act (5 U.S.C. 13101 note)) (including the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, as applicable) shall amend the rules, regulations, guidance, documents, papers, and other records of the supervising ethics office in accordance with the amendment made by this section.

SEC. 204. BANNING CONFLICTED INTERESTS IN CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) BANNING CONFLICTED TRADES.—Chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 103 of this division, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''Subchapter V—Banning Conflicted Trades in Congress

''SEC. 13161. DEFINITIONS.

''In this subchapter:

''(1) COMMODITY.—The term 'commodity' has the meaning given the term in section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a).

''(2) COVERED FINANCIAL INTEREST.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'covered financial interest' means—

''(i) any investment in—

''(I) a security (as defined in section 3(a) of Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)));

''(II) a security future (as defined in that section); or

''(III) a commodity (as defined in section 1a of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. 1a)); or

''(ii) any economic interest comparable to an interest described in clause (i) that is acquired through synthetic means, such as the use of a derivative, including an option, warrant, or other similar means.

''(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term 'covered financial interest' does not include—

''(i) a diversified mutual fund;

''(ii) a diversified exchange-traded fund;

''(iii) a United States Treasury bill, note, or bond;

''(iv) compensation from the primary occupation of a covered individual; or

''(v) any financial interest exempted under paragraph (1) or (2) of section 208(b) of title 18.

''(3) COVERED INDIVIDUAL.—The term 'covered individual' means—

''(A) a Member of Congress (as defined in section 13101); or

''(B) a spouse or dependent child of a Member of Congress.

''(4) DEPENDENT CHILD.—The term dependent child has the meaning given the term in section 13101.

''(5) FUTURE.—The term 'future' means a financial contract obligating a buyer to purchase, or a seller to sell, an asset, such as a physical commodity or a financial instrument, at a predetermined future date and price.

''(6) SECURITY.—The term 'security' has the meaning given the term in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a)).

''(7) SUPERVISING ETHICS OFFICE.—The term 'supervising ethics office', with respect to a covered individual, has the meaning given the term in section 13101 with respect to that covered individual.

''SEC. 13162. PROHIBITIONS.

''(a) TRANSACTIONS.—Except as provided in sections 13163 and 13164, and during the 180-day period beginning on the date on which the service of such covered individual is terminated, no covered individual may—

''(1) hold, purchase, sell, or conduct any type of transaction with respect to a covered financial interest; or

''(2) enter into a transaction that creates a net short position in any security.

''(b) POSITIONS.—A covered individual may not serve as an officer or member of any board of any for-profit association, corporation, or other entity.

''SEC. 13163. DIVESTITURE.

''With respect to any covered financial interest held by a covered individual, the covered individual shall sell the covered financial interest during the 180-day period beginning on the later of—

''(1) the date on which the covered individual assumes office or employment as a covered individual; and

''(2) the date of enactment of this Act.

''SEC. 13164. ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.

''(a) ADMINISTRATION.—Each supervising ethics office may issue guidance relating to any matter covered by this subchapter, including—

''(1) whether a covered individual may hold an employee stock option or other, similar instrument that has not vested before the date on which the covered individual assumes office or employment as a covered individual; and

''(2) the process and timeline for determining the date on which a covered individual shall no longer serve as an officer or member of any board of any for-profit association, corporation, or other entity.

''(b) ENFORCEMENT.—A covered individual who knowingly fails to comply with this subchapter—

''(1) shall disgorge to the Treasury of the United States any profit from a transaction or holding involving a covered financial interest that is conducted in violation of this subchapter; and

''(2) shall be assessed a fine by the supervising ethics office of not less than 10 percent of the value of the covered financial interest that was purchased or sold, or the security in which a net short position was created, in violation of this subchapter, as applicable.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 103 of this division, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SUBCHAPTER V—BANNING CONFLICTED TRADES IN CONGRESS

''13161. Definitions.
''13162. Prohibitions.
''13163. Divestiture.
''13164. Administration and enforcement.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) AUTHORITY AND FUNCTIONS.—Section 13122(f)(2)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking ''Subject to clause (iv) of this subparagraph, before'' each place it appears and inserting ''Before''; and

(B) by striking clause (iv).

(2) LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995.—Section 3(4)(D) of the Lobbying Disclosure Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1602(4)(D)) is amended by striking ''legislative branch employee serving in a position described under section 13101(13) of title 5, United States Code'' and inserting ''officer or employee of Congress (as defined in section 13101 of title 5, United States Code)''.

(3) STOCK ACT.—Section 2 of the STOCK Act (5 U.S.C. 13101 note) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''(11)'';

(B) in paragraph (4), by striking ''(10)'';

(C) in paragraph (5), by striking ''(9)''; and

(D) in paragraph (6), by striking ''(18)''.

(4) SECURITIES EXCHANGE ACT OF 1934.—Section 21A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78u–1) is amended—

(A) in subsection (g)(2)(B)(ii), by striking ''(11)''; and

(B) in subsection (h)(2)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''(9)''; and

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''(10)''.

SEC. 205. ELECTRONIC FILING AND ONLINE PUBLIC AVAILABILITY OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE FORMS.

(a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS AND CONGRESSIONAL STAFF.—Section 8(b)(1) of the STOCK Act (5 U.S.C. 13107 note) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', pursuant to subchapter I of chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, through databases maintained on the official websites of the Senate and House of Representatives'' after ''enable'';

(2) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''reports received by them pursuant to section 13105(h)(1)(A) of title 5, United States Code, and'' and inserting ''each report received under section 13105(h)(1)(A) of that subchapter; and''; and

(3) by striking subparagraph (B) and the undesignated matter following that subparagraph and inserting the following:

''(B) public access—

''(i) to each—

''(I) financial disclosure report filed by a Member of Congress or a candidate for Congress;

''(II) transaction disclosure report filed by a Member of Congress or a candidate for Congress pursuant to section 13105(l) of that subchapter; and

''(III) notice of extension or amendment with respect to a report described in subclause (I) or (II), pursuant to that subchapter; and

''(ii) in a manner that—

''(I) allows the public to search, sort, and download data contained in the reports described in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) by criteria required to be reported, including by filer name, asset, transaction type, ticker symbol, notification date, amount of transaction, and date of transaction;

''(II) allows access through an application programming interface; and

''(III) is fully compliant with—

''(aa) section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d); and

''(bb) the most recent Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (or successor guidelines).''.

(b) VERY SENIOR EXECUTIVE BRANCH EMPLOYEES.—Section 11(b)(1) of the STOCK Act (Public Law 112–105; 126 Stat. 299) is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting '', pursuant to subchapter I of chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, through databases maintained on the official website of the Office of Government Ethics'' after ''enable''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (B) and the undesignated matter following that subparagraph and inserting the following:

''(B) public access—

''(i) to each—

''(I) financial disclosure report filed by an officer occupying a position listed in section 5312 or 5313 of title 5, United States Code, having been nominated by the President and confirmed by the Senate to that position;

''(II) transaction disclosure report filed by an individual described in subclause (I) pursuant to section 13105(l) of title 5, United States Code; and

''(III) notice of extension or amendment with respect to a report described in subclause (I) or (II), pursuant to subchapter I of chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code; and

''(ii) in a manner that—

''(I) allows the public to search, sort, and download data contained in the reports described in subclause (I) or (II) of clause (i) by criteria required to be reported, including by filer name, asset, transaction type, ticker symbol, notification date, amount of transaction, and date of transaction;

''(II) allows access through an application programming interface; and

''(III) is fully compliant with—

''(aa) section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794d); and

''(bb) the most recent Web Content Accessibility Guidelines (or successor guidelines).''.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply on and after the date that is 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1702. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION _____

—PREVENTING CHILD LABOR EXPLOITATION IN FEDERAL CONTRACTING ACT

SEC. _____1. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Preventing Child Labor Exploitation in Federal Contracting Act''.

SEC. _____2. DEFINITIONS.

In this division:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Oversight and Accountability of the House of Representatives.

(2) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given such term in section 133 of title 41, United States Code.

SEC. _____3. PROMOTION OF WORKPLACE ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) REQUIRED REPRESENTATIONS AND CERTIFICATIONS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulatory Council shall amend the Federal Acquisition Regulation to—

(1) require any entity that enters into a contract with an executive agency to represent, on an annual basis and to the best of the knowledge of the entity, whether, within the preceding 3-year period, any final administrative merits determination, arbitral award or decision, or civil judgment, as defined in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, has been issued against the entity for any violation of section 12 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 212), relating to child labor;

(2) provide (through a revision of the Certification Regarding Knowledge of Child Labor for Listed End Products as described in section 52.222–18 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation or through, if necessary, another certification) a requirement that an offeror—

(A) certify, to the best of the knowledge of the entity, whether, within the preceding 3-year period, any final administrative merits determination, arbitral award or decision, or civil judgment, as defined in coordination with the Secretary of Labor, for a violation described in paragraph (1) has been issued against the entity; and

(B) require such a certification from each of the subcontractors or service providers to be used in performing, or that were considered for the performance of, the contract for which the offeror is submitting an offer and provide such certifications with the certification by the offeror under subparagraph (A);

(3) prohibit executive agencies from awarding a contract to—

(A) an entity that provides an affirmative response to a representation under paragraph (1) and has failed to implement any corrective measure negotiated under subsection (b); or

(B) an offeror that—

(i) provides an affirmative response to a certification under paragraph (2) and has failed to implement any corrective measure negotiated under subsection (b); or

(ii) intends to use a subcontractor or service provider in the performance of the contract that was identified as having violations in such an affirmative response and has failed to implement any corrective measure negotiated under such subsection;

(4) require the name and address of each entity that provides an affirmative response to a representation under paragraph (1), and the name and address of each offeror, subcontractor, or service provider identified as having violations in an affirmative response to a certification under paragraph (2), to be referred to the Secretary of Labor for purposes of negotiating with that entity, offeror, subcontractor, or service provider on corrective measures under subsection (b) and preparing the list and conducting suspension and debarment proceedings under subsection (c);

(5) provide procedures for consultation with the Secretary of Labor by an offeror described in paragraph (2) to assist the offeror in evaluating the information on compliance with section 12 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, relating to child labor, submitted to the offeror by a subcontractor or service provider pursuant to such paragraph; and

(6) make any other changes necessary to implement the requirements of this division.

(b) CORRECTIVE MEASURES.—An entity that makes an affirmative response to a representation under subsection (a)(1) or offeror, subcontractor, or service provider that makes an affirmative response in a certification under subsection (a)(2)—

(1) shall update the representation or certification, respectively, based on any steps taken by the entity, offeror, subcontractor, or service provider to correct violations of or improve compliance with section 12 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, relating to child labor, including any agreements entered into with the Secretary of Labor; and

(2) may negotiate with the Secretary of Labor regarding corrective measures that the entity, offeror, subcontractor, or service provider may take in order to avoid being placed on the list under subsection (c) and referred for suspension and debarment proceedings under such subsection, in the case the entity, offeror, subcontractor, or service provider meets the criteria for such list and proceedings under such subsection.

(c) LIST OF INELIGIBLE ENTITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For each calendar year beginning with the first calendar year that begins after the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor, in coordination with other executive agencies as necessary, shall prepare a list and conduct suspension and debarment proceedings for—

(A) each entity that provided an affirmative response to a representation under subsection (a)(1) and has failed to implement any corrective measure negotiated under subsection (b) for the year of the list; and

(B) each offeror, subcontractor, or service provider that was identified as having violations in an affirmative response to a certification under subsection (a)(2) and has failed to implement any corrective measure negotiated under subsection (b) for the year of the list.

(2) INELIGIBILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall not, during the period of time described in subparagraph (B), solicit offers from, award contracts to, or consent to subcontracts with any entity, offeror, subcontractor, or service provider that is listed—

(i) under paragraph (1); and

(ii) as an active exclusion in the System for Award Management.

(B) PERIOD OF TIME.—The period of time described in this subparagraph is a period of time determined by the suspension and debarment official that is not less than 4 years from the date on which the entity, offeror, subcontractor, or service provider is listed as an exclusion in the System for Award Management.

(3) ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining the entities to consider for suspension and debarment proceedings under paragraph (1), the Secretary of Labor shall ensure procedures for such determination are consistent with the procedures set forth in subpart 9.4 of the Federal Acquisition Regulation for the suspension and debarment of Federal contractors.

(d) PENALTIES FOR FAILURE TO REPORT.—

(1) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for a person to knowingly fail to make a representation or certification required under paragraph (1) or (2), respectively, of subsection (a).

(2) PENALTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A violation of paragraph (1) shall be referred by any executive agency

with knowledge of such violation for suspension and debarment proceedings, to be conducted by the suspension and debarment official of the Department of Labor.

(B) LOSS TO GOVERNMENT.—A violation of paragraph (1) shall be subject to the penalties under sections 3729 through 3733 of title 31, United States Code (commonly known as the ''False Claims Act'').

(e) ANNUAL REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—For each calendar year beginning with the first calendar year that begins after the date that is 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress, and make publicly available on a public website, a report that includes—

(1) the number of entities, offerors, subcontractors, or service providers on the list under subsection (c) for the year of the report;

(2) the number of entities, offerors, subcontractors, or service providers that agreed to take corrective measures under subsection (b) for such year;

(3) the amount of the applicable contracts for the entities, offerors, subcontractors, or service providers described in paragraph (1) or (2); and

(4) an assessment of the effectiveness of the implementation of this division for such year.

SEC. _____4. GAO STUDY.

Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the prevalence of violations of section 12 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 212), relating to child labor, among Federal contractors and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report with the findings of the study.

SEC. _____ 5. USE OF CIVIL PENALTIES COLLECTED FOR CHILD LABOR LAW VIOLATIONS.—

Section 16(e)(5) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 216(e)(5)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''Except'' and all that follows through ''sums'' and inserting ''Sums''; and

(2) by striking the second sentence.

SEC. _____6. NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out this division.

SA 1703. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. INCREASE OF DUTY ON AUTOS ORIGINATING IN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, heading 8703 of the HTS shall be applied and administered with respect to imports originating in the People's Republic of China—

(1) in the column 1 general rate of duty column, by substituting ''100%'' for the rate of duty otherwise applicable; and

(2) in the column 2 rate of duty column, by substituting ''100%'' for the rate of duty otherwise applicable.

(b) MODIFICATION OF SCHEDULE OF CONCESSIONS TO GATT 1994.—With due regard for the international obligations of the United States, particularly Article XXXVIII of the GATT 1947 requiring any suspension of trade agreement concessions to be made on a most-favored nation basis, the United States Trade Representative shall take the necessary steps to modify the Schedule of Concessions to accommodate the increase under subsection (a) in the rate of duty applicable to articles covered under heading 8703 of the HTS that originate in the People's Republic of China.

(c) RULES OF ORIGIN.—For purposes of this section, an article covered under heading 8703 of the HTS originates in the People's Republic of China if the article is—

(1) produced in the People's Republic of China;

(2) produced by an entity organized under the laws of or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the People's Republic of China, without regard to the country in which that entity is located; or

(3) produced by an entity over which control is exercised by an entity organized under the laws of or otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the People's Republic of China, without regard to the country in which either such entity is located.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) CONTROL.—The term ''control'' has the meaning given that term in section 800.208 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act).

(2) GATT 1947.—The term ''GATT 1947'' has the meaning given that term in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

(3) HTS.—The term ''HTS'' means the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.

(4) SCHEDULE OF CONCESSIONS.—The term ''Schedule of Concessions'' has the meaning given the term ''Schedule XX'' in section 2 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (19 U.S.C. 3501).

SA 1704. Mr. HAWLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division G, add the following:

TITLE V—STOP CSAM ACT

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Strengthening Transparency and Obligations to Protect Children Suffering from Abuse and Mistreatment Act of 2024'' or the ''STOP CSAM Act of 2024''.

SEC. 502. PROTECTING CHILD VICTIMS AND WITNESSES IN FEDERAL COURT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3509 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking ''or exploitation'' and inserting ''exploitation, or kidnapping, including international parental kidnapping'';

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking ''physical or mental injury'' and inserting ''physical injury, psychological abuse'';

(C) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

''(5) the term 'psychological abuse' includes—

''(A) a pattern of acts, threats of acts, or coercive tactics intended to degrade, humiliate, intimidate, or terrorize a child; and

''(B) the infliction of trauma on a child through—

''(i) isolation;

''(ii) the withholding of food or other necessities in order to control behavior;

''(iii) physical restraint; or

''(iv) the confinement of the child without the child's consent and in degrading conditions;'';

(D) in paragraph (6), by striking ''child prostitution'' and inserting ''child sex trafficking'';

(E) by striking paragraph (7) and inserting the following:

''(7) the term 'multidisciplinary child abuse team' means a professional unit of individuals working together to investigate child abuse and provide assistance and support to a victim of child abuse, composed of representatives from—

''(A) health, social service, and legal service agencies that represent the child;

''(B) law enforcement agencies and prosecutorial offices; and

''(C) children's advocacy centers;'';

(F) in paragraph (9)(D)—

(i) by striking ''genitals'' and inserting ''anus, genitals,''; and

(ii) by striking ''or animal'';

(G) in paragraph (11), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(H) in paragraph (12)—

(i) by striking ''the term 'child abuse' does not'' and inserting ''the terms 'physical injury' and 'psychological abuse' do not''; and

(ii) by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(I) by adding at the end the following:

''(13) the term 'covered person' means a person of any age who—

''(A) is or is alleged to be—

''(i) a victim of a crime of physical abuse, sexual abuse, exploitation, or kidnapping, including international parental kidnapping; or

''(ii) a witness to a crime committed against another person; and

''(B) was under the age of 18 when the crime described in subparagraph (A) was committed; and

''(14) the term 'protected information', with respect to a covered person, includes—

''(A) personally identifiable information of the covered person, including—

''(i) the name of the covered person;

''(ii) an address;

''(iii) a phone number;

''(iv) a user name or identifying information for an online, social media, or email account; and

''(v) any information that can be used to distinguish or trace the identity of the covered person, either alone or when combined with other information that is linked or linkable to the covered person;

''(B) medical, dental, behavioral, psychiatric, or psychological information of the covered person;

''(C) educational or juvenile justice records of the covered person; and

''(D) any other information concerning the covered person that is deemed 'protected information' by order of the court under subsection (d)(5).'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(C), by striking ''minor'' and inserting ''child''; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the heading, by striking ''VIDEOTAPED'' and inserting ''RECORDED'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''that the deposition be recorded and preserved on videotape'' and inserting ''that a video recording of the deposition be made and preserved'';

(iii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (ii), by striking ''that the child's deposition be taken and preserved by videotape'' and inserting ''that a video recording of the child's deposition be made and preserved'';

(II) in clause (iii)—

(aa) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking ''videotape'' and inserting ''recorded''; and

(bb) in subclause (IV), by striking ''videotape'' and inserting ''recording''; and

(III) in clause (v)—

(aa) in the heading, by striking ''VIDEOTAPE'' and inserting ''VIDEO RECORDING'';

(bb) in the first sentence, by striking ''made and preserved on video tape'' and inserting ''recorded and preserved''; and

(cc) in the second sentence, by striking ''videotape'' and inserting ''video recording'';

(iv) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''child's videotaped'' and inserting ''video recording of the child's'';

(v) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) by striking ''videotaping'' and inserting ''deposition''; and

(II) by striking ''videotaped'' and inserting ''recorded'';

(vi) in subparagraph (E), by striking ''videotaped'' and inserting ''recorded''; and

(vii) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''videotape'' each place the term appears and inserting ''video recording'';

(3) in subsection (d)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking ''the name of or any other information concerning a child'' and inserting ''a covered person's protected information''; and

(ii) in clause (ii)—

(I) by striking ''documents described in clause (i) or the information in them that concerns a child'' and inserting ''a covered person's protected information''; and

(II) by striking '', have reason to know such information'' and inserting ''(including witnesses or potential witnesses), have reason to know each item of protected information to be disclosed'';

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking ''the name of or any other information concerning a child'' each place the term appears and inserting ''a covered person's protected information'';

(ii) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(iii) by striking ''All papers'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—All papers''; and

(iv) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) ENFORCEMENT OF VIOLATIONS.—The court may address a violation of subparagraph (A) in the same manner as disobedience or resistance to a lawful court order under section 401(3).'';

(C) in paragraph (3)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) by striking ''a child from public disclosure of the name of or any other information concerning the child'' and inserting ''a covered person's protected information from public disclosure''; and

(II) by striking '', if the court determines that there is a significant possibility that such disclosure would be detrimental to the child'';

(ii) in subparagraph (B)—

(I) in clause (i)—

(aa) by striking ''a child witness, and the testimony of any other witness'' and inserting ''any witness''; and

(bb) by striking ''the name of or any other information concerning a child'' and inserting ''a covered person's protected information''; and

(II) in clause (ii), by striking ''child'' and inserting ''covered person''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(C)(i) For purposes of this paragraph, there shall be a presumption that public disclosure of a covered person's protected information would be detrimental to the covered person.

''(ii) The court shall deny a motion for a protective order under subparagraph (A) only if the court finds that the party opposing the motion has rebutted the presumption under clause (i) of this subparagraph.'';

(D) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking ''This subsection'' and inserting the following:

''(A) DISCLOSURE TO CERTAIN PARTIES.—This subsection'';

(ii) in subparagraph (A), as so designated—

(I) by striking ''the name of or other information concerning a child'' and inserting ''a covered person's protected information''; and

(II) by striking ''or an adult attendant, or to'' and inserting ''an adult attendant, a law enforcement agency for any intelligence or investigative purpose, or''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) REQUEST FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE.—If any party requests public disclosure of a covered person's protected information to further a public interest, the court shall deny the request unless the court finds that—

''(i) the party seeking disclosure has established that there is a compelling public interest in publicly disclosing the covered person's protected information;

''(ii) there is a substantial probability that the public interest would be harmed if the covered person's protected information is not disclosed;

''(iii) the substantial probability of harm to the public interest outweighs the harm to the covered person from public disclosure of the covered person's protected information; and

''(iv) there is no alternative to public disclosure of the covered person's protected information that would adequately protect the public interest.''; and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) OTHER PROTECTED INFORMATION.—The court may order that information shall be considered to be 'protected information' for purposes of this subsection if the court finds that the information is sufficiently personal, sensitive, or identifying that it should be subject to the protections and presumptions under this subsection.'';

(4) by striking subsection (f) and inserting the following:

''(f) VICTIM IMPACT STATEMENT.—

''(1) PROBATION OFFICER.—In preparing the presentence report pursuant to rule 32(c) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, the probation officer shall request information from the multidisciplinary child abuse team, if applicable, or other appropriate sources to determine the impact of the offense on a child victim and any other children who may have been affected by the offense.

''(2) GUARDIAN AD LITEM.—A guardian ad litem appointed under subsection (h) shall—

''(A) make every effort to obtain and report information that accurately expresses the views of a child victim, and the views of family members as appropriate, concerning the impact of the offense; and

''(B) use forms that permit a child victim to express the child's views concerning the personal consequences of the offense, at a level and in a form of communication commensurate with the child's age and ability.'';

(5) in subsection (h), by adding at the end the following:

''(4) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the United States courts to carry out this subsection $25,000,000 for each fiscal year.

''(B) SUPERVISION OF PAYMENTS.—Payments from appropriations authorized under subparagraph (A) shall be made under the supervision of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.'';

(6) in subsection (i)—

(A) by striking ''A child testifying at or attending a judicial proceeding'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A child testifying at a judicial proceeding, including in a manner described in subsection (b),'';

(B) in paragraph (1), as so designated—

(i) in the third sentence, by striking ''proceeding'' and inserting ''testimony''; and

(ii) by striking the fifth sentence; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) RECORDING.—If the adult attendant is in close physical proximity to or in contact with the child while the child testifies—

''(A) at a judicial proceeding, a video recording of the adult attendant shall be made and shall become part of the court record; or

''(B) in a manner described in subsection (b), the adult attendant shall be visible on the closed-circuit television or in the recorded deposition.

''(3) COVERED PERSONS ATTENDING PROCEEDING.—A covered person shall have the right to be accompanied by an adult attendant when attending any judicial proceeding.'';

(7) in subsection (j)—

(A) by striking ''child'' each place the term appears and inserting ''covered person''; and

(B) in the fourth sentence—

(i) by striking ''and the potential'' and inserting '', the potential'';

(ii) by striking ''child's'' and inserting ''covered person's''; and

(iii) by inserting before the period at the end the following: '', and the necessity of the continuance to protect the defendant's rights'';

(8) in subsection (k), by striking ''child'' each place the term appears and inserting ''covered person''; and

(9) in subsection (l), by striking ''child'' each place the term appears and inserting ''covered person''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to conduct that occurs before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 503. FACILITATING PAYMENT OF RESTITUTION; TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS TO RESTITUTION STATUTES.

Title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 1593(c)—

(A) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(c)'';

(B) by striking ''chapter, including, in'' and inserting the following: ''chapter.

''(2) In''; and

(C) in paragraph (2), as so designated, by inserting ''may assume the rights of the victim under this section'' after ''suitable by the court'';

(2) in section 2248(c)—

(A) by striking ''For purposes'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes'';

(B) by striking ''chapter, including, in'' and inserting the following: ''chapter.

''(2) ASSUMPTION OF CRIME VICTIM'S RIGHTS.—In''; and

(C) in paragraph (2), as so designated, by inserting ''may assume the rights of the victim under this section'' after ''suitable by the court'';

(3) in section 2259—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''DIRECTIONS.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the'' and inserting ''RESTITUTION FOR CHILD PORNOGRAPHY PRODUCTION.—If the defendant was convicted of child pornography production, the''; and

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''$3,000.'' and inserting the following: ''—

''(i) $3,000; or

''(ii) 10 percent of the full amount of the victim's losses, if the full amount of the victim's losses is less than $3,000.''; and

(B) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

''(1) CHILD PORNOGRAPHY PRODUCTION.—For purposes of this section and section 2259A, the term 'child pornography production' means—

''(A) a violation of subsection (a), (b), or (c) of section 2251, or an attempt or conspiracy to violate any of those subsections under subsection (e) of that section;

''(B) a violation of section 2251A;

''(C) a violation of section 2252(a)(4) or 2252A(a)(5), or an attempt or conspiracy to violate either of those sections under section 2252(b)(2) or 2252A(b)(2), to the extent such conduct involves child pornography—

''(i) produced by the defendant; or

''(ii) that the defendant attempted or conspired to produce;

''(D) a violation of section 2252A(g) if the series of felony violations involves not fewer than 1 violation—

''(i) described in subparagraph (A), (B), (E), or (F) of this paragraph;

''(ii) of section 1591; or

''(iii) of section 1201, chapter 109A, or chapter 117, if the victim is a minor;

''(E) a violation of subsection (a) of section 2260, or an attempt or conspiracy to violate that subsection under subsection (c)(1) of that section;

''(F) a violation of section 2260B(a)(2) for promoting or facilitating an offense—

''(i) described in subparagraph (A), (B), (D), or (E) of this paragraph; or

''(ii) under section 2422(b); and

''(G) a violation of chapter 109A or chapter 117, if the offense involves the production or attempted production of, or conspiracy to produce, child pornography.''; and

(ii) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) TRAFFICKING IN CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—For purposes of this section and section 2259A, the term 'trafficking in child pornography' means—

''(A) a violation of subsection (d) of section 2251 or an attempt or conspiracy to violate that subsection under subsection (e) of that section;

''(B) a violation of paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (a) of section 2252, or an attempt or conspiracy to violate any of those paragraphs under subsection (b)(1) of that section;

''(C) a violation of section 2252(a)(4) or 2252A(a)(5), or an attempt or conspiracy to violate either of those sections under section 2252(b)(2) or 2252A(b)(2), to the extent such conduct involves child pornography—

''(i) not produced by the defendant; or

''(ii) that the defendant did not attempt or conspire to produce;

''(D) a violation of paragraph (1), (2), (3), (4), or (6) of subsection (a) of section 2252A, or an attempt or conspiracy to violate any of those paragraphs under subsection (b)(1) of that section;

''(E) a violation of subsection (a)(7) of section 2252A, or an attempt or conspiracy to violate that subsection under subsection (b)(3) of that section;

''(F) a violation of section 2252A(g) if the series of felony violations exclusively involves violations described in this paragraph;

''(G) a violation of subsection (b) of section 2260, or an attempt or conspiracy to violate that subsection under subsection (c)(2) of that section; and

''(H) a violation of subsection (a)(1) of section 2260B, or a violation of subsection (a)(2) of that section for promoting or facilitating an offense described in this paragraph.'';

(4) in section 2259A(a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''under section 2252(a)(4) or 2252A(a)(5)'' and inserting ''described in section 2259(c)(3)(C)''; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking ''any other offense for trafficking in child pornography'' and inserting ''any offense for trafficking in child pornography other than an offense described in section 2259(c)(3)(C)'';

(5) in section 2429—

(A) in subsection (b)(3), by striking ''2259(b)(3)'' and inserting ''2259(c)(2)''; and

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) by inserting ''(1)'' after ''(d)'';

(ii) by striking ''chapter, including, in'' and inserting the following: ''chapter.

''(2) In''; and

(iii) in paragraph (2), as so designated, by inserting ''may assume the rights of the victim under this section'' after ''suitable by the court''; and

(6) in section 3664, by adding at the end the following:

''(q) TRUSTEE OR OTHER FIDUCIARY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—

''(A) APPOINTMENT OF TRUSTEE OR OTHER FIDUCIARY.—When the court issues an order of restitution under section 1593, 2248, 2259, 2429, or 3663, or subparagraphs (A)(i) and (B) of section 3663A(c)(1), for a victim described in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph, the court, at its own discretion or upon motion by the Government, may appoint a trustee or other fiduciary to hold any amount paid for restitution in a trust or other official account for the benefit of the victim.

''(B) COVERED VICTIMS.—A victim referred to in subparagraph (A) is a victim who is—

''(i) under the age of 18 at the time of the proceeding;

''(ii) incompetent or incapacitated; or

''(iii) subject to paragraph (3), a foreign citizen or stateless person residing outside the United States.

''(2) ORDER.—When the court appoints a trustee or other fiduciary under paragraph (1), the court shall issue an order specifying—

''(A) the duties of the trustee or other fiduciary, which shall require—

''(i) the administration of the trust or maintaining an official account in the best interests of the victim; and

''(ii) disbursing payments from the trust or account—

''(I) to the victim; or

''(II) to any individual or entity on behalf of the victim;

''(B) that the trustee or other fiduciary—

''(i) shall avoid any conflict of interest;

''(ii) may not profit from the administration of the trust or maintaining an official account for the benefit of the victim other than as specified in the order; and

''(iii) may not delegate administration of the trust or maintaining the official account to any other person;

''(C) if and when the trust or the duties of the other fiduciary will expire; and

''(D) the fees payable to the trustee or other fiduciary to cover expenses of administering the trust or maintaining the official account for the benefit of the victim, and the schedule for payment of those fees.

''(3) FACT-FINDING REGARDING FOREIGN CITIZENS AND STATELESS PERSON.—In the case of a victim who is a foreign citizen or stateless person residing outside the United States and is not under the age of 18 at the time of the proceeding or incompetent or incapacitated, the court may appoint a trustee or other fiduciary under paragraph (1) only if the court finds it necessary to—

''(A) protect the safety or security of the victim; or

''(B) provide a reliable means for the victim to access or benefit from the restitution payments.

''(4) PAYMENT OF FEES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The court may, with respect to the fees of the trustee or other fiduciary—

''(i) pay the fees in whole or in part; or

''(ii) order the defendant to pay the fees in whole or in part.

''(B) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—With respect to a court order under subparagraph (A)(ii) requiring a defendant to pay fees—

''(i) subsection (f)(3) shall apply to the court order in the same manner as that subsection applies to a restitution order;

''(ii) subchapter C of chapter 227 (other than section 3571) shall apply to the court order in the same manner as that subchapter applies to a sentence of a fine; and

''(iii) subchapter B of chapter 229 shall apply to the court order in the same manner as that subchapter applies to the implementation of a sentence of a fine.

''(C) EFFECT ON OTHER PENALTIES.—Imposition of payment under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall not relieve a defendant of, or entitle a defendant to a reduction in the amount of, any special assessment, restitution, other fines, penalties, or costs, or other payments required under the defendant's sentence.

''(D) SCHEDULE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if the court orders the defendant to make any payment under subparagraph (A)(ii), the court may provide a payment schedule that is concurrent with the payment of any other financial obligation described in subparagraph (C).

''(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the United States courts to carry out this subsection $15,000,000 for each fiscal year.

''(B) SUPERVISION OF PAYMENTS.—Payments from appropriations authorized under subparagraph (A) shall be made under the supervision of the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts.''.

SEC. 504. CYBERTIPLINE IMPROVEMENTS, AND ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY BY THE TECH INDUSTRY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2258A—

(A) by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following:

''(a) DUTY TO REPORT.—

''(1) DUTY.—In order to reduce the proliferation of online child exploitation and to prevent the online sexual exploitation of children, as soon as reasonably possible after obtaining actual knowledge of any facts or circumstances described in paragraph (2) or any apparent child pornography on the provider's service, and in any event not later than 60 days after obtaining such knowledge, a provider shall submit to the CyberTipline of NCMEC, or any successor to the CyberTipline operated by NCMEC, a report containing—

''(A) the mailing address, telephone number, facsimile number, electronic mailing address of, and individual point of contact for, such provider; and

''(B) information described in subsection (b) concerning such facts or circumstances or apparent child pornography.

''(2) FACTS OR CIRCUMSTANCES.—The facts or circumstances described in this paragraph are any facts or circumstances indicating an apparent, planned, or imminent violation of section 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, 2252B, or 2260.

''(3) PERMITTED ACTIONS BASED ON REASONABLE BELIEF.—In order to reduce the proliferation of online child exploitation and to prevent the online sexual exploitation of children, if a provider has a reasonable belief that any facts or circumstances described in paragraph (2) exist, the provider may submit to the CyberTipline of NCMEC, or any successor to the CyberTipline operated by NCMEC, a report described in paragraph (1).

''(b) CONTENTS OF REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In an effort to prevent the future sexual victimization of children, and to the extent the information is within the custody or control of a provider, each report provided under paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a)—

''(A) shall include, to the extent that it is applicable and reasonably available—

''(i) identifying information regarding any individual who is the subject of the report, including name, address, electronic mail address, user or account identification, Internet Protocol address, and uniform resource locator;

''(ii) the terms of service in effect at the time of—

''(I) the apparent violation; or

''(II) the detection of apparent child pornography or a planned or imminent violation;

''(iii) a copy of any apparent child pornography that is the subject of the report that was identified in a publicly available location;

''(iv) for each item of apparent child pornography included in the report under clause (iii) or paragraph (2)(C), information indicating whether—

''(I) the apparent child pornography was publicly available; or

''(II) the provider, in its sole discretion, viewed the apparent child pornography, or any copy thereof, at any point concurrent with or prior to the submission of the report; and

''(v) for each item of apparent child pornography that is the subject of the report, an indication as to whether the apparent child pornography—

''(I) has previously been the subject of a report under paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a); or

''(II) is the subject of multiple contemporaneous reports due to rapid and widespread distribution; and

''(B) may, at the sole discretion of the provider, include the information described in paragraph (2) of this subsection.

''(2) OTHER INFORMATION.—The information referred to in paragraph (1)(B) is the following:

''(A) HISTORICAL REFERENCE.—Information relating to when and how a customer or subscriber of a provider uploaded, transmitted, or received content relating to the report or when and how content relating to the report was reported to, or discovered by the provider, including a date and time stamp and time zone.

''(B) GEOGRAPHIC LOCATION INFORMATION.—Information relating to the geographic location of the involved individual or website, which may include the Internet Protocol address or verified address, or, if not reasonably available, at least one form of geographic identifying information, including area code or zip code, provided by the customer or subscriber, or stored or obtained by the provider.

''(C) APPARENT CHILD PORNOGRAPHY.—Any apparent child pornography not described in paragraph (1)(A)(iii), or other content related to the subject of the report.

''(D) COMPLETE COMMUNICATION.—The complete communication containing any apparent child pornography or other content, including—

''(i) any data or information regarding the transmission of the communication; and

''(ii) any visual depictions, data, or other digital files contained in, or attached to, the communication.

''(E) TECHNICAL IDENTIFIER.—An industry-standard hash value or other similar industry-standard technical identifier for any reported visual depiction as it existed on the provider's service.

''(F) DESCRIPTION.—For any item of apparent child pornography that is the subject of the report, an indication of whether—

''(i) the depicted sexually explicit conduct involves—

''(I) genital, oral, or anal sexual intercourse;

''(II) bestiality;

''(III) masturbation;

''(IV) sadistic or masochistic abuse; or

''(V) lascivious exhibition of the anus, genitals, or pubic area of any person; and

''(ii) the depicted minor is—

''(I) an infant or toddler;

''(II) prepubescent;

''(III) pubescent;

''(IV) post-pubescent; or

''(V) of an indeterminate age or developmental stage.'';

''(c) FORWARDING OF REPORT AND OTHER INFORMATION TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to its clearinghouse role as a private, nonprofit organization, and at the conclusion of its review in furtherance of its nonprofit mission, NCMEC shall make available each report submitted under paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a) to one or more of the following law enforcement agencies:

''(A) Any Federal law enforcement agency that is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes.

''(B) Any State or local law enforcement agency that is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation.

''(C) A foreign law enforcement agency designated by the Attorney General under subsection (d)(3) or a foreign law enforcement agency that has an established relationship with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Immigration and Customs Enforcement, or INTERPOL, and is involved in the investigation of child sexual exploitation, kidnapping, or enticement crimes.

''(2) TECHNICAL IDENTIFIERS.—If a report submitted under paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a) contains an industry-standard hash value or other similar industry-standard technical identifier—

''(A) NCMEC may compare that hash value or identifier with any database or repository of visual depictions owned or operated by NCMEC; and

''(B) if the comparison under subparagraph (A) results in a match, NCMEC may include the matching visual depiction from its database or repository when forwarding the report to an agency described in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1).'';

(B) in subsection (d)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by striking ''subsection (c)(1)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(1)(A)''; and

(ii) in paragraph (3)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''subsection (c)(3)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(1)(C)''; and

(II) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''subsection (c)(3)'' and inserting ''subsection (c)(1)(C)'';

(C) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

''(e) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) CRIMINAL PENALTY.—

''(A) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for a provider to knowingly—

''(i) fail to submit a report under subsection (a)(1) within the time period required by that subsection; or

''(ii) fail to preserve material as required under subsection (h).

''(B) PENALTY.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—A provider that violates subparagraph (A) shall be fined—

''(I) in the case of an initial violation, not more than $150,000; and

''(II) in the case of any second or subsequent violation, not more than $300,000.

''(ii) HARM TO INDIVIDUALS.—The maximum fine under clause (i) shall be tripled if an individual is harmed as a direct and proximate result of the applicable violation.

''(2) CIVIL PENALTY.—

''(A) VIOLATIONS RELATING TO CYBERTIPLINE REPORTS AND MATERIAL PRESERVATION.—A provider shall be liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty in an amount of not less than $50,000 and not more than $100,000 if the provider knowingly—

''(i) fails to submit a report under subsection (a)(1) within the time period required by that subsection;

''(ii) fails to preserve material as required under subsection (h); or

''(iii) submits a report under paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a) that—

''(I) contains materially false or fraudulent information; or

''(II) omits information described in subsection (b)(1)(A) that is reasonably available.

''(B) ANNUAL REPORT VIOLATIONS.—A provider shall be liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty in an amount of not less than $100,000 and not more than $1,000,000 if the provider knowingly—

''(i) fails to submit an annual report as required under subsection (i); or

''(ii) submits an annual report under subsection (i) that—

''(I) contains a materially false, fraudulent, or misleading statement; or

''(II) omits information described in subsection (i)(1) that is reasonably available.

''(C) HARM TO INDIVIDUALS.—The amount of a civil penalty under subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be tripled if an individual is harmed as a direct and proximate result of the applicable violation.

''(D) COSTS OF CIVIL ACTIONS.—A provider that commits a violation described in subparagraph (A) or (B) shall be liable to the United States Government for the costs of a civil action brought to recover a civil penalty under that subparagraph.

''(E) ENFORCEMENT.—This paragraph shall be enforced in accordance with sections 3731, 3732, and 3733 of title 31, except that a civil action to recover a civil penalty under subparagraph (A) or (B) of this paragraph may only be brought by the United States Government.

''(3) DEPOSIT OF FINES AND PENALTIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any criminal fine or civil penalty collected under this subsection shall be deposited into the Child Pornography Victims Reserve as provided in section 2259B.'';

(D) in subsection (f), by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) affirmatively search, screen, or scan for—

''(A) facts or circumstances described in subsection (a)(2);

''(B) information described in subsection (b)(2); or

''(C) any apparent child pornography.'';

(E) in subsection (g)—

(i) in paragraph (2)(A)—

(I) in clause (iii), by inserting ''or personnel at a children's advocacy center'' after ''State)''; and

(II) in clause (iv), by striking ''State or subdivision of a State'' and inserting ''State, subdivision of a State, or children's advocacy center'';

(ii) in paragraph (3), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by inserting ''paragraph (1) or (3) of'' before ''subsection (a)''; and

(iii) in paragraph (4), by striking ''subsection (a)(1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a)'';

(F) in subsection (h)—

(i) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (a)(1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a)''; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

''(5) RELATION TO REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Submission of a report as described in paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a) does

not satisfy the obligations under this subsection.''; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) ANNUAL REPORT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than March 31 of the second year beginning after the date of enactment of the STOP CSAM Act of 2024, and of each year thereafter, a provider that had more than 1,000,000 unique monthly visitors or users during each month of the preceding year and accrued revenue of more than $50,000,000 during the preceding year shall submit to the Attorney General and the Chair of the Federal Trade Commission a report, disaggregated by subsidiary, that provides the following information for the preceding year to the extent such information is applicable and reasonably available:

''(A) CYBERTIPLINE DATA.—

''(i) The total number of reports that the provider submitted under paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a).

''(ii) Which items of information described in subsection (b)(2) are routinely included in the reports submitted by the provider under paragraph (1) or (3) of subsection (a).

''(B) REPORT AND REMOVE DATA.—With respect to section 506 of the STOP CSAM Act of 2024—

''(i) a description of the provider's designated reporting system;

''(ii) the number of complete notifications received;

''(iii) the number of proscribed visual depictions involving a minor that were removed; and

''(iv) the total amount of any fine ordered and paid.

''(C) OTHER REPORTING TO THE PROVIDER.—

''(i) The measures the provider has in place to receive other reports concerning child sexual exploitation and abuse using the provider's product or on the provider's service.

''(ii) The average time for responding to reports described in clause (i).

''(iii) The number of reports described in clause (i) that the provider received.

''(iv) A summary description of the actions taken upon receipt of the reports described in clause (i).

''(D) POLICIES.—

''(i) A description of the policies of the provider with respect to the commission of child sexual exploitation and abuse using the provider's product or on the provider's service, including how child sexual exploitation and abuse is defined.

''(ii) A description of possible consequences for violations of the policies described in clause (i).

''(iii) The methods of informing users of the policies described in clause (i).

''(iv) The process for adjudicating potential violations of the policies described in clause (i).

''(E) CULTURE OF SAFETY.—

''(i) The measures and technologies that the provider deploys to protect children from sexual exploitation and abuse using the provider's product or service.

''(ii) The measures and technologies that the provider deploys to prevent the use of the provider's product or service by individuals seeking to commit child sexual exploitation and abuse.

''(iii) Factors that interfere with the provider's ability to detect or evaluate instances of child sexual exploitation and abuse.

''(iv) An assessment of the efficacy of the measures and technologies described in clauses (i) and (ii) and the impact of the factors described in clause (iii).

''(F) SAFETY BY DESIGN.—The measures that the provider takes before launching a new product or service to assess—

''(i) the safety risks for children with respect to sexual exploitation and abuse; and

''(ii) whether and how individuals could use the new product or service to commit child sexual exploitation and abuse.

''(G) TRENDS AND PATTERNS.—Any information concerning emerging trends and changing patterns with respect to the commission of online child sexual exploitation and abuse.

''(2) AVOIDING DUPLICATION.—Notwithstanding the requirement under the matter preceding paragraph (1) that information be submitted annually, in the case of any report submitted under that paragraph after the initial report, a provider shall submit information described in subparagraphs (D) through (G) of that paragraph not less frequently than once every 3 years or when new information is available, whichever is more frequent.

''(3) LIMITATION.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall require the disclosure of trade secrets or other proprietary information.

''(4) PUBLICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Attorney General and the Chair of the Federal Trade Commission shall publish the reports received under this subsection.

''(B) REDACTION.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General and Chair of the Federal Trade Commission shall redact from a report published under subparagraph (A) any information as necessary to avoid—

''(I) undermining the efficacy of a safety measure described in the report; or

''(II) revealing how a product or service of a provider may be used to commit online child sexual exploitation and abuse.

''(ii) ADDITIONAL REDACTION.—

''(I) REQUEST.—In addition to information redacted under clause (i), a provider may request the redaction, from a report published under subparagraph (A), of any information that is law enforcement sensitive or otherwise not suitable for public distribution.

''(II) AGENCY DISCRETION.—The Attorney General and Chair of the Federal Trade Commission—

''(aa) shall consider a request made under subclause (I); and

''(bb) may, in their discretion, redact from a report published under subparagraph (A) any information that is law enforcement sensitive or otherwise not suitable for public distribution, whether or not requested.'';

(2) in section 2258B—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''may not be brought in any Federal or State court''; and

(ii) by striking ''Except as provided in subsection (b), a civil claim or criminal charge'' and inserting the following:

''(1) LIMITED LIABILITY.—Except as provided in subsection (b), a civil claim or criminal charge described in paragraph (2) may not be brought in any Federal or State court.

''(2) COVERED CLAIMS AND CHARGES.—A civil claim or criminal charge referred to in paragraph (1) is a civil claim or criminal charge''; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting ''or knowingly failed to comply with a requirement under section 2258A'' after ''misconduct'';

(3) in section 2258C—

(A) in subsection (a)(1), by inserting ''use of the provider's products or services to commit'' after ''stop the'';

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking ''Any provider'' and inserting the following:

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Any provider'';

(ii) in paragraph (1), as so designated, by striking ''receives'' and inserting '', in its sole discretion, obtains''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) LIMITATION ON SHARING WITH OTHER ENTITIES.—A provider that obtains elements under subsection (a)(1) may not distribute those elements, or make those elements available, to any other entity, except for the sole and exclusive purpose of stopping the online sexual exploitation of children.''; and

(C) in subsection (c)—

(i) by striking ''subsections'' and inserting ''subsection'';

(ii) by striking ''providers receiving'' and inserting ''a provider to obtain'';

(iii) by inserting '', or'' after ''NCMEC''; and

(iv) by inserting ''use of the provider's products or services to commit'' after ''stop the'';

(4) in section 2258E—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking ''electronic communication service provider'' and inserting ''electronic communication service'';

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(C) in paragraph (8), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(9) the term 'publicly available', with respect to a visual depiction on a provider's service, means the visual depiction can be viewed by or is accessible to all users of the service, regardless of the steps, if any, a user must take to create an account or to gain access to the service in order to access or view the visual depiction.'';

(5) in section 2259B(a), by inserting '', any fine or penalty collected under section 2258A(e) or subparagraph (A) of section 506(g)(24) of the STOP CSAM Act of 2024 (except as provided in clauses (i) and (ii)(I) of subparagraph (B) of such section 506(g)(24)),'' after ''2259A''; and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

''§ 2260B. Liability for certain child exploitation offenses

''(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for a provider of an interactive computer service, as that term is defined in section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230), that operates through the use of any facility or means of interstate or foreign commerce or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, through such service to knowingly—

''(1) host or store child pornography or make child pornography available to any person; or

''(2) otherwise knowingly promote or facilitate a violation of section 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, or 2422(b).

''(b) PENALTY.—A provider of an interactive computer service that violates subsection (a)—

''(1) subject to paragraph (2), shall be fined not more than $1,000,000; and

''(2) if the offense involves a conscious or reckless risk of serious personal injury or an individual is harmed as a direct and proximate result of the violation, shall be fined not more than $5,000,000.

''(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

''(1) APPLICABILITY TO LEGAL PROCESS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to any action by a provider of an interactive computer service that is necessary to comply with a valid court order, subpoena, search warrant, statutory obligation, or preservation request from law enforcement.

''(2) KNOWLEDGE WITH RESPECT TO EACH ITEM REQUIRED.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1), the term 'knowingly' shall be construed to mean knowledge of each item of child pornography that the provider hosted, stored, or made available.

''(d) DEFENSE.—In a prosecution under subsection (a)(1), it shall be a defense, which the provider must establish by a preponderance of the evidence, that—

''(1) the provider disabled access to or removed the child pornography as soon as possible, and in any event not later than 48

hours after obtaining knowledge that the child pornography was being hosted, stored, or made available by the provider (or, in the case of a provider that, for the most recent calendar year, averaged fewer than 10,000,000 active users on a monthly basis in the United States, as soon as possible, and in any event not later than 2 business days after obtaining such knowledge); or

''(2) the provider—

''(A) exercised its best effort to disable access to or remove the child pornography but was unable to do so for reasons outside the provider's control; and

''(B) determined it is technologically impossible for the provider to disable access to or remove the child pornography.''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 110 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''2260B. Liability for certain child exploitation offenses.''.

SEC. 505. EXPANDING CIVIL REMEDIES FOR VICTIMS OF ONLINE CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION.

Section 2255 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''a violation of section 1589, 1590, 1591, 2241(c), 2242, 2243, 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, 2260, 2421, 2422, or 2423 of this title'' and inserting ''a child exploitation violation or conduct relating to child exploitation'';

(B) by inserting ''or conduct'' after ''as a result of such violation''; and

(C) by striking ''sue in any'' and inserting ''bring a civil action in the''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

''(1) the term 'child exploitation violation' means a violation of section 1589, 1590, 1591, 1594(a) (involving a violation of section 1589, 1590, or 1591), 1594(b) (involving a violation of section 1589 or 1590), 1594(c), 2241, 2242, 2243, 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, 2260, 2421, 2422, or 2423 of this title;

''(2) the term 'conduct relating to child exploitation' means—

''(A) with respect to a provider of an interactive computer service or a software distribution service operating through the use of any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce, or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, the intentional, knowing, or reckless promotion or facilitation of a violation of section 1591, 1594(c), 2251, 2251A, 2252, 2252A, or 2422(b) of this title; and

''(B) with respect to a provider of an interactive computer service operating through the use of any means or facility of interstate or foreign commerce, or in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, the intentional, knowing, or reckless hosting or storing of child pornography or making child pornography available to any person;

''(3) the term 'interactive computer service' has the meaning given that term in section 230(f) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230(f)); and

''(4) the term 'software distribution service' means an online service, whether or not operated for pecuniary gain, from which individuals can purchase, obtain, or download software that—

''(A) can be used by an individual to communicate with another individual, by any means, to store, access, distribute, or receive any visual depiction, or to transmit any live visual depiction; and

''(B) was not developed by the online service.

''(e) RELATION TO SECTION 230 OF THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934.—Nothing in section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230) shall be construed to impair or limit any claim brought under this section for conduct relating to child exploitation.

''(f) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

''(1) APPLICABILITY TO LEGAL PROCESS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to any action by a provider of an interactive computer service that is necessary to comply with a valid court order, subpoena, search warrant, statutory obligation, or preservation request from law enforcement.

''(2) KNOWLEDGE WITH RESPECT TO EACH ITEM REQUIRED.—For purposes of conduct relating to child exploitation described in subsection (d)(2)(B), the term 'knowing' shall be construed to mean knowledge of each item of child pornography that the provider hosted, stored, or made available.

''(g) ENCRYPTION TECHNOLOGIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), none of the following actions or circumstances shall serve as an independent basis for liability of a provider of an interactive computer service for conduct relating to child exploitation:

''(A) The provider utilizes full end-to-end encrypted messaging services, device encryption, or other encryption services.

''(B) The provider does not possess the information necessary to decrypt a communication.

''(C) The provider fails to take an action that would otherwise undermine the ability of the provider to offer full end-to-end encrypted messaging services, device encryption, or other encryption services.

''(2) CONSIDERATION OF EVIDENCE.—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to prohibit a court from considering evidence of actions or circumstances described in that paragraph if the evidence is otherwise admissible.

''(h) DEFENSE.—In a claim under subsection (a) involving knowing conduct relating to child exploitation described in subsection (d)(2)(B), it shall be a defense, which the provider must establish by a preponderance of the evidence, that—

''(1) the provider disabled access to or removed the child pornography as soon as possible, and in any event not later than 48 hours after obtaining knowledge that the child pornography was being hosted, stored, or made available by the provider (or, in the case of a provider that, for the most recent calendar year, averaged fewer than 10,000,000 active users on a monthly basis in the United States, as soon as possible, and in any event not later than 2 business days after obtaining such knowledge); or

''(2) the provider—

''(A) exercised its best effort to disable access to or remove the child pornography but was unable to do so for reasons outside the provider's control; and

''(B) determined it is technologically impossible for the provider to disable access to or remove the child pornography.''.

SEC. 506. REPORTING AND REMOVAL OF PROSCRIBED VISUAL DEPICTIONS RELATING TO CHILDREN; ESTABLISHMENT OF CHILD ONLINE PROTECTION BOARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) Over 40 years ago, the Supreme Court of the United States ruled in New York v. Ferber, 458 U.S. 747 (1982), that child sexual abuse material (referred to in this subsection as ''CSAM'') is a ''category of material outside the protections of the First Amendment''. The Court emphasized that children depicted in CSAM are harmed twice: first through the abuse and exploitation inherent in the creation of the materials, and then through the continued circulation of the imagery, which inflicts its own emotional and psychological injury.

(2) The Supreme Court reiterated this point 9 years ago in Paroline v. United States, 572 U.S. 434 (2014), when it explained that CSAM victims suffer ''continuing and grievous harm as a result of [their] knowledge that a large, indeterminate number of individuals have viewed and will in the future view images of the sexual abuse [they] endured''.

(3) In these decisions, the Supreme Court noted that the distribution of CSAM invades the privacy interests of the victims.

(4) The co-mingling online of CSAM with other, non-explicit depictions of the victims links the victim's identity with the images of their abuse. This further invades a victim's privacy and disrupts their sense of security, thwarting what the Supreme Court has described as ''the individual interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters''.

(5) The internet is awash with child sexual abuse material. In 2021, the CyberTipline, operated by the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children to combat online child sexual exploitation, received reports about 39,900,000 images and 44,800,000 videos depicting child sexual abuse.

(6) Since 2017, Project Arachnid, operated by the Canadian Centre for Child Protection, has sent over 26,000,000 notices to online providers about CSAM and other exploitive material found on their platforms. According to the Canadian Centre, some providers are slow to remove the material, or take it down only for it to be reposted again a short time later.

(7) This legislation is needed to create an easy-to-use and effective procedure to get CSAM and harmful related imagery quickly taken offline and kept offline to protect children, stop the spread of illegal and harmful content, and thwart the continued invasion of the victims' privacy.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Child Online Protection Board established under subsection (d), shall begin operations, at which point providers shall begin receiving notifications as set forth in subsection (c)(2).

(2) EXTENSION.—The Commission may extend the deadline under paragraph (1) by not more than 180 days if the Commission provides notice of the extension to the public and to Congress.

(3) PUBLIC NOTICE.—The Commission shall provide notice to the public of the date that the Child Online Protection Board established under subsection (d) is scheduled to begin operations on—

(A) the date that is 60 days before such date that the Board is scheduled to begin operations; and

(B) the date that is 30 days before such date that the Board is scheduled to begin operations.

(c) REPORTING AND REMOVAL OF PROSCRIBED VISUAL DEPICTIONS RELATING TO CHILDREN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a provider receives a complete notification as set forth in paragraph (2)(A) that the provider is hosting a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child, as soon as possible, but in any event not later than 48 hours after such notification is received by the provider (or, in the case of a small provider, not later than 2 business days after such notification is received by the small provider), the provider shall—

(A)(i) remove the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child; and

(ii) notify the complainant that it has done so; or

(B) notify the complainant that the provider—

(i) has determined that visual depiction referenced in the notification does not constitute a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child;

(ii) is unable to remove the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child using reasonable means; or

(iii) has determined that the notification is duplicative under paragraph (2)(C)(i).

(2) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To be complete under this subsection, a notification must be a written communication to the designated reporting system of the provider (or, if the provider does not have a designated reporting system, a written communication that is served on the provider in accordance with subparagraph (F)) that includes the following:

(i) An identification of, and information reasonably sufficient to permit the provider to locate, the alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child. Such information may include, at the option of the complainant, a copy of the alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child or the uniform resource locator where such alleged proscribed visual depiction is located.

(ii) The complainant's name and contact information, to include a mailing address, telephone number, and an electronic mail address, except that, if the complainant is the victim depicted in the alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child, the complainant may elect to use an alias, including for purposes of the signed statement described in clause (v), and omit a mailing address.

(iii) If applicable, a statement indicating that the complainant has previously notified the provider about the alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child which may, at the option of the complainant, include a copy of the previous notification.

(iv) A statement indicating that the complainant has a good faith belief that the information in the notification is accurate.

(v) A signed statement under penalty of perjury indicating that the notification is submitted by—

(I) the victim depicted in the alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child;

(II) an authorized representative of the victim depicted in the alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child; or

(III) a qualified organization.

(B) INCLUSION OF MULTIPLE VISUAL DEPICTIONS IN SAME NOTIFICATION.—A notification may contain information about more than one alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child, but shall only be effective with respect to each alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child included in the notification to the extent that the notification includes sufficient information to identify and locate such visual depiction.

(C) LIMITATION ON DUPLICATIVE NOTIFICATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—After a complainant has submitted a notification to a provider, the complainant may submit additional notifications at any time only if the subsequent notifications involve—

(I) a different alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a minor;

(II) the same alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a minor that is in a different location; or

(III) recidivist hosting.

(ii) NO OBLIGATION.—A provider who receives any additional notifications that do not comply with clause (i) shall not be required to take any additional action except—

(I) as may be required with respect to the original notification; and

(II) to notify the complainant as provided in paragraph (1)(B)(iii).

(D) INCOMPLETE OR MISDIRECTED NOTIFICATION.—

(i) REQUIREMENT TO CONTACT COMPLAINANT REGARDING INSUFFICIENT INFORMATION.—

(I) REQUIREMENT TO CONTACT COMPLAINANT.—If a notification that is submitted to a provider under this subsection does not contain sufficient information under subparagraph (A)(i) to identify or locate the visual depiction that is the subject of the notification but does contain the complainant contact information described in subparagraph (A)(ii), the provider shall, not later than 48 hours after receiving the notification (or, in the case of a small provider, not later than 2 business days after such notification is received by the small provider), contact the complainant via electronic mail address to obtain such information.

(II) EFFECT OF COMPLAINANT PROVIDING SUFFICIENT INFORMATION.—If the provider is able to contact the complainant and obtain sufficient information to identify or locate the visual depiction that is the subject of the notification, the provider shall then proceed as set forth in paragraph (1), except that the applicable timeframes described in such paragraph shall commence on the day the provider receives the information needed to identify or locate the visual depiction.

(III) EFFECT OF COMPLAINANT INABILITY TO PROVIDE SUFFICIENT INFORMATION.—If the provider is able to contact the complainant but does not obtain sufficient information to identify or locate the visual depiction that is the subject of the notification, the provider shall so notify the complainant not later than 48 hours after the provider determines that it is unable to identify or locate the visual depiction (or, in the case of a small provider, not later than 2 business days after the small provider makes such determination), after which no further action by the provider is required and receipt of the notification shall not be considered in determining whether the provider has actual knowledge of any information described in the notification.

(IV) EFFECT OF COMPLAINANT FAILURE TO RESPOND.—If the complainant does not respond to the provider's attempt to contact the complainant under this clause within 14 days of such attempt, no further action by the provider is required and receipt of the notification shall not be considered in determining whether the provider has actual knowledge of any information described in the notification.

(ii) TREATMENT OF INCOMPLETE NOTIFICATION WHERE COMPLAINANT CANNOT BE CONTACTED.—If a notification that is submitted to a provider under this subsection does not contain sufficient information under subparagraph (A)(i) to identify or locate the visual depiction that is the subject of the notification and does not contain the complainant contact information described in subparagraph (A)(ii) (or if the provider is unable to contact the complainant using such information), no further action by the provider is required and receipt of the notification shall not be considered in determining whether the provider has actual knowledge of any information described in the notification.

(iii) TREATMENT OF NOTIFICATION NOT SUBMITTED TO DESIGNATED REPORTING SYSTEM.—If a provider has a designated reporting system, and a complainant submits a notification under this subsection to the provider without using such system, the provider shall not be considered to have received the notification.

(E) OPTION TO CONTACT COMPLAINANT REGARDING THE PROSCRIBED VISUAL DEPICTION INVOLVING A MINOR.—

(i) CONTACT WITH COMPLAINANT.—If the provider believes that the proscribed visual depiction involving a minor referenced in the notification does not meet the definition of such term as provided in subsection (r)(10), the provider may, not later than 48 hours after receiving the notification (or, in the case of a small provider, not later than 2 business days after such notification is received by the small provider), contact the complainant via electronic mail address to so indicate.

(ii) FAILURE TO RESPOND.—If the complainant does not respond to the provider within 14 days after receiving the notification, no further action by the provider is required and receipt of the notification shall not be considered in determining whether the provider has actual knowledge of any information described in the notification.

(iii) COMPLAINANT RESPONSE.—If the complainant responds to the provider within 14 days after receiving the notification, the provider shall then proceed as set forth in paragraph (1), except that the applicable timeframes described in such paragraph shall commence on the day the provider receives the complainant's response.

(F) SERVICE OF NOTIFICATION WHERE PROVIDER HAS NO DESIGNATED REPORTING SYSTEM; PROCESS WHERE COMPLAINANT CANNOT SERVE PROVIDER.—

(i) NO DESIGNATED REPORTING SYSTEM.—If a provider does not have a designated reporting system, a complainant may serve the provider with a notification under this subsection to the provider in the same manner that petitions are required to be served under subsection (g)(4).

(ii) COMPLAINANT CANNOT SERVE PROVIDER.—If a provider does not have a designated reporting system and a complainant cannot reasonably serve the provider with a notification as described in clause (i), the complainant may bring a petition under subsection (g)(1) without serving the provider with the notification.

(G) RECIDIVIST HOSTING.—If a provider engages in recidivist hosting of a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child, in addition to any action taken under this section, a complainant may submit a report concerning such recidivist hosting to the CyberTipline operated by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, or any successor to the CyberTipline operated by the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

(H) PRESERVATION.—A provider that receives a complete notification under this subsection shall preserve the information in such notification in accordance with the requirements of sections 2713 and 2258A(h) of title 18, United States Code. For purposes of this subparagraph, the period for which providers shall be required to preserve information in accordance with such section 2258A(h) may be extended in 90-day increments on written request by the complainant or order of the Board.

(I) NON-DISCLOSURE.—Except as otherwise provided in subsection (g)(19)(C), for 120 days following receipt of a notification under this subsection, a provider may not disclose the existence of the notification to any person or entity except to an attorney for purposes of obtaining legal advice, the Board, the Commission, a law enforcement agency described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of section 2258A(g)(3) of title 18, United States Code, the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, or as necessary to respond to legal process. Nothing in the preceding sentence shall be construed to infringe on the provider's ability to communicate general information about terms of service violations.

(d) ESTABLISHMENT OF CHILD ONLINE PROTECTION BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the Federal Trade Commission a Child Online Protection Board, which shall administer and enforce the requirements of subsection (e) in accordance with this section.

(2) OFFICERS AND STAFF.—The Board shall be composed of 3 full-time Child Online Protection Officers who shall be appointed by the Commission in accordance with paragraph (5)(A). A vacancy on the Board shall not impair the right of the remaining Child Online Protection Officers to exercise the functions and duties of the Board.

(3) CHILD ONLINE PROTECTION ATTORNEYS.—Not fewer than 2 full-time Child Online Protection Attorneys shall be hired to assist in the administration of the Board.

(4) TECHNOLOGICAL ADVISER.—One or more technological advisers may be hired to assist with the handling of digital evidence and consult with the Child Online Protection Officers on matters concerning digital evidence and technological issues.

(5) QUALIFICATIONS.—

(A) OFFICERS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Each Child Online Protection Officer shall be an attorney duly licensed in at least 1 United States jurisdiction who has not fewer than 7 years of legal experience concerning child sexual abuse material and technology-facilitated crimes against children.

(ii) EXPERIENCE.—Two of the Child Online Protection Officers shall have substantial experience in the evaluation, litigation, or adjudication of matters relating to child sexual abuse material or technology-facilitated crimes against children.

(B) ATTORNEYS.—Each Child Online Protection Attorney shall be an attorney duly licensed in at least 1 United States jurisdiction who has not fewer than 3 years of substantial legal experience concerning child sexual abuse material and technology-facilitated crimes against children.

(C) TECHNOLOGICAL ADVISER.—A technological adviser shall have at least one year of specialized experience with digital forensic analysis.

(6) COMPENSATION.—

(A) CHILD ONLINE PROTECTION OFFICERS.—

(i) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term ''senior level employee of the Federal Government'' means an employee, other than an employee in the Senior Executive Service, the position of whom is classified above GS–15 of the General Schedule.

(ii) PAY RANGE.—Each Child Online Protection Officer shall be compensated at a rate of pay that is not less than the minimum, and not more than the maximum, rate of pay payable for senior level employees of the Federal Government, including locality pay, as applicable.

(B) CHILD ONLINE PROTECTION ATTORNEYS.—Each Child Online Protection Attorney shall be compensated at a rate of pay that is not more than the maximum rate of pay payable for level 10 of GS–15 of the General Schedule, including locality pay, as applicable.

(C) TECHNOLOGICAL ADVISER.—A technological adviser of the Board shall be compensated at a rate of pay that is not more than the maximum rate of pay payable for level 10 of GS–14 of the General Schedule, including locality pay, as applicable.

(7) VACANCY.—If a vacancy occurs in the position of Child Online Protection Officer, the Commission shall act expeditiously to appoint an Officer for that position.

(8) SANCTION OR REMOVAL.—Subject to subsection (e)(2), the Chair of the Commission or the Commission may sanction or remove a Child Online Protection Officer.

(9) ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT.—The Commission shall provide the Child Online Protection Officers and Child Online Protection Attorneys with necessary administrative support, including technological facilities, to carry out the duties of the Officers and Attorneys under this section. The Department of Justice may provide equipment and guidance on the storage and handling of proscribed visual depictions relating to children.

(10) LOCATION OF BOARD.—The offices and facilities of the Child Online Protection Officers and Child Online Protection Attorneys shall be located at the headquarters or other office of the Commission.

(e) AUTHORITY AND DUTIES OF THE BOARD.—

(1) FUNCTIONS.—

(A) OFFICERS.—Subject to the provisions of this section and applicable regulations, the functions of the Officers of the Board shall be as follows:

(i) To render determinations on petitions that may be brought before the Officers under this section.

(ii) To ensure that petitions and responses are properly asserted and otherwise appropriate for resolution by the Board.

(iii) To manage the proceedings before the Officers and render determinations pertaining to the consideration of petitions and responses, including with respect to scheduling, discovery, evidentiary, and other matters.

(iv) To request, from participants and nonparticipants in a proceeding, the production of information and documents relevant to the resolution of a petition or response.

(v) To conduct hearings and conferences.

(vi) To facilitate the settlement by the parties of petitions and responses.

(vii) To impose fines as set forth in subsection (g)(24).

(viii) To provide information to the public concerning the procedures and requirements of the Board.

(ix) To maintain records of the proceedings before the Officers, certify official records of such proceedings as needed, and, as provided in subsection (g)(19)(A), make the records in such proceedings available to the public.

(x) To carry out such other duties as are set forth in this section.

(xi) When not engaged in performing the duties of the Officers set forth in this section, to perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Chair of the Commission or the Commission.

(B) ATTORNEYS.—Subject to the provisions of this section and applicable regulations, the functions of the Attorneys of the Board shall be as follows:

(i) To provide assistance to the Officers of the Board in the administration of the duties of those Officers under this section.

(ii) To provide assistance to complainants, providers, and members of the public with respect to the procedures and requirements of the Board.

(iii) When not engaged in performing the duties of the Attorneys set forth in this section, to perform such other duties as may be assigned by the Commission.

(C) DESIGNATED SERVICE AGENTS.—The Board may maintain a publicly available directory of service agents designated to receive service of petitions filed with the Board.

(2) INDEPENDENCE IN DETERMINATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall render the determinations of the Board in individual proceedings independently on the basis of the records in the proceedings before it and in accordance with the provisions of this section, judicial precedent, and applicable regulations of the Commission.

(B) PERFORMANCE APPRAISALS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law or any regulation or policy of the Commission, any performance appraisal of an Officer or Attorney of the Board may not consider the substantive result of any individual determination reached by the Board as a basis for appraisal except to the extent that result may relate to any actual or alleged violation of an ethical standard of conduct.

(3) DIRECTION BY COMMISSION.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Officers and Attorneys shall, in the administration of their duties, be under the supervision of the Chair of the Commission.

(4) INCONSISTENT DUTIES BARRED.—An Officer or Attorney of the Board may not undertake any duty that conflicts with the duties of the Officer or Attorney in connection with the Board, to include the obligation to render impartial determinations on petitions considered by the Board under this section.

(5) RECUSAL.—An Officer or Attorney of the Board shall recuse himself or herself from participation in any proceeding with respect to which the Officer or Attorney, as the case may be, has reason to believe that he or she has a conflict of interest.

(6) EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.—Except as may otherwise be permitted by applicable law, any party or interested owner involved in a proceeding before the Board shall refrain from ex parte communications with the Officers of the Board and the Commission relevant to the merits of such proceeding before the Board.

(7) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Actions of the Officers and the Commission under this section in connection with the rendering of any determination are subject to judicial review as provided under subsection (g)(28).

(f) CONDUCT OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE BOARD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Proceedings of the Board shall be conducted in accordance with this section and regulations established by the Commission under this section, in addition to relevant principles of law.

(2) RECORD.—The Board shall maintain records documenting the proceedings before the Board.

(3) CENTRALIZED PROCESS.—Proceedings before the Board shall—

(A) be conducted at the offices of the Board without the requirement of in-person appearances by parties or others;

(B) take place by means of written submissions, hearings, and conferences carried out through internet-based applications and other telecommunications facilities, except that, in cases in which physical or other nontestimonial evidence material to a proceeding cannot be furnished to the Board through available telecommunications facilities, the Board may make alternative arrangements for the submission of such evidence that do not prejudice any party or interested owner; and

(C) be conducted and concluded in an expeditious manner without causing undue prejudice to any party or interested owner.

(4) REPRESENTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A party or interested owner involved in a proceeding before the Board may be, but is not required to be, represented by—

(i) an attorney; or

(ii) a law student who is qualified under applicable law governing representation by law students of parties in legal proceedings and who provides such representation on a pro bono basis.

(B) REPRESENTATION OF VICTIMS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A petition involving a victim under the age of 16 at the time the petition is filed shall be filed by an authorized representative, qualified organization, or a person described in subparagraph (A).

(ii) NO REQUIREMENT FOR QUALIFIED ORGANIZATIONS TO HAVE CONTACT WITH, OR KNOWLEDGE OF, VICTIM.—A qualified organization may submit a notification to a provider or file a petition on behalf of a victim without regard to whether the qualified organization has contact with the victim or knows the identity, location, or contact information of the victim.

(g) PROCEDURES TO CONTEST A FAILURE TO REMOVE A PROSCRIBED VISUAL DEPICTION RELATING TO A CHILD OR A NOTIFICATION REPORTING A PROSCRIBED VISUAL DEPICTION RELATING TO A CHILD.—

(1) PROCEDURE TO CONTEST A FAILURE TO REMOVE.—

(A) COMPLAINANT PETITION.—A complainant may file a petition to the Board claiming that, as applicable—

(i) the complainant submitted a complete notification to a provider concerning a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child, and that—

(I) the provider—

(aa) did not remove the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child within the timeframe required under subsection (c)(1)(A)(i); or

(bb) incorrectly claimed that—

(AA) the visual depiction at issue could not be located or removed through reasonable means;

(BB) the notification was incomplete; or

(CC) the notification was duplicative under subsection (c)(2)(C)(i); and

(II) did not file a timely petition to contest the notification with the Board under paragraph (2); or

(ii) a provider is hosting a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child, does not have a designated reporting system, and the complainant was unable to serve a notification on the provider under this subsection despite reasonable efforts.

(B) ADDITIONAL CLAIM.—As applicable, a petition filed under subparagraph (A) may also claim that the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child at issue in the petition involves recidivist hosting.

(C) TIMEFRAME.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A petition under this paragraph shall be considered timely if it is filed within 30 days of the applicable start date, as defined under clause (ii).

(ii) APPLICABLE START DATE.—For purposes of clause (i), the term ''applicable start date'' means—

(I) in the case of a petition under subparagraph (A)(i) claiming that the visual depiction was not removed or that the provider made an incorrect claim relating to the visual depiction or notification, the day that the provider's option to file a petition has expired under paragraph (2)(B); and

(II) in the case of a petition under subparagraph (A)(ii) related to a notification that could not be served, the last day of the 2-week period that begins on the day on which the complainant first attempted to serve a notification on the provider involved.

(D) IDENTIFICATION OF VICTIM.—Any petition filed to the Board by the victim or an authorized representative of the victim shall include the victim's legal name. A petition filed to the Board by a qualified organization may, but is not required to, include the victim's legal name. Any petition containing the victim's legal name shall be filed under seal. The victim's legal name shall be redacted from any documents served on the provider and interested owner or made publicly available.

(E) FAILURE TO REMOVE VISUAL DEPICTIONS IN TIMELY MANNER.—A complainant may file a petition under subparagraph (A)(i) claiming that a visual depiction was not removed even if the visual depiction was removed prior to the petition being filed, so long as the petition claims that the visual depiction was not removed within the timeframe specified in subsection (c)(1).

(2) PROCEDURE TO CONTEST A NOTIFICATION.—

(A) PROVIDER PETITION.—If a provider receives a complete notification as described in subsection (c)(2) through its designated reporting system or in accordance with subsection (c)(2)(F)(i), the provider may file a petition to the Board claiming that the provider has a good faith belief that, as applicable—

(i) the visual depiction that is the subject of the notification does not constitute a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child;

(ii) the notification is frivolous or was submitted with an intent to harass the provider or any person;

(iii) the alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child cannot reasonably be located by the provider;

(iv) for reasons beyond the control of the provider, the provider cannot remove the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child using reasonable means; or

(v) the notification was duplicative under subsection (c)(2)(C)(i).

(B) TIMEFRAME.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clauses (ii) and (iii), a petition contesting a notification under this paragraph shall be considered timely if it is filed by a provider not later than 14 days after the day on which the provider receives the notification or the notification is made complete under subsection (c)(2)(D)(i).

(ii) NO DESIGNATED REPORTING SYSTEM.—Subject to clause (iii), if a provider does not have a designated reporting system, a petition contesting a notification under this paragraph shall be considered timely if it is filed by a provider not later than 7 days after the day on which the provider receives the notification or the notification is made complete under subsection (c)(2)(D)(i).

(iii) SMALL PROVIDERS.—In the case of a small provider, each of the timeframes applicable under clauses (i) and (ii) shall be increased by 48 hours.

(3) COMMENCEMENT OF PROCEEDING.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In order to commence a proceeding under this section, a petitioning party shall, subject to such additional requirements as may be prescribed in regulations established by the Commission, file a petition with the Board, that includes a statement of claims and material facts in support of each claim in the petition. A petition may set forth more than one claim. A petition shall also include information establishing that it has been filed within the applicable timeframe.

(B) REVIEW OF PETITIONS BY CHILD ONLINE PROTECTION ATTORNEYS.—Child Online Protection Attorneys may review petitions to assess whether they are complete. The Board may permit a petitioning party to refile a defective petition. The Attorney may assist the petitioning party in making any corrections.

(C) DISMISSAL.—The Board may dismiss, with or without prejudice, any petition that fails to comply with subparagraph (A).

(4) SERVICE OF PROCESS REQUIREMENTS FOR PETITIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of petitions under paragraphs (1) and (2), the petitioning party shall, at or before the time of filing a petition, serve a copy on the other party. A corporation, partnership, or unincorporated association that is subject to suit in courts of general jurisdiction under a common name shall be served by delivering a copy of the petition to its service agent, if one has been so designated.

(B) MANNER OF SERVICE.—

(i) SERVICE BY NONDIGITAL MEANS.—Service by nondigital means may be any of the following:

(I) Personal, including delivery to a responsible person at the office of counsel.

(II) By priority mail.

(III) By third-party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 days.

(ii) SERVICE BY DIGITAL MEANS.—Service of a paper may be made by sending it by any digital means, including through a provider's designated reporting system.

(iii) WHEN SERVICE IS COMPLETED.—Service by mail or by commercial carrier is complete 3 days after the mailing or delivery to the carrier. Service by digital means is complete on filing or sending, unless the party making service is notified that the paper was not received by the party served.

(C) PROOF OF SERVICE.—A petition filed under paragraph (1) or (2) shall contain—

(i) an acknowledgment of service by the person served;

(ii) proof of service consisting of a statement by the person who made service certifying—

(I) the date and manner of service;

(II) the names of the persons served; and

(III) their mail or electronic addresses, facsimile numbers, or the addresses of the places of delivery, as appropriate for the manner of service; or

(iii) a statement indicating that service could not reasonably be completed.

(D) ATTORNEY FEES AND COSTS.—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, all parties to a petition shall bear their own attorney fees and costs.

(5) SERVICE OF OTHER DOCUMENTS.—Documents submitted or relied upon in a proceeding, other than the petition, shall be served in accordance with regulations established by the Commission.

(6) NOTIFICATION OF RIGHT TO OPT OUT.—In order to effectuate service on a responding party, the petition shall notify the responding party of their right to opt out of the proceeding before the Board, and the consequences of opting out and not opting out, including a prominent statement that by not opting out the respondent—

(A) loses the opportunity to have the dispute decided by a court created under article III of the Constitution of the United States; and

(B) waives the right to a jury trial regarding the dispute.

(7) INITIAL PROCEEDINGS.—

(A) CONFERENCE.—Within 1 week of completion of service of a petition under paragraph (4), 1 or more Officers of the Board shall hold a conference to address the matters described in subparagraphs (B) and (C).

(B) OPT-OUT PROCEDURE.—At the conference, an Officer of the Board shall explain that the responding party has a right to opt out of the proceeding before the Board, and describe the consequences of opting out and not opting out as described in paragraph (6). A responding party shall have a period of 30 days, beginning on the date of the conference, in which to provide written notice of such choice to the petitioning party and the Board. If the responding party does not submit an opt-out notice to the Board within that 30-day period, the proceeding shall be deemed an active proceeding and the responding party shall be bound by the determination in the proceeding. If the responding party opts out of the proceeding during that 30-day period, the proceeding shall be dismissed without prejudice.

(C) DISABLING ACCESS.—At the conference, except for petitions setting forth claims described in clauses (iii) and (iv) of paragraph (2)(A), an Officer of the Board shall order the provider involved to disable public and user access to the alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child at issue in the petition for the pendency of the proceeding, including judicial review as provided in subsection (g)(28), unless the Officer of the Board finds that—

(i) it is likely that the Board will find that the petition is frivolous or was filed with an intent to harass any person;

(ii) there is a probability that disabling public and user access to such visual depiction will cause irreparable harm;

(iii) the balance of equities weighs in favor of preserving public and user access to the visual depiction; and

(iv) disabling public and user access to the visual depiction is contrary to the public interest.

(D) EFFECT OF FAILURE TO DISABLE ACCESS.—

(i) PROVIDER PETITION.—If the petition was filed by a provider, and the provider fails to comply with an order issued pursuant to subparagraph (B), the Board may—

(I) dismiss the petition with prejudice; and

(II) refer the matter to the Attorney General.

(ii) EFFECT OF DISMISSAL.—If a provider's petition is dismissed under clause (i)(I), the complainant may bring a petition under paragraph (1) as if the provider did not file a petition within the timeframe specified in paragraph (2)(B). For purposes of paragraph (1)(C)(ii), the applicable start date shall be the date the provider's petition was dismissed.

(iii) COMPLAINANT PETITION.—If the petition was filed by a complainant, and the provider fails to comply with an order issued pursuant to subparagraph (B), the Board—

(I) shall—

(aa) expedite resolution of the petition; and

(bb) refer the matter to the Attorney General; and

(II) may apply an adverse inference with respect to disputed facts against such provider.

(8) SCHEDULING.—Upon receipt of a complete petition and at the conclusion of the opt out procedure described in paragraph (7), the Board shall issue a schedule for the future conduct of the proceeding. A schedule issued by the Board may be amended by the Board in the interests of justice.

(9) CONFERENCES.—One or more Officers of the Board may hold a conference to address case management or discovery issues in a proceeding, which shall be noted upon the record of the proceeding and may be recorded or transcribed.

(10) PARTY SUBMISSIONS.—A proceeding of the Board may not include any formal motion practice, except that, subject to applicable regulations and procedures of the Board—

(A) the parties to the proceeding and an interested owner may make requests to the Board to address case management and discovery matters, and submit responses thereto; and

(B) the Board may request or permit parties and interested owners to make submissions addressing relevant questions of fact or law, or other matters, including matters raised sua sponte by the Officers of the Board, and offer responses thereto.

(11) DISCOVERY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Discovery in a proceeding shall be limited to the production of relevant information and documents, written interrogatories, and written requests for admission, as provided in regulations established by the Commission, except that—

(i) upon the request of a party, and for good cause shown, the Board may approve additional relevant discovery, on a limited basis, in particular matters, and may request specific information and documents from parties in the proceeding, consistent with the interests of justice;

(ii) upon the request of a party or interested owner, and for good cause shown, the Board may issue a protective order to limit the disclosure of documents or testimony that contain confidential information;

(iii) after providing notice and an opportunity to respond, and upon good cause shown, the Board may apply an adverse inference with respect to disputed facts against a party or interested owner who has failed to timely provide discovery materials in response to a proper request for materials that could be relevant to such facts; and

(iv) an interested owner shall only produce or receive discovery to the extent it relates to whether the visual depiction at issue constitutes a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child.

(B) PRIVACY.—Any alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child received by the Board or the Commission as part of a proceeding shall be filed under seal and shall remain in the care, custody, and control of the Board or the Commission. For purposes of discovery, the Board or Commission shall make the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child reasonably available to the parties and interested owner but shall not provide copies. The privacy protections described in section 3509(d) of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to the Board, Commission, provider, complainant, and interested owner.

(12) RESPONSES.—The responding party may refute any of the claims or factual assertions made by the petitioning party, and may also claim that the petition was not filed in the applicable timeframe or is barred under subsection (h). If a complainant is the petitioning party, a provider may additionally claim in response that the notification was incomplete and could not be made complete under subsection (c)(2)(D)(i). The petitioning party may refute any responses submitted by the responding party.

(13) INTERESTED OWNER.—An individual notified under paragraph (19)(C)(ii) may, within 14 days of being so notified, file a motion to join the proceeding for the limited purpose of claiming that the visual depiction at issue does not constitute a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child. The Board shall serve the motion on both parties. Such motion shall include a factual basis and a signed statement, submitted under penalty of perjury, indicating that the individual produced or created the visual depiction at issue. The Board shall dismiss any motion that does not include the signed statement or that was submitted by an individual who did not produce or create the visual depiction at issue. If the motion is granted, the interested owner may also claim that the notification and petition were filed with an intent to harass the interested owner. Any party may refute the claims and factual assertions made by the interested owner.

(14) EVIDENCE.—The Board may consider the following types of evidence in a proceeding, and such evidence may be admitted without application of formal rules of evidence:

(A) Documentary and other nontestimonial evidence that is relevant to the petitions or responses in the proceeding.

(B) Testimonial evidence, submitted under penalty of perjury in written form or in accordance with paragraph (15), limited to statements of the parties and nonexpert witnesses, that is relevant to the petitions or responses in a proceeding, except that, in exceptional cases, expert witness testimony or other types of testimony may be permitted by the Board for good cause shown.

(15) HEARINGS.—Unless waived by all parties, the Board shall conduct a hearing to receive oral presentations on issues of fact or law from parties and witnesses to a proceeding, including oral testimony, subject to the following:

(A) Any such hearing shall be attended by not fewer than two of the Officers of the Board.

(B) The hearing shall be noted upon the record of the proceeding and, subject to subparagraph (C), may be recorded or transcribed as deemed necessary by the Board.

(C) A recording or transcript of the hearing shall be made available to any Officer of the Board who is not in attendance.

(16) VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL.—

(A) BY PETITIONING PARTY.—Upon the written request of a petitioning party, the Board shall dismiss the petition, with or without prejudice.

(B) BY RESPONDING PARTY OR INTERESTED OWNER.—Upon written request of a responding party or interested owner, the Board shall dismiss any responses to the petition, and shall consider all claims and factual assertions in the petition to be true.

(17) FACTUAL FINDINGS.—Subject to paragraph (11)(A)(iii), the Board shall make factual findings based upon a preponderance of the evidence.

(18) DETERMINATIONS.—

(A) NATURE AND CONTENTS.—A determination rendered by the Board in a proceeding shall—

(i) be reached by a majority of the Board;

(ii) be in writing, and include an explanation of the factual and legal basis of the determination; and

(iii) include a clear statement of all fines, costs, and other relief awarded.

(B) DISSENT.—An Officer of the Board who dissents from a decision contained in a determination under subparagraph (A) may append a statement setting forth the grounds for that dissent.

(19) PUBLICATION AND DISCLOSURE.—

(A) PUBLICATION.—Each final determination of the Board shall be made available on a publicly accessible website, except that the final determination shall be redacted to protect confidential information that is the subject of a protective order under paragraph (11)(A)(ii) or information protected pursuant to paragraph (11)(B) and any other information protected from public disclosure under the Federal Trade Commission Act or any other applicable provision of law.

(B) FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT.—All information relating to proceedings of the Board under this section is exempt from disclosure to the public under section 552(b)(3) of title 5, except for determinations, records, and information published under subparagraph (A). Any information that is disclosed under this subparagraph shall have redacted any information that is the subject of a protective order under paragraph (11)(A)(ii) or protected pursuant to paragraph (11)(B).

(C) EFFECT OF PETITION ON NON-DISCLOSURE PERIOD.—

(i) Submission of a petition extends the non-disclosure period under subsection (c)(2)(I) for the pendency of the proceeding. The provider may submit an objection to the Board that nondisclosure is contrary to the interests of justice. The complainant may, but is not required to, respond to the objection. The Board should sustain the objection unless there is reason to believe that the circumstances in section 3486(a)(6)(B) of title 18, United States Code, exist and outweigh the interests of justice.

(ii) If the Board sustains an objection to the nondisclosure period, the provider or the Board may notify the apparent owner of the visual depiction in question about the proceeding, and include instructions on how the owner may move to join the proceeding under paragraph (13).

(iii) If applicable, the nondisclosure period expires 120 days after the Board's determination becomes final, except it shall expire immediately upon the Board's determination becoming final if the Board finds that the visual depiction is not a proscribed visual depiction relating to a minor.

(iv) The interested owner of a visual depiction may not bring any legal action against any party related to the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child until the Board's determination is final. Once the determination is final, the owner of the visual depiction may pursue any legal relief available under the law, subject to subsections (h), (k), and (l).

(20) RESPONDING PARTY'S DEFAULT.—If the Board finds that service of the petition on the responding party could not reasonably be completed, or the responding party has failed to appear or has ceased participating in a proceeding, as demonstrated by the responding party's failure, without justifiable cause, to meet one or more deadlines or requirements set forth in the schedule adopted by the Board, the Board may enter a default determination, including the dismissal of any responses asserted by the responding party, as follows and in accordance with such other requirements as the Commission may establish by regulation:

(A) The Board shall require the petitioning party to submit relevant evidence and other information in support of the petitioning party's claims and, upon review of such evidence and any other requested submissions from the petitioning party, shall determine whether the materials so submitted are sufficient to support a finding in favor of the petitioning party under applicable law and, if so, the appropriate relief and damages, if any, to be awarded.

(B) If the Board makes an affirmative determination under subparagraph (A), the Board shall prepare a proposed default determination, and shall provide written notice to the responding party at all addresses, including electronic mail addresses, reflected in the records of the proceeding before the Board, of the pendency of a default determination by the Board and of the legal significance of such determination. Such notice shall be accompanied by the proposed default determination and shall provide that the responding party has a period of 30 days, beginning on the date of the notice, to submit any evidence or other information in opposition to the proposed default determination.

(C) If the responding party responds to the notice provided under subparagraph (B) within the 30-day period provided in such subparagraph, the Board shall consider responding party's submissions and, after allowing the petitioning party to address such submissions, maintain, or amend its proposed determination as appropriate, and the resulting determination shall not be a default determination.

(D) If the respondent fails to respond to the notice provided under subparagraph (B), the Board shall proceed to issue the default determination. Thereafter, the respondent may only challenge such determination to the extent permitted under paragraph (28).

(21) PETITIONING PARTY OR INTERESTED OWNER'S FAILURE TO PROCEED.—If a petitioning party or interested owner who has joined the proceeding fails to proceed, as demonstrated by the failure, without justifiable cause, to meet one or more deadlines or requirements set forth in the schedule adopted by the Board, the Board may, upon providing written notice to the petitioning party or interested owner and a period of 30 days, beginning on the date of the notice, to respond to the notice, and after considering any such response, issue a determination dismissing the claims made by the petitioning party or interested owner. The Board may order the petitioning party to pay attorney fees and costs under paragraph (26)(B), if appropriate. Thereafter, the petitioning party may only challenge such determination to the extent permitted under paragraph (28).

(22) REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION.—A party or interested owner may, within 30 days after the date on which the Board issues a determination under paragraph (18), submit to the Board a written request for reconsideration of, or an amendment to, such determination if the party or interested owner identifies a clear error of law or fact material to the outcome, or a technical mistake. After providing the other parties an opportunity to address such request, the Board shall either deny the request or issue an amended determination.

(23) REVIEW BY COMMISSION.—If the Board denies a party or interested owner a request for reconsideration of a determination under paragraph (22), the party or interested owner may, within 30 days after the date of such denial, request review of the determination by the Commission in accordance with regulations established by the Commission. After providing the other party or interested owner an opportunity to address the request, the Commission shall either deny the request for review, or remand the proceeding to the Board for reconsideration of issues specified in the remand and for issuance of an amended determination. Such amended determination shall not be subject to further consideration or review, other than under paragraph (28).

(24) FAVORABLE RULING ON COMPLAINANT PETITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Board grants a complainant's petition filed under this section, notwithstanding any other law, the Board shall—

(i) order the provider to immediately remove the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child, and to permanently delete all copies of the visual depiction known to and under the control of the provider unless the Board orders the provider to preserve the visual depiction;

(ii) impose a fine of $50,000 per proscribed visual depiction relating to a child covered by the determination, but if the Board finds that—

(I) the provider removed the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child after the period set forth in subsection (c)(1)(A)(i), but before the complainant filed a petition, such fine shall be $25,000;

(II) the provider has engaged in recidivist hosting for the first time with respect to the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child in question, such fine shall be $100,000 per proscribed visual depiction relating to a child; or

(III) the provider has engaged in recidivist hosting of the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child in question 2 or more times, such fine shall be $200,000 per proscribed visual depiction relating to a child;

(iii) order the provider to pay reasonable costs to the complainant; and

(iv) refer any matters involving intentional or willful conduct by a provider with respect to a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child, or recidivist hosting, to the Attorney General for prosecution under any applicable laws.

(B) PROVIDER PAYMENT OF FINE AND COSTS.—Notwithstanding any other law, the Board shall direct a provider to promptly pay fines and costs imposed under subparagraph (A) as follows:

(i) If the petition was filed by a victim, such fine and costs shall be paid to the victim.

(ii) If the petition was filed by an authorized representative of a victim—

(I) 30 percent of such fine shall be paid to the authorized representative and 70 percent of such fine paid to the victim; and

(II) costs shall be paid to the authorized representative.

(iii) If the petition was filed by a qualified organization—

(I) the fine shall be paid to the Child Pornography Victims Reserve as provided in section 2259B of title 18, United States Code; and

(II) costs shall be paid to the qualified organization.

(25) EFFECT OF DENIAL OF PROVIDER PETITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Board denies a provider's petition to contest a notification filed under paragraph (2), it shall order the provider to immediately remove the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child, and to permanently delete all copies of the visual depiction known to and under the control of the provider unless the Board orders the provider to preserve the visual depiction.

(B) REFERRAL FOR FAILURE TO REMOVE MATERIAL.—If a provider does not remove and, if applicable, permanently delete a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child within 48 hours of the Board issuing a determination under subparagraph (A), or not later than 2 business days of the Board issuing a determination under subparagraph (A) concerning a small provider, the Board shall refer the matter to the Attorney General for prosecution under any applicable laws.

(C) COSTS FOR FRIVOLOUS PETITION.—If the Board finds that a provider filed a petition under paragraph (2) for a harassing or improper purpose or without reasonable basis in law or fact, the Board shall order the provider to pay the reasonable costs of the complainant.

(26) EFFECT OF DENIAL OF COMPLAINANT'S PETITION OR FAVORABLE RULING ON PROVIDER'S PETITION.—

(A) RESTORATION.—If the Board grants a provider's petition filed under paragraph (2) or if the Board denies a petition filed by the complainant under paragraph (1), the provider may restore access to any visual depiction that was at issue in the proceeding.

(B) COSTS FOR INCOMPLETE OR FRIVOLOUS NOTIFICATION AND HARASSMENT.—If, in granting or denying a petition as described in subparagraph (A), the Board finds that the notification contested in the petition could not be made complete under subsection (c)(2)(D), is frivolous, or is duplicative under subsection (c)(2)(C)(i), the Board may order the complainant to pay costs to the provider and any interested owner, which shall not exceed a total of $10,000, or, if the Board finds that the complainant filed the notification with an intent to harass the provider or any person, a total of $15,000.

(27) CIVIL ACTION; OTHER RELIEF.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Whenever any provider or complainant fails to comply with a final determination of the Board issued under paragraph (18), the Department of Justice may commence a civil action in a district court of the United States to enforce compliance with such determination.

(B) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commission or Department of Justice under any other provision of law.

(28) CHALLENGES TO THE DETERMINATION.—

(A) BASES FOR CHALLENGE.—Not later than 45 days after the date on which the Board issues a determination or amended determination in a proceeding, or not later than 45 days after the date on which the Board completes any process of reconsideration or the Commission completes a review of the determination, whichever occurs later, a party may seek an order from a district court, located where the provider or complainant conducts business or resides, vacating, modifying, or correcting the determination of the Board in the following cases:

(i) If the determination was issued as a result of fraud, corruption, misrepresentation, or other misconduct.

(ii) If the Board exceeded its authority or failed to render a determination concerning the subject matter at issue.

(iii) In the case of a default determination or determination based on a failure to prosecute, if it is established that the default or failure was due to excusable neglect.

(B) PROCEDURE TO CHALLENGE.—

(i) NOTICE OF APPLICATION.—Notice of the application to challenge a determination of the Board shall be provided to all parties to the proceeding before the Board, in accordance with the procedures applicable to service of a motion in the court where the application is made.

(ii) STAYING OF PROCEEDINGS.—For purposes of an application under this paragraph, any judge who is authorized to issue an order to stay the proceedings in an any other action brought in the same court may issue an order, to be served with the notice of application, staying proceedings to enforce the award while the challenge is pending.

(29) FINAL DETERMINATION.—A determination of the Board shall be final on the date that all opportunities for a party or interested owner to seek reconsideration or review of a determination under paragraph (22) or (23), or for a party to challenge the determination under paragraph (28), have expired or are exhausted.

(h) EFFECT OF PROCEEDING.—

(1) SUBSEQUENT PROCEEDINGS.—The issuance of a final determination by the Board shall preclude the filing by any party of any subsequent petition that is based on the notification at issue in the final determination. This paragraph shall not limit the ability of any party to file a subsequent petition based on any other notification.

(2) DETERMINATION.—Except as provided in paragraph (1), the issuance of a final determination by the Board, including a default determination or determination based on a failure to prosecute, shall preclude relitigation of any allegation, factual claim, or response in any subsequent legal action or proceeding before any court, tribunal, or the Board, and may be relied upon for such purpose in a future action or proceeding arising from the same specific activity, subject to the following:

(A) No party or interested owner may relitigate any allegation, factual claim, or response that was properly asserted and considered by the Board in any subsequent proceeding before the Board involving the same parties or interested owner and the same proscribed visual depiction relating to a minor.

(B) A finding by the Board that a visual depiction constitutes a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child—

(i) may not be relitigated in any civil proceeding brought by an interested owner; and

(ii) may not be relied upon, and shall not have preclusive effect, in any other action or proceeding involving any party before any court or tribunal other than the Board.

(C) A determination by the Board shall not preclude litigation or relitigation as between the same or different parties before any court or tribunal other than the Board of the same or similar issues of fact or law in connection with allegations or responses not asserted or not finally determined by the Board.

(D) Except to the extent permitted under this subsection, any final determination of the Board may not be cited or relied upon as legal precedent in any other action or proceeding before any court or tribunal other than the Board.

(3) OTHER MATERIALS IN PROCEEDING.—A submission or statement of a party, interested owner, or witness made in connection with a proceeding before the Board, including a proceeding that is dismissed, may not serve as the basis of any action or proceeding before any court or tribunal except for any legal action related to perjury or for conduct described in subsection (k)(2). A statement of a party, interested owner, or witness may be received as evidence, in accordance with applicable rules, in any subsequent legal action or proceeding before any court, tribunal, or the Board.

(4) FAILURE TO ASSERT RESPONSE.—Except as provided in paragraph (1), the failure or inability to assert any allegation, factual claim, or response in a proceeding before the Board shall not preclude the assertion of that response in any subsequent legal action or proceeding before any court, tribunal, or the Board.

(i) ADMINISTRATION.—The Commission may issue regulations in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to implement this section.

(j) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which Child Online Protection Board issues the first determination under this section, the Commission shall conduct, and report to Congress on, a study that addresses the following:

(A) The use and efficacy of the Child Online Protection Board in expediting the removal of proscribed visual depictions relating to children and resolving disputes concerning said visual depictions, including the number of proceedings the Child Online Protection Board could reasonably administer with current allocated resources.

(B) Whether adjustments to the authority of the Child Online Protection Board are necessary or advisable, including with respect to permissible claims, responses, fines, costs, and joinder by interested parties.

(C) Whether the Child Online Protection Board should be permitted to expire, be extended, or be expanded.

(D) Such other matters as the Commission believes may be pertinent concerning the Child Online Protection Board.

(2) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study and completing the report required under paragraph (1), the Commission shall, to the extent feasible, consult with complainants, victims, and providers to include their views on the matters addressed in the study and report.

(k) LIMITED LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a civil claim or criminal charge against the Board, a provider, a complainant, interested owner, or representative under subsection (f)(4), for distributing, receiving, accessing, or possessing a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child for the sole and exclusive purpose of complying with the requirements of this section, or for the sole and exclusive purpose of seeking or providing legal advice in order to comply with this section, may not be brought in any Federal or State court.

(2) INTENTIONAL, RECKLESS, OR OTHER MISCONDUCT.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a claim against the Board, a provider, a complainant, interested owner, or representative under subsection (f)(4)—

(A) for any conduct unrelated to compliance with the requirements of this section;

(B) if the Board, provider, complainant, interested owner, or representative under subsection (f)(4) (as applicable)—

(i) engaged in intentional misconduct; or

(ii) acted, or failed to act—

(I) with actual malice; or

(II) with reckless disregard to a substantial risk of causing physical injury without legal justification; or

(C) in the case of a claim against a complainant, if the complainant falsely claims to be a victim, an authorized representative of a victim, or a qualified organization.

(3) MINIMIZING ACCESS.—The Board, a provider, a complainant, an interested owner, or a representative under subsection (f)(4) shall—

(A) minimize the number of individuals that are provided access to any alleged, contested, or actual proscribed visual depictions relating to a child under this section;

(B) ensure that any alleged, contested, or actual proscribed visual depictions relating to a child are transmitted and stored in a secure manner and are not distributed to or accessed by any individual other than as needed to implement this section; and

(C) ensure that all copies of any proscribed visual depictions relating to a child are permanently deleted upon a request from the Board, Commission, or the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(l) PROVIDER IMMUNITY FROM CLAIMS BASED ON REMOVAL OF VISUAL DEPICTION.—A provider shall not be liable to any person for any claim based on the provider's good faith removal of any alleged proscribed visual depiction relating to a child pursuant to a notification under this section, regardless of whether the visual depiction is found to be a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child by the Board.

(m) CONTINUED APPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL, STATE, AND TRIBAL LAW.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall not be construed to impair, supersede, or limit a provision of Federal, State, or Tribal law.

(2) NO PREEMPTION.—Nothing in this section shall prohibit a State or Tribal government from adopting and enforcing a provision of law governing child sex abuse material that is at least as protective of the rights of a victim as this section.

(n) DISCOVERY.—Nothing in this section affects discovery, a subpoena or any other court order, or any other judicial process otherwise in accordance with Federal or State law.

(o) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to relieve a provider from any obligation imposed on the provider under section 2258A of title 18, United States Code.

(p) FUNDING.—There are authorized to be appropriated to pay the costs incurred by the Commission under this section, including the costs of establishing and maintaining the Board and its facilities, $40,000,000 for each year during the period that begins with the year in which this Act is enacted and ends with the year in which certain subsections of this section expire under subsection (q).

(q) SUNSET.—Except for subsections (a), (h), (k), (l), (m), (n), (o), and (r), this section shall expire 5 years after the date on which the Child Online Protection Board issues its first determination under this section.

(r) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BOARD.—The term ''Board'' means the Child Online Protection Board established under subsection (d).

(2) CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE MATERIAL.—The term ''child sexual abuse material'' has the meaning provided in section 2256(8) of title 18, United States Code.

(3) COMMISSION.—The term ''Commission'' means the Federal Trade Commission.

(4) COMPLAINANT.—The term ''complainant'' means—

(A) the victim appearing in the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child;

(B) an authorized representative of the victim appearing in the proscribed visual depiction relating to a child; or

(C) a qualified organization.

(5) DESIGNATED REPORTING SYSTEM.—The term ''designated reporting system'' means a

digital means of submitting a notification to a provider under this subsection that is publicly and prominently available, easily accessible, and easy to use.

(6) HOST.—The term ''host'' means to store or make a visual depiction available or accessible to the public or any users through digital means or on a system or network controlled or operated by or for a provider.

(7) IDENTIFIABLE PERSON.—The term ''identifiable person'' means a person who is recognizable as an actual person by the person's face, likeness, or other distinguishing characteristic, such as a unique birthmark or other recognizable feature.

(8) INTERESTED OWNER.—The term ''interested owner'' means an individual who has joined a proceeding before the Board under subsection (g)(13).

(9) PARTY.—The term ''party'' means the complainant or provider.

(10) PROSCRIBED VISUAL DEPICTION RELATING TO A CHILD.—The term ''proscribed visual depiction relating to a child'' means child sexual abuse material or a related exploitive visual depiction.

(11) PROVIDER.—The term ''provider'' means a provider of an interactive computer service, as that term is defined in section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230), and for purposes of subsections (k) and (l), includes any director, officer, employee, or agent of such provider.

(12) QUALIFIED ORGANIZATION.—The term ''qualified organization'' means an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that is exempt from tax under section 501(a) of that Code that works to address child sexual abuse material and to support victims of child sexual abuse material.

(13) RECIDIVIST HOSTING.—The term ''recidivist hosting'' means, with respect to a provider, that the provider removes a proscribed visual depiction relating to a child pursuant to a notification or determination under this subsection, and then subsequently hosts a visual depiction that has the same hash value or other technical identifier as the visual depiction that had been so removed.

(14) RELATED EXPLOITIVE VISUAL DEPICTION.—The term ''related exploitive visual depiction'' means a visual depiction of an identifiable person of any age where—

(A) such visual depiction does not constitute child sexual abuse material, but is published with child sexual abuse material depicting that person; and

(B) there is a connection between such visual depiction and the child sexual abuse material depicting that person that is readily apparent from—

(i) the content of such visual depiction and the child sexual abuse material; or

(ii) the context in which such visual depiction and the child sexual abuse material appear.

(15) SMALL PROVIDER.—The term ''small provider'' means a provider that, for the most recent calendar year, averaged less than 10,000,000 active users on a monthly basis in the United States.

(16) VICTIM.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''victim'' means an individual of any age who is depicted in child sexual abuse material while under 18 years of age.

(B) ASSUMPTION OF RIGHTS.—In the case of a victim who is under 18 years of age, incompetent, incapacitated, or deceased, the legal guardian of the victim or representative of the victim's estate, another family member, or any other person appointed as suitable by a court, may assume the victim's rights to submit a notification or file a petition under this section, but in no event shall an individual who produced or conspired to produce the child sexual abuse material depicting the victim be named as such representative or guardian.

(17) VISUAL DEPICTION.—The term ''visual depiction'' has the meaning provided in section 2256(5) of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 507. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title, an amendment made by this title, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title and the amendments made by this title, and the application of the provision or amendment to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.

SA 1705. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds appropriated by this Act may be made available to any nongovernmental organization—

(1) that facilitates or encourages unlawful activity, including unlawful entry into the United States, human trafficking, human smuggling, drug trafficking, and drug smuggling; or

(2) to provide, or facilitate the provision of, transportation, lodging, or immigration legal services to inadmissible aliens who enter the United States after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1706. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division D, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this division may be used to provide Federal funds to a local jurisdiction that refuses to comply with a request from the Department of Homeland Security to provide advance notice of the scheduled date and time a particular illegal alien is scheduled to be released from local custody.

SA 1707. Mr. CORNYN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. PROHIBITION ON DISBURSEMENT OF FUNDS TO ANY STATE, CITY, OR LOCALITY THAT AUTHORIZES THE REGISTRATION OF NON-CITIZENS TO VOTE IN FEDERAL ELECTIONS.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by any division of this Act may be provided to a State, city, or locality that authorizes the registration of individuals who are not citizens of the United States to vote in any Federal election.

SA 1708. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to take any action described in subsection (b) if taking the action would significantly alter the application of sanctions described in subsection (c).

(b) An action described in this subsection is any determination or issuance of waivers by the Secretary of State pursuant to—

(1) section 1245(d)(5) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)(5)); or

(2) section 1244(i) or 1247(f) of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8803(i) and 8806(f)).

(c) The sanctions described in this subsection are sanctions under—

(1) section 1245(d)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8513a(d)(1)); or

(2) section 1244(c)(1) or 1247(a) of Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (22 U.S.C. 8803(c)(1) and 8806(a)).

SA 1709. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Ninety percent of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the Office of the Secretary of Defense and available for official travel may not be obligated or expended until the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness has developed and issued guidance to require uniform discharge types and assigned uniform reentry codes for all members of the Armed Forces discharged for misconduct solely for COVID-19 vaccination refusal.

SA 1710. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used for official Department of Defense travel to events focused solely on diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI), including ''listening tours'' or sensing sessions.

SA 1711. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the amount made available for the Disaster Relief Fund of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall be $20,761,000,000, of which $500,000,000 shall be to assist individuals affected by the 2024 wildfires in Texas and Oklahoma.

SA 1712. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize

the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President shall eliminate eligibility requirements for assistance under section 408 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5174) for individuals affected by the 2024 wildfires in Texas and Oklahoma.

SA 1713. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Notwithstanding any other provision of any division of this consolidated Act, including the explanatory statement described in section 4 of the matter preceding division A of this Act and any Community Project Funding/Congressionally Directed Spending table, no amounts shall be made available under division D of this Act for the Women and Infants Hospital, Rhode Island, for facilities and equipment.

SA 1714. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FAILED BANK MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS.

(a) FAILED BANK MERGERS.—Section 18(c)(13)(B) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828(c)(13)(B)) is amended by striking ''section 13.'' and inserting ''section 13, if—

''(i) at the time the responsible agency proposes to approve the application, there is no application or proposed application (other than an application that also would be subject to the prohibition in subparagraph (A)) to acquire the 1 or more insured depository institutions in default or in danger of default pending before any appropriate Federal banking agency that would, according to the responsible agency for such application, meet all applicable standards for approval by the responsible agency;

''(ii) the Corporation would provide assistance under section 13 with respect to the interstate merger transaction; and

''(iii) the Corporation has determined that the interstate merger transaction that is the subject of the application to the responsible agency is the only proposed transaction to acquire, directly or indirectly, the 1 or more insured depository institutions in default or in danger of default pending before the Corporation (other than an interstate merger transaction that also would be subject to the prohibition in subparagraph (A)) that would permit the Corporation to—

''(I) comply with the least-cost resolution requirements set forth in section 13(c)(4); or

''(II) avoid the serious adverse effects on economic conditions or financial stability that would occur absent exercise of the authority in section 13(c)(4)(G), if a systemic risk determination has been made under such section with respect to the insured depository institution or institutions that are the subject of the application.''.

(b) FAILED BANK ACQUISITIONS.—Section 3(d)(5) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1842(d)(5)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) in the matter preceding clause (i), as so redesignated, by striking ''The Board may approve'' and inserting the following:

''(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Board may approve''; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following:

''(B) Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), the Board may approve an application that would otherwise be subject to the prohibition in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2) if—

''(i) at the time the Board proposes to approve the application, there is no application or proposed application (other than an application that also would be subject to the prohibitions in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2)) to acquire, directly or indirectly, the 1 or more banks in default or in danger of default, or the acquisition with respect to which assistance is provided under section 13(c) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1823(c)), pending before the Board that would meet all applicable standards for approval under this section;

''(ii) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation would provide assistance under section 13 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1823) with respect to the acquisition that is the subject of the application to the Board; and

''(iii) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has determined that the acquisition is the only proposed transaction to acquire, directly or indirectly, the 1 or more banks in default or in danger of default pending before the Corporation (other than an acquisition that also would be subject to the prohibition in subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (2)) that would permit the Corporation to—

''(I) comply with the least-cost resolution requirements set forth in section 13(c)(4) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1823(c)(4)); or

''(II) avoid the serious adverse effects on economic conditions or financial stability that would occur absent exercise of the authority in section 13(c)(4)(G) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1823(c)(4)(G)), if a systemic risk determination has been made under such section with respect to the bank or banks that are the subject of the application.''.

SA 1715. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall make available to the public the methodology used by the Corporation to satisfy section 13(c)(4) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1823(c)(4)).

SA 1716. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of any division of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission may not use any of the funds made available to the Commission under any division of this Act to promulgate or finalize any rule that requires the disclosure of scope 3 greenhouse gas emissions.

SA 1717. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shall provide to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives the methodology used by the Corporation to satisfy section 13(c)(4) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1823(c)(4)).

SA 1718. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to release from physical custody any alien whom the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection has determined potentially poses a national security risk to the United States or its interests (commonly referred to as a ''special interest alien'') during the pendency of proceedings for such alien under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), including any related appeals.

SA 1719. Mr. TUBERVILLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title III of division D (relating to the Department of Education), insert the following:

SEC. ___. RULE REGARDING ATHLETIC PROGRAMS OR ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of receiving funds under this title, a State, local educational agency, or institution of higher education may not permit any student whose biological sex (recognized based solely on a person's reproductive biology and genetics at birth) is male to participate in an athletic program or activity that is—

(1) administered by that State, local educational agency, or institution of higher education, as the case may be; and

(2) designated for women or girls.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given the term in section 101 or 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001, 1002).

(2) LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY, STATE.—The terms ''local educational agency'' and ''State'' have the meanings given the terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

SA 1720. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. CORNYN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Notwithstanding any other provision of any division of this consolidated Act, including the explanatory statement described in section 4 of the matter preceding division A of this Act and any Community Project Funding/Congressionally Directed Spending table, no amounts shall be made available under division D of this Act for Dartmouth Hitchcock Nashua, New Hampshire, for facilities and equipment.

SA 1721. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. SINEMA) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Funds made available under section 2001(b)(1) of Public Law 117–2 shall remain available through September 30, 2025.

SA 1722. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be made available to utilize the U.S. Customs and Border Protection CBP One application, or any successor application, to facilitate the entry of any alien into the United States.

SA 1723. Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000.

(a) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR SECURE PAYMENTS.—Section 101 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111) is amended, in subsections (a) and (b), by striking ''2023'' each place it appears and inserting ''2026''.

(b) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS.—Section 103(d)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) is amended by striking ''2023'' and inserting ''2026''.

(c) RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—Section 205(a)(4) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125(a)(4)) is amended by striking ''December 20, 2023'' each place it appears and inserting ''December 20, 2026''.

(d) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT SPECIAL PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND.—Section 208 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7128) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2028''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''2026'' and inserting ''2029''.

(e) EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO EXPEND COUNTY FUNDS.—Section 305 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7144) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''2025'' and inserting ''2028''; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking ''2026'' and inserting ''2029''.

(f) RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE PILOT PROGRAM EXTENSION.—Section 205 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125) is amended by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

''(g) PILOT PROGRAM FOR RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS BY REGIONAL FORESTERS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned shall establish and carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary concerned shall allow the regional forester with jurisdiction over a unit of Federal land to appoint members of the resource advisory committee for that unit, in accordance with the applicable requirements of this section.

''(2) RESPONSIBILITIES OF REGIONAL FORESTER.—Before appointing a member of a resource advisory committee under the pilot program under this subsection, a regional forester shall conduct the review and analysis that would otherwise be conducted for an appointment to a resource advisory committee if the pilot program was not in effect, including any review and analysis with respect to civil rights and budgetary requirements.

''(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this subsection relieves a regional forester or the Secretary concerned from an obligation to comply with any requirement relating to an appointment to a resource advisory committee, including any requirement with respect to civil rights or advertising a vacancy.

''(4) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The authority provided under this subsection terminates on October 1, 2028.''.

SA 1724. Mr. JOHNSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division F, insert the following:

SEC. _____. ANY WORLD HEALTH AGENCY CONVENTION OR AGREEMENT OR OTHER INTERNATIONAL INSTRUMENT RESULTING FROM THE INTERNATIONAL NEGOTIATING BODY'S FINAL REPORT DEEMED TO BE A TREATY SUBJECT TO ADVICE AND CONSENT OF THE SENATE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''No WHO Pandemic Preparedness Treaty Without Senate Approval Act''.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) On December 1, 2021, at the second special session of the World Health Assembly (referred to in this section as the ''WHA'') decided—

(A) to establish the Intergovernmental Negotiating Body (referred to in this section as the ''INB'') to draft and negotiate a WHO convention (referred to in this section as the ''Convention''), agreement, or other international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response, with a view to adoption under article 19 or any other provision of the WHO Constitution; and

(B) that the INB shall submit a progress report to the Seventy-sixth WHA and a working draft of the convention for consideration by the Seventy-seventh WHA, which is scheduled to take place beginning on March 18, 2024.

(2) On February 24, March 14 and 15, and June 6 through 8 and 15 through 17, 2022, the INB held its inaugural meeting at which the Director-General proposed the following 5 themes to guide the INB's work in drafting the Convention:

(A) Building national, regional, and global capacities based on a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach.

(B) Establishing global access and benefit sharing for all pathogens, and determining a global policy for the equitable production and distribution of countermeasures.

(C) Establishing robust systems and tools for pandemic preparedness and response.

(D) Establishing a long-term plan for sustainable financing to ensure support for global health threat management and response systems.

(E) Empowering WHO to fulfill its mandate as the directing and coordinating authority on international health work, including for pandemic preparedness and response.

(3) On July 18 through 22, 2022, the INB held its second meeting at which it agreed that the Convention would be adopted under article 19 of the WHO Constitution and legally binding on the parties.

(4) On December 5 through 7, 2022, the INB held its third meeting at which it accepted a conceptual zero draft of the Convention and agreed to prepare a zero draft for consideration at the INB's next meeting.

(5) In early January 2023, an initial draft of the Convention was sent to WHO member states in advance of its formal introduction at the fourth meeting of the INB. The draft includes broad and binding provisions, including rules governing parties' access to pathogen genomic sequences and how the products or benefits of such access are to be distributed.

(6) On February 27 through March 3, 2023, the INB held its fourth meeting at which it—

(A) formally agreed to the draft distributed in January as the basis for commencing negotiations; and

(B) established an April 14, 2023 deadline for member states to propose any changes to the text.

(7) The INB's draft—

(A) was circulated to Member States on May 22, 2023; and

(B) was published online in all WHO official languages on June 2, 2023.

(8) On March 18 through 28, 2024, the INB is holding its Ninth Meeting at which it will consider an updated draft of the Convention reflecting input from Member States considered during the INB's Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, and Eighth meetings.

(9) On May 27 through June 1, 2024, the INB is scheduled to present its final draft of the Convention for consideration at the Seventy-seventh World Health Assembly.

(10) Section 723.3 of title 11 of the Department of State's Foreign Affairs Manual states that when ''determining whether any international agreement should be brought into force as a treaty or as an international agreement other than a treaty, the utmost care is to be exercised to avoid any invasion or compromise of the constitutional powers of the President, the Senate, and the Congress as a whole'' and includes the following criteria to be considered when determining

whether an international agreement should take the form of a treaty or an executive agreement:

(A) ''The extent to which the agreement involves commitments or risks affecting the nation as a whole''.

(B) ''Whether the agreement is intended to affect state laws''.

(C) ''Whether the agreement can be given effect without the enactment of subsequent legislation by the Congress''.

(D) ''Past U.S. practice as to similar agreements''.

(E) ''The preference of the Congress as to a particular type of agreement''.

(F) ''The degree of formality desired for an agreement''.

(G) ''The proposed duration of the agreement, the need for prompt conclusion of an agreement, and the desirability of concluding a routine or short-term agreement''.

(H) ''The general international practice as to similar agreements''.

(c) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) a significant segment of the American public is deeply skeptical of the World Health Organization, its leadership, and its independence from the pernicious political influence of certain member states, including the People's Republic of China;

(2) the current draft of the Convention does nothing to address the critical failures in the response to the COVID–19 pandemic, particularly regarding—

(A) the PRC's failure to inform the international community of the outbreak in a timely manner;

(B) the WHO repeating the PRC's false claim that there was no evidence of human-to-human transmission;

(C) the PRC's delay in sharing COVID-19's genomic sequence data; and

(D) the PRC's refusal to allow a thorough investigation of the origins of the outbreak.

(3) the Senate strongly prefers that any agreement related to pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response adopted by the World Health Assembly pursuant to the work of the INB be considered a treaty requiring the advice and consent of the Senate, with two-thirds of Senators concurring;

(4) the scope of the agreement which the INB has been tasked with drafting, as outlined by the Director-General, is so broad that any application of the factors referred to in subsection (b)(11) will weigh strongly in favor of it being considered a treaty; and

(5) given the level of public distrust, any relevant new agreement by the World Health Assembly which cannot garner the ⅔ vote needed for Senate ratification should not be agreed to or implemented by the United States.

(d) APPLICABILITY OF SENATE ADVICE AND CONSENT CONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any convention, agreement, or other international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response reached by the World Health Assembly pursuant to the recommendations, report, or work of the International Negotiating Body established by the second special session of the World Health Assembly is deemed to be a treaty that is subject to the requirements of article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States, which requires the advice and consent of the Senate, with ⅔ of all Senators concurring.

(e) FUNDING LIMITATION.—No funds appropriated by this division may be used to facilitate the implementation of any convention, agreement, or other international instrument on pandemic prevention, preparedness, and response reached by the WHA.

SA 1725. Mr. CRAPO (for himself, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. CRAMER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

LIMITATION

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act for fiscal year 2024 may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles'' (88 Fed. Reg. 29184 (May 5, 2023)), the final rule of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled ''Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles'' and submitted for publication in the Federal Register on March 20, 2024, or any substantially similar rule.

SA 1726. Mr. TUBERVILLE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds appropriated by this Act to the Office of the Secretary of Homeland Security may be obligated until after the Secretary of Homeland Security certifies that the Department of Homeland Security has achieved operational control over the entire international land and maritime borders of the United States (as described in section 2 of the Secure Fence Act of 2006 (8 U.S.C. 1701 note)), including—

(1) the establishment of systematic surveillance of the international land and maritime borders of the United States through the effective use of personnel and technology, such as unmanned aerial vehicles, ground-based sensors, satellites, radar coverage, and cameras; and

(2) sufficient physical infrastructure enhancements to prevent unlawful entry by aliens into the United States, while facilitating access to the international land and maritime borders by U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents and officers, such as the establishment of additional checkpoints, the construction of all weather access roads, and the placement of vehicle barriers.

SA 1727. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. SAFE THIRD COUNTRY EXCEPTION TO ASYLUM ELIGIBILITY.

Any alien who transited through at least 1 country outside the alien's country of citizenship, nationality, or last lawful habitual residence en route to the United States is ineligible for asylum in the United States.

SA 1728. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Department of Homeland Security by this Act may be expended to transport Federal Air Marshals to the southern border or the northern border for the purpose of carrying out non-law enforcement activities.

SA 1729. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. INELIGIBILITY FOR SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE BENEFITS.

Any alien who unlawfully enters the United States shall be permanent ineligible for benefits under the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).

SA 1730. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. EXPEDITED REMOVAL OF ALL ALIENS WHO UNLAWFULLY ENTERED THE UNITED STATES SINCE JANUARY 20, 2021.

The Secretary of Homeland Security, as expeditiously as practicable, shall place all aliens who are unlawfully present in the United States and whose latest unlawful entry into the United occurred on or after January 20, 2021, into expedited removal proceedings, consistent with section 238 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1228).

SA 1731. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. MANDATORY DETENTION FOR ILLEGAL ALIENS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall detain every alien who last entered the United States on or after January 20, 2021, and remains unlawfully present in the United States. Such aliens shall remain in detention until after—

(1) the alien's immigration proceedings have concluded, including any administrative or judicial appeals; and

(2) the alien has been granted legal status in the United States.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The requirement described in subsection (a) shall not apply to unaccompanied alien children (as defined in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2)).

SA 1732. Mr. RICKETTS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or other Acts making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, including provisions of Acts providing supplemental appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs, may not be used for a contribution, grant, or other payment to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency, notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) for any amounts provided in prior fiscal years or in fiscal year 2024; or

(2) for amounts provided in fiscal years beginning after fiscal year 2024.

SA 1733. Mr. BUDD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 426, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 552. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to grant any immigration status or other benefit to any alien who has been convicted of, been charged with, or admitted to, assaulting a law enforcement officer.

SA 1734. Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mrs. BRITT, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 426, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

SEC. 552.(a) This section may be cited as the "Laken Riley Act".

(b)(1) Congress finds that the people of the United States—

(A) mourn the devastating loss of Laken Riley and other victims of the Biden administration's open borders policies;

(B) honor the life and memory of Laken Riley and other victims of the Biden administration's open borders policies; and

(C) denounce the open borders policies of President Joe Biden, ''Border Czar'' Vice President Kamala Harris, Secretary of Homeland Security Alejandro Mayorkas, and other officials in the Biden administration.

(2) It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) the Biden administration should not have released Laken Riley's alleged murderer into the United States;

(B) the Biden administration should have arrested and detained Laken Riley's alleged murderer after he was charged with crimes in New York, New York, and Athens, Georgia;

(C) President Biden should publicly denounce his administration's immigration policies that resulted in the murder of Laken Riley; and

(D) President Biden should prevent another murder like that of Laken Riley by—

(i) ending the catch-and-release of illegal aliens;

(ii) increasing immigration enforcement;

(iii) detaining and removing criminal aliens;

(iv) reinstating the Remain in Mexico policy;

(v) ending his abuse of parole authority, and

(vi) securing the borders of the United States.

(c) Section 236(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1226(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraphs (A) and (B), by striking the comma at the end of each such subparagraph and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in subparagraph (C), by striking '', or'' and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in subparagraph (D), by striking the comma at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(D) by inserting after subparagraph (D) the following:

''(E)(i) is inadmissible under paragraph (6)(A), (6)(C), or (7) of section 212(a); and

''(ii) is charged with, is arrested for, is convicted of, or admits having committed acts constituting the essential elements of any burglary, theft, larceny, or shoplifting offense (as such terms are defined in the jurisdiction in which such acts occurred),'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (2) as paragraph (3); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

''(2) DETAINER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

''(A) issue a detainer for any alien described in paragraph (1)(E); and

''(B) if such alien is not being detained by Federal, State, or local officials, take custody of such alien effectively and expeditiously.''.

(d)(1) Section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(d)(5)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''Attorney General'' each place such term appears and inserting ''Secretary of Homeland Security'';

(B) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) by striking ''his discretion'' and inserting ''in the discretion of the Secretary'';

(ii) by striking ''he may'' and inserting ''the Secretary may'';

(iii) by striking ''he was'' and inserting ''the alien was''; and

(iv) by striking ''his case'' and inserting ''the alien's case''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(C)(i) The attorney general of a State, or another authorized State officer, alleging a violation of subparagraph (A), which requires the granting of parole be decided on a case-by-case basis and solely for urgent humanitarian reasons or a significant public benefit, which harms such State or its residents shall have standing to seek appropriate injunctive relief through an action against the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States.

''(ii) The court in which a civil action is brought pursuant to clause (i) shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of such action to the greatest extent practicable.

''(iii) In this subparagraph, a State or its residents shall be considered to have been harmed if the State or its residents experience harm, including financial harm in excess of $100.''.

(2) Section 235(b) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)) is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) ENFORCEMENT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.—

''(A) STANDING.—The attorney general of a State, or another authorized State officer, alleging a violation of the detention and removal requirements under paragraph (1) or (2), which harms such State or its residents shall have standing to bring an action against the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States to obtain appropriate injunctive relief.

''(B) EXPEDITED PROCEEDINGS.—The court in which a civil action is filed pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of such action to the greatest extent practicable.

''(C) HARM.—In subparagraph (A), a State or its residents shall be considered to have been harmed if the State or its residents experience harm, including financial harm in excess of $100.''.

(3) Section 236 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1226), as amended by section 3, is further amended—

(A) in subsection (e), by striking ''or release of any alien or the grant, revocation, or denial'' and inserting ''of any alien or the revocation or denial''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(f) ENFORCEMENT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.—

''(1) STANDING.—The attorney general of a State, or another authorized State officer, alleging an action or decision by the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security under this section to release any alien or grant bond or parole to any alien that harms such State or its residents shall have standing to seek injunctive relief by bringing an action against the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States.

''(2) EXPEDITED PROCEEDINGS.—The court in which a civil action is filed pursuant to paragraph (1) shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of such action to the greatest extent practicable.

''(3) HARM.—In subparagraph (A), a State or its residents shall be considered to have been harmed if the State or its residents experience harm, including financial harm in excess of $100.''.

(4) Section 241(a)(2) of such .Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(a)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''During the removal period,'' and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—During the removal period,''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) ENFORCEMENT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.—

''(i) STANDING.—The attorney general of a State, or another authorized State officer, alleging a violation of the detention requirement under subparagraph (A) that harms such State or its residents shall have standing to seek injunctive relief by bringing an action against the Secretary of Homeland Security on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States.

''(ii) EXPEDITED PROCEEDINGS.—The court in which a civil action is filed pursuant to clause (i) shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of such action to the greatest extent practicable.

''(iii) HARM.—In clause (i), a State or its residents shall be considered to have been harmed if the State or its residents experience harm, including financial harm in excess of $100.''.

(5) Section 242(f) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1252(f)) is amended by adding at the end following:

''(3) CERTAIN ACTIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an action brought pursuant to section 235(b)(3), subsections (e) or (f) of section 236, or section 241(a)(2)(B).''.

(6) Section 243 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1253) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ENFORCEMENT BY THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF A STATE.—

''(1) STANDING.—The attorney general of a State, or another authorized State officer, alleging a violation of the requirement to discontinue granting visas to citizens, subjects, nationals, and residents described in subsection (d), which harms such State or its residents, shall have standing to seek injunctive relief by bringing an action against the Secretary of State on behalf of such State or the residents of such State in an appropriate district court of the United States.

''(2) EXPEDITED PROCEEDINGS.—The court in which a civil action is filed under paragraph (1) shall advance on the docket and expedite the disposition of such action to the greatest extent practicable.

''(3) HARM.—In paragraph (1), a State or its residents shall be considered to have been harmed if the State or its residents experience harm, including financial harm in excess of $100.''.

SA 1735. Mr. HAGERTY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to facilitate, provide, or purchase air transportation from a foreign country to the United States for an alien in order for such alien to utilize a parole process described in—

(1) the notice of the Department of Homeland Security entitled ''Implementation of a Parole Process for Venezuelans'' (87 Fed. Reg. 63507 (October 19, 2022));

(2) the notice of the Department of Homeland Security entitled ''Implementation of a Parole Process for Haitians'' (88 Fed. Reg. 1243 (January 9, 2023));

(3) the notice of the Department of Homeland Security entitled ''Implementation of a Parole Process for Nicaraguans'' (88 Fed. Reg. 1255 (January 9, 2023)); or

(4) the notice of the Department of Homeland Security entitled ''Implementation of a Parole Process for Cubans'' (88 Fed. Reg. 1266 (January 9, 2023)).

(b) The limitation described in subsection (a) shall not apply in exigent circumstances, as determined on a case-by-case basis, including circumstances in which an individual is being—

(1) provided emergency medical treatment; or

(2) extradited to the United States and in law enforcement custody.

(c) Not later than 90 days after each determination described in subsection (b), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall notify the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives regarding such circumstances.

SA 1736. Ms. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. DAINES) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SUPPORTING NATIONAL SECURITY WITH SPECTRUM

SEC. _____. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Supporting National Security with Spectrum Act''.

(b) ADDITIONAL ''RIP AND REPLACE'' FUNDING.— Section 4(k) of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1603(k)) is amended by striking ''$1,900,000,000'' and inserting ''$4,980,000,000''.

(c) APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS.—There is appropriated to the Federal Communications Commission for fiscal year 2024, out of amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $3,080,000,000, to remain available until expended, to carry out section 4 of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1603).

(d) FCC AUCTION 97 REAUCTION OF CERTAIN LICENSES; COMPLETION OF REAUCTION.—

(1) FCC AUCTION 97 REAUCTION OF CERTAIN LICENSES.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall initiate a system of competitive bidding under section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) to grant licenses for spectrum in the inventory of the Commission within the bands of frequencies referred to by the Commission as the ''AWS-3 bands'', without regard to whether the authority of the Commission under paragraph (11) of that section has expired.

(2) COMPLETION OF REAUCTION.—The Federal Communications Commission shall complete the system of competitive bidding described in subsection (a), including receiving payments, processing applications, and granting licenses, without regard to whether the authority of the Commission under paragraph (11) of section 309(j) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 309(j)) has expired.

SA 1737. Ms. LUMMIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. POSTAL SERVICE FUNDS LIMITATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, no amounts made available under this Act shall be used by the United States Postal Service to convert a Processing and Distribution Center to a Local Processing Center in any State such that the State would no longer have any Processing and Distribution Centers located in that State.

SA 1738. Mr. SCHMITT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to—

(1) label any constitutionally protected speech of a United States citizen as disinformation or misinformation;

(2) coerce, directly or indirectly by partnering with a nongovernmental entity that is acting at the request or behest of a governmental entity, any provider or operator of a covered platform to alter, remove, restrict, or suppress constitutionally protected speech of a United States citizen that is shared on the covered platform based on a determination, by an employee acting under the official authority of the Federal Government, that the content of the speech is disinformation or misinformation; or

(3) create, or provide funding to a foreign government, quasi-governmental organization, or nonprofit organization for the research, development, or maintenance of, any disinformation or misinformation list or ranking system relating to news content, regardless of medium.

(b) For purposes of this section:

(1) The term ''constitutionally protected speech'' means speech that is protected under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, including any type of digital communication, including a post on a covered platform, an e-mail, a text, and a direct message.

(2) The term ''covered platform'' means an interactive computer service, as that term is defined in section 230 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 230).

SA 1739. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. ELIMINATING THE USE OF CONSULTANTS BY THE MAJORITY LEADER AND MINORITY LEADER OF THE SENATE.

The first sentence of section 101(a) of the Supplemental Appropriations Act, 1977 (2 U.S.C. 6501(a)), as amended by section 102 of division E, is further amended by striking ''not more'' and all that follows through ''consultants'' and inserting ''zero individual consultants''.

SA 1740. Mr. BUDD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to grant any immigration status or other benefit to any alien who is charged with, is arrested for, is convicted of, admits to a law enforcement officer or in a legal proceeding of having committed, or admits to a law enforcement officer or in a legal proceeding of committing acts constituting the essential elements of any burglary, theft, larceny, or shoplifting offense.

SA 1741. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of any division of this Act, none of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of State for the Global Engagement Center.

SA 1742. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize

the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for an assessed or voluntary contribution to the World Health Organization.

SA 1743. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for the Office of Diversity and Inclusion of the Department of State or for any other diversity, equity, and inclusion office, position, or activity at the Department.

SA 1744. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for an assessed or voluntary contribution, grant, or other payment to the Green Climate Fund, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, or to any other entity whose primary mission is to mitigate the impacts of climate change.

SA 1745. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for an assessed or voluntary contribution, grant, or other payment to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees or to any other organ, specialized agency, commission, or other formally affiliated body of the United Nations that provide funding or otherwise operates in Gaza.

SA 1746. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for reconstruction activities in Ukraine.

SA 1747. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make a grant through the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief to any organization that performs, promotes, counsels, or provides referrals for abortions.

SA 1748. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR GENDER AFFIRMING CARE.

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to perform, promote, counsel, or provide referrals for the provision of hormonal treatments or surgical care to affirm a person's chosen identity of his or her sex, if that chosen identity is incongruent with such person's biological sex.

SA 1749. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to carry out the policies described in the Department of Defense memorandum entitled ''Ensuring Access to Reproductive Health Care'' and dated October 20, 2022.

SA 1750. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON PREVENTING MODERNIZATION OF SENTINEL PROGRAM.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to prevent the modernization of the Sentinel intercontinental ballistic missile program.

SA 1751. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for a United States contribution to NATO.

SA 1752. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the Department of Defense may be used to carry out a reduction in end-strength personnel for any active, reserve, or civilian component of the Department.

SA 1753. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be obligated or expended for the Office for Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion of the Department of Defense or for any other diversity, equity, and inclusion office, position, or activity at the Department.

SA 1754. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Notwithstanding any other provision of any division of this Act, none of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Department of Defense to increase the force presence of the United States Armed Forces in the area of responsibility of the United States European Command.

SA 1755. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RULE RELATING TO COMBATING AUTO RETAIL SCAMS.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by any division of this Act may be used to enforce the provisions of the final rule submitted by the Federal Trade Commission relating to ''Combating Auto Retail Scams'' (commonly referred to as the ''CARS Rule'') (issued on December 12, 2023), or any substantially similar rule.

SA 1756. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds available for obligation or expenditure by the government

of the District of Columbia under any authority may be used to carry out the Reproductive Health Non-Discrimination Amendment Act of 2014 (D.C. Law 20–261) or to implement any rule or regulation promulgated to carry out that Act.

SA 1757. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the rule adopted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to ''The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act: Prevention and Elimination of Digital Discrimination'' (89 Fed. Reg. 4128 (January 22, 2024)).

SA 1758. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the rule adopted by the Federal Communications Commission in the Fourth Report and Order, Order on Reconsideration, and Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking in the matter of ''Review of the Commission's Broadcast and Cable Equal Employment Opportunity Rules and Policies'', adopted on February 7, 2024 (FCC 24–18).

SA 1759. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF COAST GUARD FUNDS FOR ABORTIONS.

No funds made available for the Coast Guard by this Act may be used to perform abortions or to provide travel or transportation allowances to obtain abortions.

SA 1760. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by any division of this Act may be obligated to any entity that financially supports, promotes, or hosts any obscene activities, including drag shows for children, BDSM, kink, or pedophilic practices.

SA 1761. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by any division of this Act may be used to implement or enforce any COVID–19 vaccine or face mask mandate.

SA 1762. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by any division of this Act may be used for purposes of conducting or supporting gain-of-function research.

SA 1763. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by any division of this Act may be used for the ''Saving on a Valuable Education'' plan (referred to as the ''SAVE plan'') for income-driven repayment of student loans (including student loan forgiveness under such plan) that was introduced by the Biden administration in 2023, or for any other student loan forgiveness plans introduced by the Biden Administration.

SA 1764. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT THE CLIMATE ADAPTATION AND RESILIENCE PLAN OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under any division of this Act may be used to implement the Climate Adaptation and Resilience Plan of the Department of Labor.

SA 1765. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Not withstanding any other provision of any division of this Act, no amounts shall be made available under any division of this Act, including through a grant program, to Planned Parenthood Federation of America or any its affiliates.

SA 1766. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by any division of this Act may be used for health centers based at an elementary school, secondary school, or postsecondary educational institution to promote or provide abortion or referrals for abortion services, or to promote or provide hormonal treatments or surgical care to affirm an individual's chosen identity of his or her sex, if that chosen identity is incongruent with such individual's biological sex.

SA 1767. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title V of division D, insert the following:

SEC. ____. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION OFFICES.

None of the funds appropriated under this division of this Act may be used for any activity of a diversity, equity, and inclusion office within the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Labor, the Department of Education, or the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

SA 1768. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by any division of this Act may be used to promote or provide hormonal treatments or surgical care to affirm an individual's chosen identity of his or her sex, if that chosen identity is incongruent with such individual's biological sex.

SA 1769. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR RULE.

None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available under any division of this Act may be used to implement the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to ''Employee or Independent Contractor Classification Under the Fair Labor Standards Act'' (89 Fed. Reg. 1638 (January 10, 2024)).

SA 1770. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____.

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, enforce, or

otherwise give effect to the provisions in the proposed rule entitled ''Short-Term, Limited-Duration Insurance; Independent, Noncoordinated Excepted Benefits Coverage; Level-Funded Plan Arrangements; and Tax Treatment of Certain Accident and Health Insurance'' (88 Fed. Reg. 44596; published on July 12, 2023) relating to modification of rules regarding independent, noncoordinated excepted benefits coverage or the tax treatment of employer reimbursements of employee medical expenses under certain accident and health plans.

SA 1771. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) In this section, the term ''earmark'' means—

(1) an item of Community Project Funding or Congressionally Directed Spending in any table relating to Community Project Funding/Congressionally Directed Spending that is referenced in any division of this consolidated Act or the explanatory statement described in section 4 of the matter preceding division A of this Act; or

(2) an item of Community Project Funding or Congressionally Directed Spending specified in any provision of any division of this consolidated Act or the explanatory statement described in section 4 of the matter preceding division A of this Act.

(b) When each Member of Congress that requested an earmark reads aloud the earmark on the floor of the House of Congress of the Member, the amounts made available for such earmark may be obligated and expended.

SA 1772. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the amounts appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to implement or support any international convention, agreement, protocol, legal instrument, or agreed outcome with legal force drafted by any United Nations body, the World Health Assembly, or any other intergovernmental negotiating body until such instrument has been subject to the requirements of article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States, which requires the advice and consent of the Senate, with two-thirds of Senators concurring.

SA 1773. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FUNDS FOR WEAPONS FOR UKRAINE OF SAME TYPE AS WEAPONS PENDING DELIVERY TO TAIWAN.

Notwithstanding any other provision of any division of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the Department of Defense may be used to enter into contracts for the procurement, through the Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative under section 1250(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 1068), of weapons of the same type as weapons pending delivery to Taiwan or other allies in the Indo-Pacific region through the foreign military sales process.

SA 1774. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Steward L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

DIVISION ____—REINS ACT

SEC. ___. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2024'' or the ''REINS Act of 2024''.

SEC. ___. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this division is to increase accountability for and transparency in the Federal regulatory process. Section 1 of article I of the United States Constitution grants all legislative powers to Congress. Over time, Congress has excessively delegated its constitutional charge while failing to conduct appropriate oversight and retain accountability for the content of the laws it passes. By requiring a vote in Congress, the REINS Act will result in more carefully drafted and detailed legislation, an improved regulatory process, and a legislative branch that is truly accountable to the American people for the laws imposed upon them.

SEC. ___. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING.

Chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 8—CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

''§ 801. Congressional review

''(a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

''(i) a copy of the rule;

''(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

''(iii) a finding, rendered in consultation with the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget, whether the rule is a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the finding specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 804(2);

''(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions;

''(v) the proposed effective date of the rule; and

''(vi) a statement of the constitutional authority authorizing the agency to make the rule.

''(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency promulgating the rule shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress (and to each committee of jurisdiction in each House)—

''(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs;

''(ii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of this title;

''(iii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995;

''(iv) an estimate of the effect on inflation of the rule; and

''(v) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

''(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(D) If requested in writing by a member of Congress—

''(i) the Comptroller General shall make a determination whether an agency action qualifies as a rule for purposes of this chapter, and shall submit to Congress this determination not later than 60 days after the date of the request; and

''(ii) the Comptroller General, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, shall make a determination whether a rule is considered a major rule under the provisions of this act, and shall submit to Congress this determination not later than 90 days after the date of the request.

For purposes of this section, a determination under this subparagraph shall be deemed to be a report under subparagraph (A).

''(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

''(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

''(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 802, whichever is later.

''(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 803 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

''(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this chapter in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

''(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 802.

''(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in subsection (a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

''(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

''(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

''(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

''(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

''(C) necessary for national security; or

''(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

''(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 802.

''(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this chapter, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

''(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days; or

''(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 802 and 803 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

''(2)(A) In applying sections 802 and 803 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

''(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

''(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day; or

''(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

''(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

''(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

''(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

''§ 802. Congressional approval procedure for major rules

''(a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

''(A) bears no preamble;

''(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.';

''(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): 'That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.'; and

''(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

''(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 801(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

''(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

''(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

''(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

''(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

''(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

''(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

''(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 801(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

''(h) This section and section 803 are enacted by Congress—

''(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

''(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

''§ 803. Congressional disapproval procedure for nonmajor rules

''(a) For purposes of this section, the term 'joint resolution' means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 801(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: 'That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

''(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

''(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

''(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

''(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

''(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

''(e) In the Senate, the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

''(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date; or

''(2) if the report under section 801(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 801(d)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

''(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

''(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

''(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

''(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

''(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

''§ 804. Definitions

''For purposes of this chapter:

''(1) The term 'Federal agency' means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1).

''(2) The term 'major rule' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget or the Federal agency promulgating such rule finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

''(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100 million or more;

''(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions;

''(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; or

''(D) in an increase in mandatory vaccinations.

''(3) The term 'nonmajor rule' means any rule that is not a major rule.

''(4) The term 'rule' has the meaning given such term in section 551, except that such term—

''(A) includes interpretative rules, general statements of policy, and all other agency guidance documents; and

''(B) does not include—

''(i) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

''(ii) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

''(iii) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of nonagency parties.

''(5) The term 'submission or publication date', except as otherwise provided in this chapter, means—

''(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

''(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 801(a)(1); and

''(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

''§ 805. Judicial review

''(a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this chapter shall be subject to judicial review.

''(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this chapter for a rule to take effect.

''(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 802 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

''§ 806. Exemption for monetary policy

''Nothing in this chapter shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

''§ 807. Effective date of certain rules

''Notwithstanding section 801—

''(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

''(2) any rule other than a major rule which an agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency promulgating the rule determines.

''§ 808. Review of rules currently in effect

''(a) ANNUAL REVIEW.—Beginning on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this section and annually thereafter for the 4 years following, each agency shall designate not less than 20 percent of eligible rules made by that agency for review, and shall submit a report including each such eligible rule in the same manner as a report under section 801(a)(1). Section 801, section 802, and section 803 shall apply to each such rule, subject to subsection (c) of this section. No eligible rule previously designated may be designated again.

''(b) SUNSET FOR ELIGIBLE RULES NOT EXTENDED.—Beginning after the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this section, if Congress has not enacted a joint resolution of approval for that eligible rule, that eligible rule shall not continue in effect.

''(c) APPROVAL OF RULES.—

''(1) Unless Congress approves all eligible rules designated by executive agencies for review within 90 days of designation, they shall have no effect.

''(2) A single joint resolution of approval shall apply to all eligible rules in a report designated for a year as follows: 'That Congress approves the rules submitted by the_____ for the year _____.' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

''(3) A member of either House may move that a separate joint resolution be required for a specified rule.

''(d) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term 'eligible rule' means a rule that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this section.''.

SEC. ___. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.

Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rule subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 802 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

SEC. ___. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States

shall submit a report (and publish the report on the website of the Comptroller General) to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SA 1775. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CENTRAL BANK DIGITAL CURRENCY.

None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to mint a central bank digital currency or carry out a central bank digital currency pilot program.

SA 1776. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Section 1017 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5497) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by amending the subsection heading to read as follows: ''BUDGET, FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT, AND AUDIT'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3);

(C) by redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (1) and (2), respectively; and

(D) in paragraph (1), as so redesignated, by striking subparagraphs (E) and (F);

(2) by striking subsections (b) and (c);

(3) by redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (c), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) and inserting the following:

''(1) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Bureau $650,000,000 for fiscal year 2024 to carry out the authorities of the Bureau.''; and

(B) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (2).

SEC. _____. (a) The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 1011 (12 U.S.C. 5491)—

(A) in subsection (a)—

(i) by striking ''in the Federal Reserve System,''; and

(ii) by striking ''independent bureau'' and inserting ''independent agency'';

(B) by striking subsections (b), (c), and (d);

(C) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (j);

(D) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

''(b) AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE REGULATIONS.—The commission of the Bureau—

''(1) may prescribe such regulations and issue such orders in accordance with this title as the Bureau may determine to be necessary for carrying out this title and all other laws within the jurisdiction of the Bureau; and

''(2) shall exercise any authorities granted under this title and all other laws within the jurisdiction of the Bureau.

''(c) COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The management of the Bureau shall be vested in a commission (referred to in this section as the 'commission'), which shall be composed of 5 members who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and at least 2 of whom shall have private sector experience in the provision of consumer financial products and services.

''(2) STAGGERING.—The members of the commission shall serve staggered terms, which initially shall be established by the President for terms of 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 years, respectively.

''(3) TERMS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Except with respect to the initial staggered terms described in paragraph (2), each member of the commission, including the Chair, shall serve for a term of 5 years.

''(B) REMOVAL.—The President may remove any member of the commission for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

''(C) VACANCIES.—Any member of the commission appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term to which that member's predecessor was appointed (including the Chair) shall be appointed only for the remainder of the term.

''(D) CONTINUATION OF SERVICE.—Each member of the commission may continue to serve after the expiration of the term of office to which that member was appointed until a successor has been appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, except that a member may not continue to serve more than 1 year after the date on which the term of that member would otherwise expire.

''(E) OTHER EMPLOYMENT PROHIBITED.—No member of the commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

''(d) AFFILIATION.—Not more than 3 members of the commission shall be members of any 1 political party.

''(e) CHAIR OF THE COMMISSION.—

''(1) INITIAL CHAIR.—The first member and Chair of the commission shall be the individual serving as Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection on the day before the date of enactment of this subsection. Such individual shall serve until the President has appointed all 5 members of the commission in accordance with subsection (c).

''(2) SUBSEQUENT CHAIR.—Of the 5 members appointed in accordance with subsection (c), the President shall appoint 1 member to serve as the subsequent Chair of the commission.

''(3) AUTHORITY.—The Chair shall be the principal executive officer of the commission, and shall exercise all of the executive and administrative functions of the commission, including with respect to—

''(A) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed under the commission (other than personnel employed regularly and full time in the immediate offices of members of the commission other than the Chair);

''(B) the distribution of business among personnel appointed and supervised by the Chair and among administrative units of the commission; and

''(C) the use and expenditure of funds.

''(4) LIMITATION.—In carrying out any of the functions of the Chair under this subsection, the Chair shall be governed by general policies of the commission and by such regulatory decisions, findings, and determinations as the commission may by law be authorized to make.

''(5) REQUESTS OR ESTIMATES RELATED TO APPROPRIATIONS.—Requests or estimates for regular, supplemental, or deficiency appropriations on behalf of the commission may not be submitted by the Chair without the prior approval of the commission.

''(6) DESIGNATION.—The Chair shall be known as both the 'Chair of the commission' of the Bureau and the 'Chair of the Bureau'.

''(f) INITIAL QUORUM ESTABLISHED.—For the 6 month period beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection, the first member and Chair of the commission described in subsection (e)(1) shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business until the President has appointed all 5 members of the commission in accordance with subsection (c). Following such appointment of 5 members, the quorum requirements of subsection (g) shall apply.

''(g) NO IMPAIRMENT BY REASON OF VACANCIES.—No vacancy in the members of the commission after the establishment of an initial quorum under subsection (f) shall impair the right of the remaining members of the commission to exercise all the powers of the commission. Three members of the commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business, except that if there are only 3 members serving on the commission because of vacancies in the commission, 2 members of the commission shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. If there are only 2 members serving on the commission because of vacancies in the commission, 2 members shall constitute a quorum for the 6-month period beginning on the date of the vacancy which caused the number of commission members to decline to 2.

''(h) SEAL.—The Bureau shall have an official seal.

''(i) COMPENSATION.—

''(1) CHAIR.—The Chair shall receive compensation at the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level I of the Executive Schedule under section 5313 of title 5, United States Code.

''(2) OTHER MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION.—The 4 other members of the commission shall each receive compensation at the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level II of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5, United States Code.''; and

(E) in subsection (j), as so redesignated, in the second sentence, by striking '', including in cities in which the Federal reserve banks, or branches of such banks, are located,'';

(2) in section 1012(c) (12 U.S.C. 5492(c))—

(A) in the subsection heading, by striking ''AUTONOMY OF THE BUREAU'' and inserting ''COORDINATION WITH THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS'';

(B) by striking paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5); and

(C) by striking ''GOVERNORS'' in the subsection heading, as amended by this subsection, and all that follows through ''Notwithstanding any'' in paragraph (1) and inserting the following:''GOVERNORS.—Notwithstanding any''; and

(3) in section 1014(b) (12 U.S.C. 5494(b)), by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: ''Not fewer than ½ of all members shall have private sector experience in the provision of consumer financial products and services.''.

(b) Any reference in a law, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, except in subsection (e)(1) of section 1011 of the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5491), as added by this Act, shall be deemed a reference to the commission leading and governing the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, as described in such section 1011, as amended by this Act.

(c)(1)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(i) by striking ''Director of the Bureau'' each place that term appears, other than

where that term is used to refer to a Director other than the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and inserting ''Bureau'';

(ii) by striking ''Director'' each place that term appears and inserting ''Bureau'', other than where that term is used to refer to a Director other than the Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection; and

(iii) in section 1002 (12 U.S.C. 5481), by striking paragraph (10).

(B)(i) The Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 (12 U.S.C. 5481 et seq.) is amended—

(I) in section 1013 (12 U.S.C. 5493)—

(aa) in subsection (c)(3)—

(AA) by striking ''Assistant Director of the Bureau for'' and inserting ''Head of the Office of''; and

(BB) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''Assistant Director'' and inserting ''Head of the Office''; and

(bb) in subsection (g)(2)—

(AA) in the paragraph heading, by striking ''ASSISTANT DIRECTOR'' and inserting ''HEAD OF THE OFFICE''; and

(BB) by striking ''an assistant director'' and inserting ''a Head of the Office of Financial Protection for Older Americans'';

(II) in section 1016(a) (12 U.S.C. 5496(a)), by striking ''Director of the Bureau'' and inserting ''Chair of the Bureau''; and

(III) by striking section 1066 (12 U.S.C. 5586).

(ii) The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (Public Law 111–203) is amended by striking the item relating to section 1066.

(2) The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act (12 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.) is amended—

(A) in section 111(b)(1)(D) (12 U.S.C. 5321(b)(1)(D)), by striking ''Director'' and inserting ''Chair''; and

(B) in section 1447 (12 U.S.C. 1701p–2), by striking ''Director of the Bureau'' each place that term appears and inserting ''Chair of the Bureau''.

(3) Section 921(a)(4)(C) of the Electronic Fund Transfer Act (15 U.S.C. 1693o–2(a)(4)(C)) is amended by striking ''Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection'' and inserting ''Chair of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection''.

(4) The Expedited Funds Availability Act (12 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) is amended by striking ''Director of the Bureau'' each place that term appears and inserting ''Bureau''.

(5) Section 2 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1812) is amended by striking ''Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau'' each place that term appears and inserting ''Chair of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection''.

(6) Section 1004(a)(4) of the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3303(a)(4)) is amended by striking ''Director of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau'' and inserting ''Chair of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection''.

(7) Section 513 of the Financial Literacy and Education Improvement Act (20 U.S.C. 9702) is amended by striking ''Director'' each place that term appears and inserting ''Chair''.

(8) Section 307 of the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975 (12 U.S.C. 2806 et seq) is amended by striking ''Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection'' each place that term appears and inserting ''Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection''.

(9) The Interstate Land Sales Full Disclosure Act (15 U.S.C. 1701 et seq) is amended—

(A) in section 1402 (15 U.S.C. 1701)—

(i) by striking paragraph (1); and

(ii) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (12) as paragraphs (1) through (11), respectively;

(B) in section 1403(c) (15 U.S.C. 1702(c))—

(i) by striking ''him'' and inserting ''the Bureau''; and

(ii) by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the Bureau'';

(C) in section 1407 (15 U.S.C. 1706)—

(i) in subsection (c), by striking ''he'' and inserting ''the Bureau''; and

(ii) in subsection (e), by striking ''Director or anyone designated by him'' and inserting ''Bureau'';

(D) in section 1411(a) (15 U.S.C. 1710(a))—

(i) by striking ''his findings'' and inserting ''the findings of the Bureau''; and

(ii) by striking ''his recommendation'' and inserting ''the recommendation of the Bureau'';

(E) in section 1415 (15 U.S.C. 1714)—

(i) in subsection (a), by striking ''he may, in his discretion,'' and inserting ''the Bureau may, in the discretion of the Bureau,'';

(ii) in subsection (b)—

(I) by striking ''in his discretion'' each place that term appears and inserting ''in the discretion of the Bureau'';

(II) by striking ''he deems'' and inserting ''the Bureau determines''; and

(III) by striking ''he may deem'' and inserting ''the Bureau may determine''; and

(iii) in subsection (c), by striking ''the Director, or any officer designated by him,'' and inserting ''the Bureau'';

(F) in section 1416(a) (15 U.S.C. 1715(a))—

(i) by striking ''Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection who may delegate any of his'' and inserting ''Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, which may delegate any'';

(ii) by striking ''his administrative'' and inserting ''administrative''; and

(iii) by striking ''himself'' and inserting ''the commission of the Bureau'';

(G) in section 1418a(b)(4) (15 U.S.C. 1717a(b)(4)), by striking ''Secretary's determination'' and inserting ''determination of the Bureau''; and

(H) by striking ''Director'' each place that term appears and inserting ''Bureau''.

(10) Section 5 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (12 U.S.C. 2604) is amended—

(A) by striking ''The Director of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Director')'' and inserting ''The Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection (hereafter in this section referred to as the 'Bureau')''; and

(B) by striking ''Director'' each place that term appears and inserting ''Bureau''.

(11) The S.A.F.E. Mortgage Licensing Act of 2008 (12 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.) is amended—

(A) by striking ''Director'' each place that term appears in headings and text and inserting ''Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection''; and

(B) in section 1503 (12 U.S.C. 5102), by striking paragraph (10).

(12) Section 3513(c) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking ''Director of the''.

SA 1777. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. BENEFICIAL OWNERSHIP.

None of the funds made available under this Act may be used by the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network to—

(1) request or gather beneficial ownership information under section 5336 of title 31, United States Code; or

(2) carry out regulations prescribed under section 6403 of the Corporate Transparency Act (title LXIV of division F of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116–283; 134 Stat. 4605)) or amendments made by that section.

SA 1778. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by any division of this Act may be used for any Federal agency if that Federal agency receives an appropriation through an Act of Congress for implementing provisions of Executive Order 14019 (86 Fed. Reg. 13623; relating to promoting access to voting).

SA 1779. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. PROHIBITION ON FUNDING DIVERSITY, EQUITY, AND INCLUSION OFFICES.

None of the funds appropriated under this division of this Act may be used for any activity of the Office of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in the Department of the Treasury, the Office of Equity, Diversity & Inclusion of the Internal Revenue Service, and the Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Civil Rights of the Small Business Administration.

SA 1780. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 2882, to reauthorize the Morris K. Udall and Stewart L. Udall Trust Fund, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Climate Hub of the Department of the Treasury.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 closed and open

session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 21, 2024, at 8 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 21, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 21, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, March 21, 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 21, 2024, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Ms. BUTLER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that floor privileges be granted for the balance of the day for my interns: Daniel Soria, Senaite Habtewolde, and Phoebe Perkins.

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

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 7024

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 7024) to make improvements to the child tax credit, to provide tax incentives to promote economic growth, to provide special rules for the taxation of certain residents of Taiwan with income from sources within the United States, to provide tax relief with respect to certain Federal disasters, to make improvements to the low-income housing tax credit, and for other purposes.

Mr. SCHUMER. In order to place the bill on the Calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

EXTENDING THE DEADLINE TO COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS ON THE RED RIVER

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4050, which is at the desk.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4050) to extend the deadline to commence construction of certain hydroelectric projects on the Red River.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 4050) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 4050

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF DEADLINE TO COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS ON THE RED RIVER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding the time period specified in section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) that would otherwise apply to Federal Energy Regulatory Commission projects numbered P–12756 and P–13160, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'') may, at the request of the licensee for the applicable project, and after reasonable notice, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of that section and the procedures of the Commission under that section, extend the time period during which each licensee is required to commence construction of the applicable project for one year from the date of the expiration of the extension most recently issued by the Commission under that section for the applicable project.

(b) REINSTATEMENT OF EXPIRED LICENSE.—If the time period required under section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) for commencement of construction of a project described in subsection (a) expires before the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Commission may reinstate the license for the applicable project effective as of the date of expiration of the license; and

(2) the extension authorized under subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of that expiration.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions: S. Res. 611, S. Res. 612, S. Res. 613, S. Res. 614, and S. Res. 615.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this resolution concerns a request for evidence in a criminal action pending in Nevada Federal district court. In this action, the defendant is charged with making threatening telephone calls last year to the offices of Senator JACKY ROSEN and Senator CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO. Trial is scheduled to commence in May.

The prosecution is seeking documents and testimony from employees of Senator ROSEN's and Senator CORTEZ MASTO's offices. The Senators would like to cooperate with this request by providing relevant employee testimony and documents from their offices.

The enclosed resolution would authorize employees in the offices of Senator ROSEN and Senator CORTEZ MASTO to testify and produce documents on behalf of their respective offices in this action, with representation by the Senate legal counsel.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MARCH 22, 2024

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 11 a.m. on Friday, March 22; that 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 Gonzalez nomination; further, that at 12 noon the Senate vote on confirmation of the Gonzalez nomination; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed during Friday's session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 Senator LANKFORD.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I am planning to bring three amendments to this set of appropriations bills that are coming. As we are quickly reading through it and going through the details and the information on the six

different sections of our Federal funding, which is incredibly important that we actually get done, there are many amendments that are here and many questions that have been raised.

I am raising a couple of them on two different issues. The first is a very specific issue. It has been a challenge for us on dealing with an entity called special interests aliens. It is a term you and I know, but many other people around the country do not know.

Special interest alien is an actual designation the Department of Homeland Security places on an individual when they cross the border based on where they are traveling from, maybe their connections there, areas of known terrorism, their travel patterns. The definition from the Department of Homeland Security is a special interest alien is a non-U.S. person who, based on an analysis of travel patterns, potentially poses a national security risk to the United States for its interest.

Just to be clear, when they are labeled ''special interest aliens,'' the Department of Homeland Security is declaring this person potentially a national security risk to the United States. When that individual is encountered at our southern border—we asked many questions both of FBI and DHS—what happens next?

In the past 5 months, we had 58 individuals who were on our Terror Watchlist. Those individuals on our Terror Watchlist, we know who they are. They have been identified. They were detained. We cannot get an exact number of the number of special interest aliens. These are individuals we know have terror links or come from an area where there is known terrorism or are traveling in a travel pattern that we know other terrorists have traveled on, so we know that much about them, but we don't know anything else about them.

We asked the simple question: Are they detained? The answer so far has been: Not all of them.

When someone at the southern border is declared a national security risk, we think it is reasonable to have that person detained at our southern border. In the past several days, we had almost 7,000 people a day illegally crossing our border. We don't know how many of those were labeled a national security risk, but we do believe the number in the past few months has been in the thousands.

But DHS has yet to give us the exact number. We have, potentially, in the thousands of people who have been declared by this administration as a potential national security risk, and they cannot tell us if they have been detained, their whereabouts for all of them, how they determined that they were a national security risk, or what happens next.

So the amendment I am bringing is very simple. The amendment I am bringing is to say we do not allow funding to be used to release people who have been designated a potential national security risk and to have them released into the United States so we don't have a situation where we have individuals identified at the border as a potential national security risk and then they were just released on their own recognizance for a future hearing. That needs to be fixed. I wish it was fixed today, but it is not. It is an issue. This is an issue that I have raised for a year now, both with DHS and with the FBI.

I recently met with ICE at a hearing. And when I met with some of the leadership from ICE, I asked them about this on the detention. This was the response I got from ICE, current administration: It is accurate that we are not tracking special interest aliens on a day-to-day basis, not the totality of them. Some are probably on alternatives to detention where we have more tracking on, but we are not tracking all of them.

Those who are on alternative detention means they have been released into the country, given a GPS device to turn themselves in later, after at the border they were declared a potential national security risk.

To this body, I would challenge us to say: What would it take for us to detain those individuals and to make sure that we are not releasing people into the country whom we recognize, literally, at the border are a national security risk?

That is why I am bringing this amendment to this bill to say this is a commonsense approach to be able to deal with a very pragmatic national security risk.

A second set of amendments that I am bringing actually deals with two earmarks. There are lots of earmarks in this bill, and we can have our own debate on earmarks in this body. I don't actually request earmarks on it. I want competitive grants. I want to make sure we are focused on the highest national security priorities and the national priorities that we have—and we have many. My State has several. Many of your States do as well.

We should compete for those to be able to make sure they were reaching the highest priorities. But I do understand there are some in this body who disagree with me on that. I disagree with some of the earmarks that are in this, and I see differences of opinions on some that are here. Some deal, though, with military bases and certain construction, which is totally understandable. Some deal with schools and certain construction—totally understandable. Some deal with a couple of issues that I just have a difference of opinion that is pretty strong.

Two of them deal with hospitals. Two of these earmarks deal with a hospital. One of them is Dartmouth Hitchcock hospital in New Hampshire and the other one is Women & Infants Hospital in Rhode Island.

What would be unique about those hospitals? Well, this is about $2.5 million in earmarks between the two of them. These two hospitals actually do late-term abortions. They are different than other hospitals that are on the earmark list. In fact, not only do these two hospitals actually do late-term abortions, they actually advertise that they do late-term abortions and put the word out. They make statements about that they are. Let me see if I can pull this out. They make statements they have not only supported late-term abortions up to 22 weeks, but they are ready to be able to do that.

As one says, they routinely provide abortions up to 22 weeks. At 22 weeks, we are pushing 5 months of pregnancy. We have children who are alive today who were born premature at 21 weeks. But they are alive today because they were able to get the care when they had a premature delivery at 21 weeks.

To make it clear, this is what we are actually up against and what this looks like compared to other countries and locations: Spain does not allow abortion after 14 weeks. It is not legal because the country of Spain considers late-term abortion after 14 weeks. Germany restricts abortion after 12 weeks. Italy restricts abortion after 12 weeks.

Twenty-two weeks is a late-term abortion. Most locations do not do that. We have a lot of differences of opinion on this issue of life and the value of every single child. I understand that.

We had respectful dialogue in this Chamber multiple times on this issue as I brought this up, but at 22 weeks there is no question that a child feels pain in the womb. There is no question that at 22 weeks, all science shows that a baby in the womb can recognize its own mom's voice and will jump in the womb when there is a loud sound. At 22 weeks, a baby even already has developed taste buds.

Twenty-two weeks is a late-term abortion. And two of these hospitals that have designated earmarks perform this, and I have an objection to that.

I think we, as a body, should talk about not just our standard for this but what does that mean. Can I just say it as simple as this? Even under the standard of Roe v. Wade that the Supreme Court has now turned back to the States, in this body, after the Dobbs decision, even under the standard of Roe v. Wade, 22 weeks is past the time that would be recognized that a child is viable based on previous experience with other children who have been born even before that and have survived and thrived. We, as a body, should recognize that.

And I do object to those earmarks and think that is the wrong direction for Federal dollars to be used to be able to supply a hospital with dollars that is performing this type of late-term abortion.

So I object to those two and will continue to be able to speak out on behalf of every child and the value of every child and their life in the days ahead. We have a decision to make as a body.

Are we going to stop the release of special interest aliens who have been designated by this administration to be a potential national security risk? And are we going to use Federal dollars to actually provide for late-term abortions through this bill? We will decide that tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:16 p.m., adjourned until Friday, March 22, 2024, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE 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

MAJ. GEN. STEPHEN F. JOST

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

ROBERT U. WRIGHT, JR.

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

KRISTIN N. CONTI

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DIRECTOR OF ADMISSIONS, UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 7433(C) AND 7436(B):

To be colonel

RANCE A. LEE

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

KOURTNEY C. SLAUGHTER

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

KEVIN J. BARRY

IN THE SPACE FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

JABB B. BUMANGLAG
CHRISTIAN J. YOUNG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES SPACE FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

BRANDEN E. BUFFALO

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MICHAEL LOUIS SULMEYER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE. (NEW POSITION)

CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

FELIX R. SANCHEZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 31, 2028, VICE ROBERT A. MANDELL, TERM EXPIRED.

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

CHRISTOPHER T. HANSON, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2029. (REAPPOINTMENT)

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

DARYLE WILLIAMS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2030, VICE SHELLY COLLEEN LOWE, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

RAHKEL BOUCHET, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE ROBERT E. MORIN, RETIRED.

JOHN CUONG TRUONG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSOCIATE JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE WENDELL P. GARDNER, JR., RETIRED.

REBECCA L. PENNELL, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, VICE SALVADOR MENDOZA, JR., ELEVATED.

KEVIN GAFFORD RITZ, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT, VICE JULIA SMITH GIBBONS, RETIRING.

DETRA SHAW–WILDER, OF FLORIDA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, VICE ROBERT N. SCOLA, JR., RETIRED.

JEANNETTE A. VARGAS, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, VICE PAUL G. GARDEPHE, RETIRED.

BRIAN EDWARD MURPHY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, VICE PATTI B. SARIS, RETIRING.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

BOBBY JACK WOODS, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE NORMAN EUELL ARFLACK, TERM EXPIRED.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate March 21, 2024:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

JOSE JAVIER RODRIGUEZ, OF FLORIDA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR.