



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 21, 2024

No. 88

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

Let us pray.

Father in Heaven, hallowed be Your name. Today, give special energy, insight, and patience to the Members of this body. Strengthen them against relentless pressures from constituents, lobbyists, and special interests, as You give them wisdom to resolve their differences without rancor or bitterness. Lead them in the way of compromise that doesn't sacrifice principle or self-respect and that preserves timeless values, which serve the common good. May their consistent communion with You radiate on their faces, be expressed in their character, and be exuded in positive joy.

Lord, fill this Chamber with Your spirit and our Senators with Your strength, courage, and peace. We pray in Your gracious Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, May 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.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BORDER ACT OF 2024—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S. 4361.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S. 4361, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for border security and combatting fentanyl for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 397, S. 4361, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for border security and combatting fentanyl for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Christopher Murphy, Richard J. Durbin, Tammy Duckworth, Tammy Baldwin, Catherine Cortez Masto, Brian Schatz, Mark R. Warner, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Debbie Stabenow, Gary C. Peters, Margaret Wood Hassan, Jeanne Shaheen, Angus S. King, Jr., Benjamin L. Cardin, Christopher A. Coons, John W. Hickenlooper, Jack Reed.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 8369

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 8369) to provide for the expeditious delivery of defense articles and defense services for Israel and other matters.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, for years, our Republican colleagues have insisted that the only real long-term solution to fixing the southern border was for Congress to pass legislation. We Democrats agree: Congress must

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



Printed on recycled paper.

act. We need to fix the border and reform immigration to make it fairer and more humane.

This week, Republicans will have an opportunity to join us in taking action. A few moments ago, I filed cloture on the motion to proceed to the bipartisan Border Act, the same bill negotiated 3 months ago by the bipartisan group of Senators MURPHY, SINEMA, and LANKFORD.

The Senate will vote on this bipartisan border bill on Thursday. Last night, the President called both Leader MCCONNELL and Speaker JOHNSON and urged them to go forward with our bill. All those who say we need to act on the border will get a chance this week to show they are serious about fixing the problem.

Unlike H.R. 2, the bipartisan Border Act was written explicitly to win support from both parties with input—significant input—from both sides. The Border Act is an exercise in legislating; H.R. 2 is not.

When Republicans pushed H.R. 2, it couldn't even get a single Democratic vote here in the Senate, much less all Senate Republicans, for that matter. That was not a serious bill. What we are voting on this week is serious.

It is the same bipartisan bill both sides negotiated for months last winter. It is the same bill endorsed by the National Border Patrol Council, a very conservative group; by the Chamber of Commerce; and by the very conservative Wall Street Journal editorial page.

By any objective measure, it is strong and realistic, and, most importantly, a bipartisan proposal. If our bipartisan bill was good enough to win the support of the union that represents border agents, why isn't it good enough for Senate Republicans? Are Senate Republicans saying they know better than our agents patrolling the border? I hope that is not true. I hope our Republican colleagues are ready to join us.

I will be clear: We don't expect every Democrat or every Republican to come out in favor of this bill. That is why, as I have said before, the only way to pass this bill or any border bill is with broad bipartisan support.

If you go by what Republicans said over the last few months, you would think they would leap at an opportunity like the one we have right now. In the words of Speaker JOHNSON, "The time to act on [the border] is yesterday." In the words of my colleague from Texas, "It makes no sense to me for us to do nothing when we might be able to make things better." And in the words of my colleague from South Carolina, "To those who think that if President Trump wins . . . that we can get a better deal—you won't." And he added, "This moment will pass. Do not let it pass."

Well, I wholeheartedly agree. We should not let this moment pass. Border legislation is just about the hardest thing Congress ever wrestles with. Bi-

partisan border bills are rare opportunities here in Congress. That is precisely why we have it in front of us this week. I urge everyone not to let the politics get in the way.

ABORTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now, on abortion, shortly, I will join Senators MURRAY, BALDWIN, KELLY, and some of the Nation's leading reproductive rights activists to highlight the terrible consequences of repealing the protections of Roe v. Wade.

The MAGA Supreme Court repealed Roe nearly 2 years ago. It will go down as one of the worst—if not the worst—Supreme Court decisions of modern American history. In one fell swoop, MAGA radicals on the Court made it so that our children and grandchildren will sadly grow up with fewer civil liberties than those who came before them.

Repealing Roe was tragic. It was alarming. It was outrageous, but it didn't happen in a vacuum. It happened because Senate Republicans packed our courts with hard-right judges, plucked right out of the Federalist Society checklist. It happened because Donald Trump appointed not one, not two, but three MAGA Justices, all who voted to overturn Roe. Remember what Donald Trump said a few weeks ago? He was "proud" to be the person who paved the way to overturn Roe.

And after Roe was eradicated, MAGA radicals opened the floodgates for draconian and cruel bans for women's choice across America. And we know this is just the beginning.

Does anyone seriously doubt that should Trump become President again, he won't try to add even more extreme jurists to the bench so he can continue his assault on women's reproductive freedoms? Of course, he will. And the Republican Senators, if past is prologue, are likely, unfortunately, to go along. If Donald Trump and MAGA Republicans get into power, the hard right will not rest until a national abortion ban becomes the law of the land. Mark my words, that is the direction that they will take America in.

House Republicans already included the national abortion ban in their recent Republican Study Committee budget. Remember, the Republican Study Committee includes a majority of House Republicans and their leadership.

Roe may be gone, but, sadly, the hard right's obsession with eliminating reproductive rights is not. Make no mistake, Republicans will have to answer for their anti-abortion records today, tomorrow, and at the ballot box in November.

GUN SAFETY

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on guns, 2 years ago, serious-minded Democrats and serious-minded Republicans came together to pass the most

significant bipartisan gun safety bill in 30 years. We passed several new, commonsense rules in our gun safety bill, including rules closing dangerous loopholes on background checks. And I salute so many of my colleagues—led by CHRIS MURPHY and KYRSTEN SINEMA—who helped make this happen.

Yesterday, those rules on background checks were supposed to go into effect, but, sadly, MAGA extremists had other plans. Instead, MAGA extremists exploited our justice system and put our background check reforms on ice. How did they do it? By taking their case to their favorite judge in the country, in the Northern District of Texas, to rubberstamp a nationwide injunction.

The decision out of Texas is terrible for America for two reasons: First, the decision out of Texas is another consequence of judge shopping, a deeply unfair practice which jaundices the whole fairness and support a judicial system has where radicals—rightwing MAGA radicals—all but guarantee a favorable outcome by going to a judge of their choice, often in jurisdictions where there is only one sitting judge in that local division, guaranteeing a favorable audience and guaranteeing a favorable outcome.

No one had any doubt when these rightwing anti-gun safety groups went to this one judge—the very same judge who knocked out mifepristone—no one had any doubt what decision they would receive.

Judge shopping jaundices our legal system like few other abuses do. I have introduced a bill to rein in judge shopping, and I hope both sides can work together on this legislation to restore fairness to the judicial system.

If not, we are going to see injustice after injustice, a slanted judicial system, leaning in favor of hard-right radicals imposing its will on the rest of the Nation. And the courts will have less and less respect because of it.

I urge the Judicial Conference—they agree judge shopping is bad, forum shopping is bad, but they are doing nothing to implement it. They should.

But second, maybe even worse, the decision out of Texas means MAGA radicals have temporarily succeeded in blocking commonsense gun safety measures and making our communities less safe. There were outrages in Uvalde, in Buffalo.

And, finally, the Congress, in a bipartisan way, enacted the strongest gun safety laws in decades, ever since probably I passed the Brady Law and assault weapons ban—those were my bills in the House—in 1994.

And now people are less safe—less safe—because people who shouldn't have guns, young people, are getting them. Closing loopholes on background checks help keep guns out of the hands of people who shouldn't have them.

Keeping dangerous weapons out of the hands of dangerous people should be something both sides can agree on. But, sadly, MAGA Republicans and the rightwing gun lobby thinks the opposite. And with forum shopping, they

can almost automatically get their way at least in the district courts.

PACT ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, finally, on the PACT Act, this is some good news. Today, President Biden will announce some very good news. It is very good news for our Nation's veterans. The Biden administration has now approved over 1 million claims from over 880,000 veterans still suffering from burn pit exposure thanks to our PACT Act.

When we passed the PACT Act 2 years ago, it was the most significant expansion of veterans' healthcare benefits in generations. It sent a message to our veterans suffering from cancer, lung disease, and other ailments from burn pits that we are here for you. I am glad to see the PACT Act is delivering on its promise and helping our veterans to get the care and benefits they deserve.

And like the gun bill I mentioned before and like the IRA and like the Chips and Science bill, it reminds us, when Democrats led in the House, led in the Senate, and had the Presidency, we got so much done for the American people.

FARM BILL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on the farm bill, later this week, House Republicans on the House Committee on Agriculture intend to mark up their version of the farm bill that I believe falls terribly short.

The farm bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation that Congress works on, with consequences that affect tens of millions of Americans and a broad range of interests, from farmers, both big and small, to nutrition advocates, to climate champions and rural development advocates who rebuild local economies and create jobs—lots of jobs—in rural America. Some of these agriculture programs have helped rural parts of Upstate New York over and over again.

A good farm bill represents all of the interests I just mentioned. So passing a farm bill has always been—and must be—bipartisan, but, once again, the path MAGA-right House Republicans are taking with their farm bill breaks with the bipartisan tradition, which has always enshrined the ag bill. A purely partisan bill that departs from the longstanding spirit of bipartisan cooperation, unfortunately, will not have a future in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

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. McCONNELL. 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

FDIC

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, FDIC Chairman Mark Gruenberg announced he was prepared to step down from his position and expressed pride in maintaining public confidence in the Nation's banking system. Unfortunately, there is little such confidence in his ability to foster a safe working environment for the Agency's employees.

But despite alarming reports about rampant sexual harassment, abuse, and retaliation at the FDIC, Senate Democrats in positions to insist on change have actually pulled their punches. Instead of calls for Mr. Gruenberg's prompt resignation, we have heard everything from confidence in his ability to lead change at the Agency to delicate suggestions that the President nominate a new Chair.

The senior-most members of the Banking Committee apparently can't bring themselves to call a spade a spade. Surely, their reluctance has nothing to do with the FDIC's line of succession, which would fill a vacancy with the Agency's distinguished Vice Chair, who happens to be a Republican.

Surely, our colleagues won't play politics in the face of such glaring failures of leadership at a major regulatory authority. The Senate's oversight responsibility is serious business. I hope our colleagues in the majority are up to the task.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, yesterday, the Democratic leader once again tipped his cap to President Biden for what he describes as "many actions" in "recent weeks" to secure the southern border, which leads me with a couple of questions: First, what took the President so long? And, second, why isn't he taking the actions we know would actually begin to address the crisis that he actually invited?

The reason I ask is because time matters here. The cost of an average day of avoidable crisis at the border is measured in thousands of apprehensions of illegal arrivals and the interdiction of lethal drugs like fentanyl.

And if that is not alarming enough, consider the story reported earlier this month of the catch-and-release of a military-age male who spent 2 years free in the interior of the country before he was detained for alleged affiliations with ISIS-K.

Of course, everything I have mentioned so far we only know because the Border Patrol was able to stop it. But think about what border officials know they are not catching—the known "got-aways."

For 10 years before President Biden took office, under administrations of both parties, an average of about 125,000 people per year successfully crossed the southern border and escaped into the interior. On the Biden administration's watch, in fiscal years 2021 through 2023, the average tally of known "got-aways" is 550,000—from 125,000 to more than half a million.

President Biden's Press Secretary says this administration has "done more . . . than anybody else" to secure the border. But if you wanted to make that claim true, you would say this President has done more than anyone else to make the tough jobs of CBP and other law enforcement personnel even tougher.

In fact, one sobering new report suggests that contending for years with a historic humanitarian and security crisis without effective enforcement authorities is taking a heavy toll on the men and women of the Border Patrol. The rate of suicide among CBP personnel is three times higher than it was a decade ago. As one agent told reporters, "when it turned out that the job became nothing more than processing and releasing these people, that was very hard to take."

Going soft on border security may have started as just a shortsighted campaign strategy. A reckless debate-stage promise to "surge" asylum seekers to the border might have been just a cynical play to court leftwing voters, but after 3 years on the job, President Biden's failure to perform one of the most basic functions of his office isn't endearing. It is not some impressive sign of leftwing bona fides.

It is a glaring, avoidable failure, a profound moral embarrassment, and even Washington Democrats are beginning to recognize it as a tremendous political liability. The American people are telling poll after poll that they are alarmed by the border crisis and want to see real solutions.

Fortunately, the quickest way for the President to start undoing the damage he invented is to restore and use the authorities he already has at his disposal, like "Remain in Mexico" and border wall construction. Any of our Democratic colleagues who recognize that the President must act ought to start telling him so.

It is time for the Biden administration to start exercising its immense authority to restore sanity and start cleaning up the mess at our southern border. The time for distractions is long, long past.

STUDENT LOANS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on one final matter, speaking of the failure to discharge basic responsibilities—the Biden administration's Department of Education.

Around the country, high school seniors and their parents are still reeling from delays and processing errors in a botched rollout of the Free Application

for Federal Student Aid. Families have had to make tough decisions ahead of enrollment deadlines with incomplete information.

One such parent described the frustration she and her daughter were facing back in April:

She's supposed to decide by the end of this month and pay her housing deposit, but we can't commit to anything until we know what the financials look like.

It certainly makes one wonder: What are all those bureaucrats at the Education Department up to if they can't complete a fundamental part of their job? Unfortunately but unsurprisingly, the answer seems to be spending time and taxpayer dollars on activities that run contrary to the Department's mandate.

The first of these activities, as I have discussed before, is student loan socialism. Of course, the Supreme Court made it clear that this scheme is illegal, and basic common sense tells us it is profoundly unfair both to folks who opted not to pursue a 4-year degree and to those who worked through college and paid their own bills. But President Biden has continued undeterred. Last month, his administration proposed a new rule to allow the Secretary of Education to cancel additional student debt for certain borrowers. It is estimated this will cost taxpayers nearly \$150 billion.

But the Department's illegal nonsense doesn't stop there. Unelected bureaucrats are also trying to rewrite title IX of the Civil Rights Act. The Biden administration apparently wants to take a law that was designed to promote equal opportunities for women in education and make it do the exact opposite. This rule would require States and educational institutions to abandon biological sex as the determinant in program decisions and use so-called gender identity instead, and institutions that refuse to comply would lose access to Federal funding. More than 25 States have already sued to overturn this absurd rule, but the damage to the Department of Education's reputation is already done.

High school seniors and parents have already had to make college choices without crucial financial aid information. Working taxpayers are already footing the bill for the highest earning segments of the Washington Democrats' base. Laws that enacted protections for women are already being used to violate those same protections. It is shaping up to be a banner year for the Biden administration bureaucrats.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Krissa M. Lanham, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, 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. THUNE. 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.

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, April border numbers came out last week, bringing us up to more than 1½ million migrant encounters at the southern border so far in fiscal year 2024—1½ million in just 7 months.

Between official U.S. Customs and Border Protection encounters and known “got-aways”—which are individuals the Border Patrol saw but were unable to apprehend—we are closing in on a staggering 10 million migrant encounters at our southern border under President Biden. That is substantially more than the population of New York City. In fact, it is more than the population of all but the largest U.S. States, if you can believe that. And there are still 8 more months in the President's term.

After 3 years of half measures, deflections, and outright ignoring the raging crisis at our Nation's border, the President and Democrats appear to have finally woken up to the fact that their border crisis might be a major political liability for them in the upcoming election.

Fear for their election prospects is doing what 3 years of chaos at the southern border could not, and that is get them focused on illegal immigration—sort of, because the vote on border legislation the Democrat leaders announced for this week isn't really about addressing illegal immigration; it is about giving the American people the impression that Democrats care about illegal immigration.

If the Democrat leader were serious about addressing the crisis at our southern border, he would be bringing up legislation that actually stood a chance of making it out of both Houses of Congress and to the President's desk, but he is not. Instead he is bringing up a vote that he knows will fail in the hope of giving political cover to vulnerable Democrats and with the side benefit, he hopes, of putting Republicans in a difficult spot—political theater at its finest.

If the Democrat leader goes through with this vote this week, he should expect some difficult conversations. Perhaps he would like to explain why, if Democrats are so concerned about illegal immigration and securing the border, they have repeatedly banded together this year to oppose—to oppose—

commonsense amendments that came to the floor.

You would think that if Democrats were really worried about addressing the illegal immigration crisis, they might have supported Senator BLACKBURN's motion to allow State and local law enforcement to detain criminal illegal aliens for ICE to deport them. Or Senator LANKFORD's amendment to prohibit funding from being used to release special-interest aliens—those are individuals who may pose a threat to the United States—during legal proceedings. Or Senator HAGERTY's amendments to prevent taxpayer dollars from being used to fly illegal immigrants into the United States or to have them count in the census. The list goes on.

It is hard to understand why anyone would oppose such commonsense measures, and yet all Democrats did. So it is just a little hard to swallow their newfound enthusiasm for border security.

Needless to say, it is not just Democrats in Congress scrambling for political cover. The President is also desperately trying to make himself appear serious on the border. Two weeks ago, the Department of Homeland Security proposed a rule to expedite the deportation of criminals and terrorists. But if the President thought this would make him look serious on border security, he was wrong because the President's new order is a reversal of his own policy, which was established earlier in his administration. That is right. The only reason the President had to finally allow for the immediate deportation of criminals and terrorists is because his administration had created a situation that allowed these individuals to stay in the country in the first place.

Look, I am glad President Biden is making a small attempt to clear up part of the mess he has made, but I am afraid the “Vote for me; I am cleaning up the historic disaster I have created” may not be the most convincing election slogan.

Let's be very clear. We are here today with 3 successive years of record-breaking illegal immigration at our southern border because of President Biden. On the day he took office, the President began dismantling the border security policies of his predecessor that, I might add, had been working. Illegal immigration began surging in response, and it has never stopped.

So while I appreciate that my Democratic colleagues would like to make it seem like this is a congressional matter in order to take the President off the hook and put Republicans on it, the truth is, we don't need congressional action to fix the crisis at our southern border. President Biden created this border crisis, and he can end it today using the very same authority he used to dismantle so many border security policies when he became President.

We have 5 more months until election day, and I suspect this won't be

the last attempt by Democrats to try to convince people that they want to address illegal immigration. But after 3-plus years of a Democrat-created border crisis, will the American people really believe—really believe—that the arsonists who started the fire are really serious about putting it out?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to speak to the same topic that my distinguished colleague from South Dakota was talking about. He called what was going to happen over the next couple of days here political theater. That is pretty accurate. A political stunt. Political cover. A charade. Instead of actually securing the border, that is what Democrats in Congress, that is what President Biden—that is all they are interested in, because, as my colleague mentioned, President Biden has all the authority he needs to secure the border.

But I want to spend a little bit of time here talking about the bipartisan bill that has been reintroduced that we will be voting on again on Thursday, although it failed very quickly because it literally was worse than doing nothing.

But I think the first point to be made is—so the American public understands—when President Biden and Democrats in Congress talk about securing the border, they are not talking about securing the border the way most Americans think about it, like actually securing the border. What they are talking about is: How do we make it more efficient to encounter, process, and disperse illegal immigrants who are coming to this country with invalid asylum claims? How can we encounter them, process them, and disperse them as efficiently as possible? That is what they are talking about. So don't be fooled when they talk about securing the border.

Proof positive of that is, one of the lead Democrat negotiators in this bipartisan bill—let me give the exact quote. He said the bill requires the President to funnel asylum claims to the land ports of entry when more than 5,000 people cross a day. That is not called securing the border; that is just sending the flow someplace else. Then the Senator went on and said: The border never closes.

So, again, when Democrats talk about securing the border, they are talking about more efficiently encountering, processing, and dispersing people; they are not talking about securing the border.

I want to start—to prove my point that they were never serious in these negotiations other than looking for political cover—with this quote that the majority leader gave to POLITICO a day or two after that border bill failed. The majority leader said:

We were playing chess, they were playing checkers, and we ended up with a Ukraine bill.

He also went on to say:

We also end up in much better shape on the border than we were three months ago.

I will come back to this, but let me hit the points now. If you were really negotiating in good faith, if those negotiations failed, would you literally rub your negotiating partner's nose in the failure by claiming: We were playing chess, those knuckleheads were playing checkers, and we got exactly what we wanted? I would argue that is not the sign of a good-faith negotiation.

Then, if you were really interested in securing the border, you would never make that statement: "We . . . end[ed] up in . . . better shape on the border than we were three months ago." Better shape on the border would have been actually passed enhanced authority for the President to actually secure the border.

The majority leader thinks he is in better shape on the border because he got the political cover he sought, which was his only goal in those negotiations.

Let me spend just a little bit of time describing why that bill was far worse—and I mean far worse—than doing nothing.

This is the border chart I have been producing since I became chairman of Homeland Security in 2015. This shows monthly totals of encounters on the southwest border.

You can see, back here in 2014—I have recreated that right here—that President Obama, when he hit 2,000 people a day, declared that a humanitarian crisis. And President Obama was correct; it was a humanitarian crisis.

Now, the solution back then was we started detaining people. We started clamping down. We built a new detention facility. President Obama actually had success in reducing the flow until a court reinterpreted the Flores settlement agreement and said that that applied to not only unaccompanied children, forcing their release in 20 days; it also applied to children accompanied by their parents.

That was the one court decision that did weaken a Presidential authority. But the fact of the matter is, even with that weakened Presidential authority, because of DACA, which sparked all this, when President Trump faced his border crisis—almost 5,000 people a day in 1 month—he used the Presidential authority that the Supreme Court, in its 2018 decision talking about the Immigration and Nationality Act, said that current law exudes deference to the President in every clause. It entrusts to the President decisions whether and when to suspend entry, whose entry to suspend, for how long, and on what conditions. It thus vests the President with ample power to impose entry restrictions in addition to those elsewhere enumerated in the Immigration and Nationality Act.

So obviously President Trump was able to use existing authority. He closed the border in 12 months—12

months—not through any help by Congress passing a law; by using that authority where the Supreme Court said the law exudes deference to the Executive.

Well, when President Biden came into office, he blew the border wide open. How? He did it by using that exact same Executive authority that exuded deference to the President. He used that deference, he used that authority, and he blew open the border, and we see the catastrophe that has resulted.

Now, the problem with this bill is it codifies most of President Biden's open border policy. It sets thresholds at 5,000, at 4,000, and I will talk about those in greater detail. But thresholds to do what? Supposedly to secure the border. No, it doesn't really secure the border. Again, it sends those individuals to the ports of entry to have their asylum claims adjudicated in a Rube Goldberg-type situation. It spends almost \$20 billion, this bill—\$20 billion—primarily, again, to accomplish the Democrats' definition of securing the border, which is to more efficiently encounter, process, and disperse illegal migrants who do not have valid asylum claims. That is what this bill does. It builds more detention facilities. It hires a small number of Border Patrol agents—425—but it hires over 4,000 asylum officers to, again, adjudicate these claims.

And they use a new standard now. It goes from a significant possibility that these claims are valid to a reasonable. I am sorry; I don't see much distinction there. So, again, these asylum officers are going to be given all kinds of discretion. These adjudications are now going to be done by asylum officers, not by immigration judges.

So I see nothing in this bill that in any way, shape, or form forces a higher standard. It is all subjective. And under this administration, the subjectiveness of that I can pretty well guarantee you will continue the catastrophe.

It pays for more detention beds. It pays for alternates to detention, which has never worked effectively. But, again, \$20 billion of money we don't have.

Now, when President Trump secured the border, he didn't have additional funding for that. He didn't have additional Customs and Border Protection agents. He used his policies. He used his Executive authority—"Remain in Mexico." You can't come to this country and claim asylum; you have to do it from your home country or stay in Mexico to do it. That was a huge deterrent, and the flow stopped with safe third country agreements. There were other things. Again, using that Executive authority, he secured the border. We didn't need an immigration bill—certainly not this Rube Goldberg bill that spends \$20 billion that we don't have.

Rather than spending all that money to encourage more illegal immigrants

to come to this country, we ought to stop the flow, and then we wouldn't have to spend the money. Doesn't that make a whole lot more sense? Do what President Trump did: Actually stop the flow. But, again, that is not what this bill does.

I think the worst aspect of this bill—and this is why I always talk about it is worse than doing nothing—is not the 5,000 average migrants a day, which was—I mean, that is what this would look like if we just normalized 5,000 or 4,000. You are just codifying the open border. The 5,000 threshold makes it mandatory that the President supposedly secure the border. Again, it doesn't really define that. I would argue that doesn't even secure the border. But it is the 4,000 discretionary threshold—that, when average migration, I think, over 7 days reaches 4,000 a day—a massive number—now the President, it says, has discretion to stop processing asylum claims and supposedly secure the border.

Well, why is that problematic? Well, again, the Supreme Court said the current law exudes deference. President Trump had the authority. By Congress passing a law basically implying the President doesn't have the authority to stop processing asylum claims, you are weakening that authority. And even worse, that discretionary authority ends after 3 years. So that bipartisan bill would actually dramatically weaken the authority of a President who is actually serious about securing the border.

That is why that bill had to be defeated and must be defeated now. It is not a serious attempt. It is a bill that was negotiated in bad faith, with the Democrats supposedly playing chess and, unfortunately, our side playing checkers.

Again, it doesn't have to be this complex. Use current authority. Take a look at what Trump did. Do that. Don't spend additional money. Stop the flow. That ought to be our goal.

So, again, most Republicans in the Senate conference, we weren't looking for an immigration bill. We certainly weren't looking for one that weakened the President's authority. We would have been happy to strengthen the President's authority. We would have been happy to clarify—by the way, Obama's Secretary of Homeland Security, Jeh Johnson, completely disagreed with the court decision on the Flores settlement. We would be happy to clarify that, no, Flores only applies to unaccompanied children. We have that deterrence. We could follow the law to detain people who came to this country illegally. We would be happy to strengthen authority.

What we were looking for in a border bill was to have an enforcement mechanism that would force President Biden to use the authority he has to actually secure the border based on our definition of securing the border, the way most Americans view securing the border. Stop the flow of illegal migrants

that has caused a clear and present danger to this Nation. I could go through the list of horribles—the drug traffickers, the human traffickers, the sex traffickers, the members of some of the most brutal gangs in Mexico, South and Central America, the military-age men coming into this country. We are going to be dealing with this catastrophe for decades—for decades; the rapes, the murders that are being committed by people in this country who shouldn't be here that have been facilitated by this open border policy.

Again, Republicans would be happy to strengthen the President's authority to actually secure the border. What we are not happy to do is engage in this charade.

Let me end on this note again: Is this the quote of someone who has entered into good faith negotiations to develop a bill to actually secure the border? This is the majority leader of the Senate, the one who is going to engage in political theater again this week, bringing up the exact same bill that has already failed. It failed in the eyes of the public within 24 hours after the introduction, it was so bad. It was worse than doing nothing. But the majority leader seemed to be pretty happy with that failed bill:

We were playing chess, they were playing checkers, and we ended up with a Ukraine bill.

That is what they wanted. Their primary focus, their priority, was providing \$60 billion to a bloody stalemate, which, by the way, a couple of days after that thing passed, the administration was already indicating, well, that is probably not going to be enough. Even though the majority leader came out of the White House and said: This is simple. Ukraine gets \$60 billion, they win. If they don't get \$60 billion, they lose.

This is a disingenuous quote of a bad-faith negotiating partner. But it is also the quote—if you look at the last sentence there—of somebody who is not looking to secure the border but was looking for political cover. That is all he wanted. That is all the Democrats wanted. That is all President Biden wants: political cover.

We also end up in much better shape on the border than we were 3 months ago.

Again, the bill didn't pass. I am glad it didn't. It would have been worse than doing nothing. But they didn't get a bill to supposedly secure the border. And he is happy about it? He has a big old Cheshire Cat grin on his face: We were playing chess, they were playing checkers, we got exactly what we wanted. And \$60 billion to secure another country's border, and we can keep our border wide open. We can allow this flood of illegal migrants coming to this country. We don't care. We want an open border. We know it causes problems. All we want is political cover, and we got it.

We are in a lot better shape passing nothing; not strengthening the President's authority to close the border;

not having enforcement mechanisms to force President Biden, who wants an open border, to use the authority to secure the border. No. They got a bill that they are going to bring up again. It will fail. They are going to play political theater. They are going to use political cover. And they are just happy as a lark. They think they have political cover.

I am hoping that the American public is paying attention to this charade, to this political theater, and recognizes that President Biden and his colleagues in the Democratic Congress want an open border. They caused this problem, and they will do nothing to secure it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. I ask unanimous consent the Senate start the scheduled vote early.

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

CLOUTURE 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:

CLOUTURE 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. 599, Krissa M. Lanham, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Peter Welch, Sheldon Whitehouse, Raphael G. Warnock, Laphonza R. Butler, Brian Schatz, Benjamin L. Cardin.

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 Krissa M. Lanham, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HAS-SAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 66, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 173 Ex.]
YEAS—66

Baldwin	Graham	Peters
Bennet	Heinrich	Reed
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Risch
Booker	Hirono	Romney
Brown	Hoeven	Rosen
Butler	Kaine	Rounds
Cantwell	Kelly	Sanders
Capito	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Luján	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Cassidy	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	Marshall	Tillis
Coons	McConnell	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Warner
Cramer	Moran	Warnock
Crapo	Mullin	Warren
Daines	Murkowski	Welch
Duckworth	Murphy	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murray	Wicker
Fetterman	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young

NAYS—27

Barrasso	Ernst	Paul
Blackburn	Fischer	Ricketts
Boozman	Grassley	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Britt	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Budd	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lankford	Thune
Cotton	Lee	Tuberville
Cruz	Lummis	Vance

NOT VOTING—7

Hagerty	Menendez	Tester
Hassan	Schmitt	Tester
Hawley	Shaheen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). On this vote, the yeas are 66, the nays are 27.

The motion is agreed to.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:53 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUJÁN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

NOMINATION OF KRISSE M. LANHAM

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Krissa Lanham to the U.S. District Court for the District of Arizona.

Born in Bangkok, Thailand, Ms. Lanham received her B.A., summa cum laude, from Yale University and her J.D. from Yale Law School. She then served as a law clerk, first for Judge Robert N. Chatigny on the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut and then for Judge Barry G. Silverman on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Phoenix.

In 2009, Ms. Lanham began working as an assistant U.S. attorney in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Arizona. She has served as appellate division chief since 2020, after previously serving as deputy appellate chief, human trafficking coordinator, and medical marijuana coordinator. She also serves as the Ninth Circuit representative to the Department of Justice's Appellate Chiefs Working Group.

Ms. Lanham has represented the United States in more than 500 Federal

prosecutions, and she has represented the United States and its Agencies in more than 50 civil cases. She has tried nine Federal criminal cases to verdict, including six jury trials.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Ms. Lanham as "well qualified" to serve on the District of Arizona. She has deep ties to Arizona, and she enjoys the strong support of both of her home State Senators, Ms. SINEMA and Mr. KELLY.

At Ms. Lanham's confirmation hearing, Senator SINEMA highlighted Ms. Lanham's commitment to public service and noted how she looked forward to Ms. Lanham's continued service to the Nation as a district judge. I also look forward to Ms. Lanham's continued service, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

VOTE ON LANHAM NOMINATION

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

Mr. PETERS. 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 executive clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HAS-SAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT).

The result was announced—yeas 66, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 174 Ex.]

YEAS—66

Baldwin	Graham	Padilla
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Risch
Brown	Hoeven	Romney
Butler	Kaine	Rosen
Cantwell	Kelly	Rounds
Capito	King	Schatz
Cardin	Klobuchar	Schumer
Carper	Luján	Sinema
Casey	Lummis	Smith
Cassidy	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tillis
Coons	Marshall	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Warner
Cramer	Merkley	Warnock
Crapo	Moran	Warren
Daines	Mullin	Welch
Duckworth	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Durbin	Murphy	Wicker
Fetterman	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Young

NAYS—26

Barrasso	Cornyn	Hyde-Smith
Blackburn	Cotton	Johnson
Boozman	Cruz	Kennedy
Braun	Ernst	Lankford
Britt	Fischer	Lee
Budd	Grassley	Paul

Ricketts
Rubio
Scott (FL)

Scott (SC)
Sullivan
Thune

Tuberville
Vance

NOT VOTING—8

Hagerty	Menendez	Shaheen
Hassan	Sanders	Tester
Hawley	Schmitt	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELCH). 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 actions.

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 senior assistant executive 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. 600, Angela M. Martinez, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Alex Padilla, Amy Klobuchar, Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Peter Welch, Sheldon Whitehouse, Raphael G. Warnock, Laphonza R. Butler, Brian Schatz, Benjamin L. Cardin.

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 Angela M. Martinez, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HAS-SAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 29, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 175 Ex.]

YEAS—64

Baldwin	Coons	Hoeven
Bennet	Cortez Masto	Kaine
Blumenthal	Cramer	Kelly
Booker	Crappo	King
Brown	Duckworth	Klobuchar
Butler	Durbin	Lankford
Cantwell	Capito	Luján
Capito	Fetterman	Manchin
Cardin	Gillibrand	Markey
Carper	Graham	McCormick
Casey	Heinrich	Marshall
Cassidy	Hickenlooper	Merkley
Collins	Hirono	

Moran	Romney	Warner
Mullin	Rosen	Warnock
Murkowski	Sanders	Warren
Murphy	Schatz	Welch
Murray	Schumer	Whitehouse
Ossoff	Sinema	Wicker
Padilla	Smith	Wyden
Peters	Stabenow	Young
Reed	Tillis	
Risch	Van Hollen	

NAYS—29

Barrasso	Ernst	Rounds
Blackburn	Fischer	Rubio
Boozman	Grassley	Schmitt
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Britt	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Budd	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tuberville
Cruz	Paul	Vance
Daines	Ricketts	

NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Hawley	Tester
Hagerty	Menendez	
Hassan	Shaheen	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 29.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Angela M. Martinez, of Arizona, to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the confirmation vote on the Martinez nomination occur at 11:30 a.m. on Wednesday, May 22, 2024, and that the cloture motions filed during yesterday's session ripen upon disposition of the Martinez nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if a motion to proceed to S.J. Res. 58 is made, the motion to proceed be agreed to and that at 6 p.m., the joint resolution be considered read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

RURAL PROSPERITY AND FOOD SECURITY ACT

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my support for the Rural Prosperity and Food Security Act, which is the strong, bipartisan farm bill proposal that has been put

forward by our colleague from Michigan, Senator STABENOW, chair of the Agriculture Committee.

Chair STABENOW's framework reflects more than 2 years of work and outreach and contains more than 100 bipartisan bills, and it puts the 2024 farm bill back on track for being signed into law this year. As Chair STABENOW says, this farm bill is designed to keep farmers farming, families fed, and rural communities strong.

The farm bill touches nearly every aspect of life, and it touches the life of nearly every American. It is a big, complicated piece of legislation, but at its core, it does three things.

The first is that it governs how nutrition assistance, like SNAP, works for 42 million Americans, including 2.5 million rural residents.

The second thing is that it sets the rules for how farm and forestry programs work, including conservation and risk management tools like crop insurance, animal health, research and education, and forestry and timber.

Third, it drives rural development by supporting rural broadband, housing, childcare, and rural energy so that rural America can be strong, prosperous, and competitive.

For many years, the farm bill has bucked the tide of partisanship in Congress by finding common ground, providing stability and predictability to farmers, ranchers, and rural communities, and by sustaining nearly 2.3 million jobs across the country.

And why does it pass with such broad bipartisan support? Because we have all agreed in Congress to support what I think of as the three pillars of the farm bill: nutrition assistance, farm and conservation programs, and rural development.

This has been the grand bargain of Congress—that we agree together to keep each of these pillars strong, and then you can pass the bill. If you weaken any of these pillars, then a bipartisan farm bill just doesn't stand.

Colleagues, this grand bargain will be the recipe for success for the 2024 farm bill as well. So I want to spend a few minutes talking about where we have agreement and what more we need to do to pass a strong bipartisan bill.

Chair STABENOW released her proposal in early May, and, just this week, the House Agriculture Committee will mark up Chair THOMPSON's farm bill proposal. While Chair THOMPSON should be commended for including many proposals with broad bipartisan support, his bill significantly weakens nutrition and conservation programs. This undermines the grand bargain that is necessary to pass a bipartisan bill.

Here is what I am talking about when it comes to nutrition programs: Almost 45 million Americans live in homes that don't have regular access to affordable food. Almost all of these households are working families or seniors or people who are living with disabilities. This is interestingly and especially a rural issue. Households in

rural areas are even more affected. Of the top 10 counties facing the greatest food insecurity in this country, 9 are primarily in rural areas.

So Chair STABENOW's proposal, which I support, strengthens nutrition assistance. It makes certain that nutrition assistance now and into the future is going to meet the needs of Americans by making sure that monthly stipends are enough so that families can afford the food that they need.

I want to just note that it is not as if people are getting lots and lots of money here. I think the average cost for a family—the average benefit of a family—is somewhere in the neighborhood of \$6 a day. So we are not talking about a lot of money per person.

In contrast, the House Republicans' proposal prevents nutrition assistance from keeping pace with food costs. What does that mean for a family that is relying on SNAP benefits, for example? The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the House Republicans' farm bill could result in a \$30 billion cut to SNAP over the next decade. This is going to hurt people. It is not going to help them. It won't work, and it won't pass with bipartisan support.

Simply put, any farm bill proposal that weakens nutrition assistance now or in the future can't pass Congress.

The foundational farm bill risk management, research, and conservation programs—those foundational programs—are also incredibly important. They should be strengthened and not weakened in the next farm bill.

To that end, Chair STABENOW's farm bill includes many bipartisan provisions that I have fought for, along with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. It updates and improves crop insurance and other USDA programs so that they work better, especially for small and beginning farmers and farmers from more diverse backgrounds. I am thinking, in Minnesota, of Native farmers, of Black, Hmong, and Latino farmers, and of farmers who are recent African immigrants.

It is interesting that, across the country and in Minnesota, the average age of farmers and ranchers in America is 58 to 60 years old. So it is essential for the future of our food system and for agriculture and farming that crop insurance is going to work for the next generation of farmers taking over, and that is what Chair STABENOW's bill does.

I want to also note that Senator STABENOW's farm bill maintains the sugar program, which is so important to Minnesota's sugar beet farmers. The U.S. sugar policy runs at zero cost to taxpayers. What it does is to just simply make sure that American farmers can compete on a fair playing field against subsidized foreign sugar.

Senator STABENOW's farm bill also includes updates to the Dairy Margin Coverage Program that we established in the 2018 bill. I expect this is important to the Vermont dairy farmers, as it is important to Minnesota's dairy

farmers. It basically provides them with an additional tool to help them manage the inevitable ups and downs in the sector in which they are competing.

When it comes to what we need to do around conservation, Senator STABENOW's farm bill also protects the transformational conservation and climate-smart laws that we passed in the Inflation Reduction Act.

Now, you don't need to tell Minnesota farmers that climate change is real. They see it every day in the growing intensity of the storms and droughts and fires and floods that they contend with. They also appreciate that better support for conservation programs for working farm and ranch land is good for their bottom line and improves their resilience. American family farmers are good stewards of their land, and Federal conservation programs need to support them.

Climate-smart conservation means healthier soil and less need for expensive inputs. It is a win for farmers, for rural communities, and it is a win for the fight against climate change. It is also true that we need to get a better understanding of and be able to measure better how farming and ranching practices are working to sequester carbon and improve soil health.

So I appreciate Chair STABENOW's work to include ideas from my bipartisan bill with Senator YOUNG of Indiana to work on this and to help farmers identify best practices to make their farms more resilient and to combat climate change at the same time.

Now is not the time to dismantle or weaken conservation and climate-smart agriculture efforts. This is why proposals in Chair THOMPSON's bill in the House to strip out the climate-smart guardrails within our conservation programs—I mean, that just won't work, and it will not get the bipartisan support that the farm bill needs.

Both Republicans and Democrats, I know, appreciate the importance of a strong rural development title in the farm bill. I want to touch on that for a minute as well.

Small towns and rural places are creative. They are entrepreneurial. They are diverse, wonderful places to live and to raise a family. They produce our food and our energy. They are hubs of manufacturing, small business, education, healthcare, the arts, and culture. The farm bill needs to support them, and that is what Chair STABENOW's framework accomplishes.

This farm bill has a strong energy title, including reauthorizing REAP. That is the Rural Energy for America Program, which helps ag producers and small businesses design and build projects to improve energy efficiency and to build out new renewable energy sources. This is good, of course. It creates jobs, it reduces energy bills, and it cuts greenhouse gas emissions.

So I am glad that improvements and updates I pushed for are included in the chair's framework. I am also glad to

see included proposals that I support and have worked on to increase childcare options and to improve broadband. People living in rural areas and in Tribal communities should not be stuck with slow internet speeds that folks in the cities would never put up with. This farm bill mandates faster minimum speeds for USDA broadband programs. That is what I pushed for in the work that I have done as well.

Over the last several years, many individuals and groups have done excellent work to develop a strong farm bill, so as I conclude, I want to particularly note the excellent work and advocacy of the Native Farm Bill Coalition. This is over 170 Tribes and Native groups that have worked together to improve how USDA and farm programs work with Tribal governments and Native producers, from farming and ranching to nutrition programs, rural development, and forestry.

This is incredibly important work, especially because, too often, Native voices have not been heard in this policy development. In 2018, the farm bill changed that. Under Chair STABENOW's leadership, the 2018 farm bill included over 60 provisions that benefited Indian Country. This was a huge success, and we learned a lot from that. This next farm bill has to continue that progress.

Members of the Native Farm Bill Coalition are visiting Washington just this week to testify to our responsibility in Congress, as defined in our treaty and trust obligations, to include Native farmers and Tribal governments in decisions about agriculture and forestry. We need to listen to them. It is actually our obligation to listen to them and to right the wrongs that have been perpetrated since the beginning of Federal farm and nutrition policy and long before.

Tribal self-governance is an essential step here. Self-governance—what it does is it recognizes that Tribal nations' authority to administer Federal programs—they have that authority within their own communities, and it recognizes that. This is not a new idea; it has worked successfully for over 30 years and is widely seen as one of the most successful Federal Indian policies that we have moved forward. It works because it recognizes that Tribal governments are in the best position to know what their communities need, and they know best how to deliver for them.

This is called 638 authority. Folks may have seen this on the buttons of people walking around the hallway talking about 638 authority. What it comes from is the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act. It says that Tribes can have the authority to plan and conduct and administer Federal programs.

The 2018 farm bill created several self-governance pilot projects in forestry and in nutrition programs. These were very successful, and they should be made permanent. Chair STABENOW's bill does this, along with also including

many other provisions to recognize and respect the role of Tribal governments and Native producers.

We can do more, and we should. With expanded self-governance authority, Tribal nations will be able to build food systems that address food insecurity. They will be able to increase access to indigenous foods and to use indigenous knowledge for forest management and to support strong Tribal economies. Tribal leaders often say "Nothing about us without us." This value must guide us as we pass a 2024 farm bill.

I will continue to stand with Native leaders so that we can continue to make progress and pass the very best farm bill possible—one that respects our responsibilities to Tribes and to Native people; one that keeps farmers farming, families fed, and rural and Tribal communities strong.

We have a lot more work to do, but we have made progress, and I am ready to keep up the work with my Democratic and Republican colleagues to pass a farm bill that delivers on this promise.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 2

MR. CRUZ. Mr. President, this week, Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER is bringing up the failed border bill that the Senate already rejected in February, all on a political ploy to give vulnerable Democrat Senators up for reelection camouflage to hide their real views on the border.

That failed border bill is nothing but a fig leaf that pretends to do something about border security but wouldn't actually secure the border. In fact, if it became law, it would make the problem worse.

This Democrat bill would codify catch-and-release. It would put into Federal law Joe Biden's policy of releasing illegal aliens into this country. That is the cause of the open border crisis we have right now. It would normalize 5,000 illegal immigrants a day. That works out to 1.8 million illegal immigrants a year every year, year after year, forever. It would provide immediate work permits to illegal aliens when they cross the border illegally, and it would provide many of them with taxpayer-funded lawyers.

Not only is the bill by design utterly ineffective at securing the border, it is designed to fail. In fact, we can quantify mathematically the chances this bill has of passing the House of Representatives, and those chances are 0.00 percent.

There is, however, a bill that we know would actually secure the border and would do so right now. It would put real penalties in place to end catch-and-release and to defund the NGOs that are a critical part of the human trafficking network. That bill is H.R. 2. H.R. 2 has already passed the House of Representatives. I am proud to lead H.R. 2 here in the Senate.

If the Democrats want to do the responsible thing that would actually secure the border, we would pass H.R. 2, but instead the Democrats deliberately want this border crisis to continue—every single Democrat Member of this body. We know this because every one of them has voted over and over and over again against policies to actually secure the border.

When Joe Biden came into office, he inherited the lowest rate of illegal immigration in 45 years. All President Biden had to do was nothing—just don't screw it up—but instead he deliberately broke the system.

He made three decisions his first week in office that caused this crisis:

No. 1, he immediately halted construction of the border wall.

No. 2, he reinstated the disastrous policy of catch-and-release—the policy the Democrats now want to put into Federal law.

No. 3, he pulled out of the incredibly successful “Remain in Mexico” agreement. The “Remain in Mexico” agreement is what had produced the lowest rate of illegal immigration in 45 years.

And what happened? We went from incredible success of securing the border to immediately the worst illegal immigration in our Nation’s history. Over 11 million illegal immigrants have come into this country under Joe Biden and the Democrats. It is an invasion. It is larger than the population of more than half of our States.

Now, why on Earth would the Democrats turn a blind eye to the people who are suffering and dying? Why would they turn a blind eye to the body bags, to the 853 migrants who died last year crossing illegally? Why would they turn a blind eye to the children being brutalized by human traffickers? Why would they turn a blind eye to the women being sexually assaulted by human traffickers? Why would they turn a blind eye to the more than 100,000 Americans who died last year of drug overdoses? Why would the Democrats turn a blind eye to the families, to the children being murdered by illegal immigrants whom Joe Biden is releasing? The answer, sadly, is that they see every one of these 11 million illegal immigrants as future Democrat voters. It is a cynical decision that in order to stay in power, it is fine for people to suffer and die.

In just a moment, I am going to proound a unanimous consent request to take up and pass H.R. 2. When I do so, we will have a moment of decision. All the Democrats have to do for this to pass is nothing—just like Joe Biden. All Joe Biden had to do at the beginning of his Presidency to not break the border was nothing, just keep in place the policies that were working.

When I ask for unanimous consent to pass this bill, if the Democrats do nothing, it will pass the Senate and go immediately to President Biden’s desk, and he can sign it into law.

I am going to predict right now we are going to hear two magic words

from the Democrats. We are going to hear the words “I object” because they object to securing the border. They object to stopping this invasion. They object to standing up to the cartels. They object to protecting the American people.

But before I do that, I want to yield to my colleague from Kansas, Senator MARSHALL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Texas for leading the charge up here to secure our border.

Since day one, Joe Biden has allowed the cartels to have operational control of our Nation’s border, exploiting every weakness and pushing deadly fentanyl into our communities, killing over 300 Americans every day.

I rise today to join my colleague in calling for unanimous consent for H.R. 2, the Secure the Border Act, which the House passed over a year ago and has sat languishing here on this side of the Capitol, waiting for a hearing, waiting for a vote.

Time after time, the President and his administration have shown us that our national security is an afterthought. We are facing unprecedented times.

Under this President’s watch, over 11 million illegal aliens are here now on U.S. soil, and instead of taking any real measures to address the crisis, he is doubling down.

With just 6 months until the election now, the left wants you to believe they have suddenly stumbled upon a solution to the border crisis they created. In the news this week, we will see the Democrats’ bait-and-switch tactics. And I want to remind the American people to watch what the majority leader and this administration do, not what they say. They have no serious solution. They know it. That is why it is painfully obvious that the stunts being pulled here this week are politically motivated.

Americans across the heartland are feeling unsafe due to Joe Biden’s worsening border crisis. Even a State like Kansas is now a border State. Fentanyl is flooding into our communities across the State, claiming a life most every day and now is the leading cause of death among young adults in America.

Joe Biden’s border crisis has resulted in over 300 known terrorists being apprehended in the past year for attempting to cross the southern border. Additionally, over 35,000 Chinese nationals and thousands of individuals from countries like Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, and Syria have crossed through our southern border.

We are in a sad state of affairs when our foreign adversaries are paying closer attention to our vulnerabilities at our borders than the President of the United States. Even our own FBI is sounding the alarm, now warning that because of this invasion, we are on high alert for a terrorist attack in the coming months.

I stand today with a clear message for this Chamber: It is time to do what is right for the American people, not politically motivated messaging stunts that aren’t serious or sincere to the people who have been victims of the Biden administration’s lawlessness.

We have a solution to secure our borders, a proposal that could go to the President’s desk today. Let’s pass the Secure the Border Act, H.R. 2. This legislation tightens asylum standards. It builds a wall. It increases Border Patrol agents. And it ends catch-and-release. It passed over in the House over a year ago, but the majority leader refuses us to take a vote in the Senate.

If Senate Democrats were truly serious about securing our borders, enforcing the rule of law, and protecting our Nation’s sovereignty, they would stop wasting time and take up H.R. 2 today.

Without secure borders, we cannot ensure our Nation’s safety. This national security crisis is unprecedented, and we have thoughtful, real solutions to address it immediately. Americans deserve to feel safe in their own homes. This half-baked, so-called border bill is an insult to Laken Riley and her family and every other American citizen who has been victimized by crimes committed by someone who should not be in this country.

Even the lead Democrat architect of the so-called border bill has said flat out this legislation does not close the border. You can quote him. It does not close the border. That is all the American people need to hear to see how fast and loose the Democrat Party is willing to play with our national security.

This is a campaign stunt for the candidates you have in battleground States who are on political life support, and no grandstanding in Washington this week will change that fact.

I would like to yield back to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, now is the moment when we will discover whether or not the Senate will pass real and strong legislation to secure the border. Again, all the Democrats have to do to send H.R. 2 to the President’s desk to be able to be signed today is nothing. And so let’s listen for those magic words. The two magic words that would kill this bill are “I object.” Let’s hear if that is what the Democrats have to say.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 71, H.R. 2; that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—now, for the rest of the story.

Last October, President Biden had a major piece of legislation that provided

assistance to Ukraine in its battle against Vladimir Putin. It provided assistance to Israel, assistance to Taiwan, and a massive amount of humanitarian aid. It was bipartisan, we thought.

Then the Republicans, particularly in the Senate, stepped up and said: We are not going to consider any bill like that unless you attach something to deal with our border, border security.

Well, we said: How are we going to achieve that? They gave us a formula that they wanted. They wanted to have their lead negotiator, the Senate Republicans did, one of our colleagues, Senator JAMES LANKFORD of Oklahoma. JAMES LANKFORD is a certified conservative—I am sure he would be happy to be called that—and a person I respect a great deal. He is a man of principle, and he was in charge of negotiating on the Republican side.

So they asked us: Whom do you want—the Democrats—to negotiate? We said: CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut and KYRSTEN SINEMA, an Independent Democrat from Arizona. The three of them went to work in October of last year, and they worked on this for weeks, months. It went back and forth, and it looked many times like it was hopeless; we couldn't reach an agreement.

Lo and behold, they did. They came up with a bill, a bill that massively changed the way we manage the border. They brought it to the White House, this bipartisan bill, and they said to Joe Biden: This bipartisan bill, will you support it? He said: I will.

So we had a perfect formula: a bipartisan bill and a Congress with a Democratic Senate and a Republican House and a President of the United States who says: I will sign it.

So what happened next? That is the best part. Many of the Republicans didn't take yes for an answer because we had this bipartisan bill, the architect being the Republican Senator of their choice. They decided to ask one man whether they should go forward. Want to guess who it was? Donald Trump.

Donald Trump said: No. I am sorry. I don't want to see this issue go away. I want to be able to work on this issue as part of my Presidential campaign in the year 2024. So I am telling you right now, stop that bill; stop that bipartisan bill. Don't vote for it. And he said: If you want to know, you can blame me. Go ahead and blame me for stopping the bill.

That is what he said. That is a quote. It is on the record. I saw him say it. And in fact, most of the Republicans, except for a handful on the other side of the aisle, then decided that the Lankford bipartisan bill was no longer acceptable because Trump said it was unacceptable.

And that is what happened. And so that bill died and didn't go forward. And, unfortunately, we know the reality, as I mentioned earlier, is that any immigration bill that has a ghost of a chance needs to be bipartisan.

This bill would prohibit funding for processing individuals who arrive at our border between ports of entry. Think about that. The bill would prohibit funding for processing individuals who arrive at our border between ports of entry. This would prevent Border Patrol agents from executing their duties and essentially create an open border in between ports of entry.

This bill would also dramatically limit the use of parole programs that the Biden administration and prior administrations—Republicans and Democrats—have relied on for emergencies.

I am proud to represent the city of Chicago. There is a section of that city called Ukrainian Village. It is in the Near North. I have been there many times. I have been to their churches. I have been to their schools. I have been to their bakeries, as you can tell. I really like that section of Chicago, and a lot of Ukrainian Americans live there.

When we decided to help the refugees from the Ukrainian war, under President Biden and others, we said that we would give them an opportunity to come to the safety of the United States while the war was pending. In the city of Chicago, we estimate that 36,000 Ukrainians came to Chicago. We basically said to them: If you can find a family to sponsor you, we will give you a work permit, and you can stay here while the conflict continues in your country.

They were absorbed into the Chicago and Illinois and the Midwest economy without a ripple. They are hard-working people, good people. They were accepted in the churches and the schools—their kids went to school there—and they really contributed to the Chicago scene. They have done a great job.

Well, the authority of a President like Biden to make that decision for Ukrainian refugees is removed by this bill. This authority has been relied on by the executive branch for decades in emergency situations. The evacuation of hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese allies in the 1970s and the evacuation of thousands of Iraqi Kurds in the 1990s would be eliminated by this bill.

This partisan legislation only received Republican votes—not a single Democratic vote. This partisan legislation also includes many provisions that are completely unrelated to border security; for example—listen to this one. How about this. Want to put this in a comprehensive border bill? It would prohibit funds from being used by the Department of Homeland Security to purchase electric vehicles for the Agency's law enforcement agents. What in the heck is that all about?

This bill would also impose mandatory electronic employment verification, known as E-Verify, on every sector of the American economy.

I left a meeting in my office with a person representing farmworkers in the State of North Carolina. Do you know

what percentage of farmworkers in America working today, going out and harvesting the crops and fruits and vegetables, are undocumented? Fifty percent. Fifty percent are undocumented today. So this bill would impose mandatory E-Verify and would include the agriculture industry and these undocumented workers. Fifty percent of agriculture workers would be unable to work.

What would that do to our food supply chain? I can tell you, it would come to a grinding halt, and it would dramatically increase food prices. Hear that, America? This provision by the junior Senator from Texas would raise food prices on its own. Massive consequences for American families.

This bill is so extreme, there was a bipartisan opposition to it in the House of Representatives. Under close scrutiny, this bill is simply not a serious effort to secure our border. It would harm our economy and make our country less safe and less secure.

The bipartisan bill which Donald Trump and many of the Senate Republicans killed would have worked to move us in the right direction. We earlier had an opportunity to vote on this legislation that would have actually helped us on the border. Though I had some concerns about it, I thought it was a genuine bipartisan effort I could support.

I was disappointed but hardly surprised that the vast majority of my Republican colleagues, including the junior Senator from Texas, who is making this motion today, voted against it—this bipartisan bill, with JAMES LANKFORD's leadership on the Republican side, rejected out of hand by Republicans in the Senate.

It is no surprise to me the junior Senator did that. The only time we brought a bipartisan, comprehensive immigration bill to the floor, he voted against that too. It is no surprise.

This bill, written by the Senate Republicans' designated negotiator, Senator LANKFORD of Oklahoma, endorsed by the National Border Patrol Council, the union that represents Border Patrol agents—the Speaker of the House declared it dead on arrival in the House before the text was even released.

We can only fix our broken immigration system if we do it on a bipartisan basis. Nobody gets their way around here. You have to work for compromise. It is clear that the House Republicans are unwilling to help secure the border under those terms. Instead, they want to maintain the crisis at the border to help score political points for their favorite candidate for President.

Instead of a symbolic and failed effort to pass bipartisan bills that won't actually address challenges, let's work together on a bipartisan basis. Let's start with the Lankford bill. That is where the opportunity will be on the floor. If you want to change it, let's amend it. For goodness' sake, let's start with a bill that we agreed was going to be the starting point not too

long ago, before Donald Trump made his pronouncement, one that supports our frontline law enforcement officials, addresses the needs of the economy, provides a path to citizenship for Dreamers and immigrant farmworkers, and lives up to our Nation's legacy of providing safe harbor to refugees fleeing for their lives.

The American people are tired of partisan bickering over immigration. They want us to work together to secure our border, support our economy, and stand by America's fundamental principles.

Proudly, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, well, I would like to say I am surprised, but I am not. It is worth, though, pausing to reflect both on what the Senator from Illinois said and what he didn't say.

What he didn't say: He didn't dispute the point I made about this Democrat bill they are having a show vote on later this week. He didn't dispute that this bill codifies catch-and-release; that it puts into Federal statute Joe Biden's lawless practice of releasing illegal immigrants when they are apprehended. He didn't dispute that.

He didn't dispute that this bill would normalize 5,000 illegal immigrants a day, 1.8 million illegal immigrants a year, every year, forever. He didn't dispute that either.

He didn't dispute that this bill would give illegal immigrants who are apprehended immediate work permits. He didn't dispute that. He didn't dispute that this bill would give many of them taxpayer-funded lawyers. And he also didn't dispute a point I have made many other times, though I didn't just make it, that it would give billions of dollars to the NGOs that are part of the human trafficking network; that it would fund the people trafficking millions into this country.

He didn't dispute any of that. Instead, he said the standard Democrat line, which is: Trump, Trump, Trump. Trump is the bad guy. It is all Trump's fault.

And I get that, in Democrat circles, Trump is the bogeyman. But there is a simple fact. When Donald Trump was in the White House and when he was actually working to secure the border, we had the lowest rate of illegal immigration in 45 years. When Joe Biden and the Democrats are in charge, we have the highest rate of illegal immigration in American history. That is a fact. And all the political smoke and mirrors from the Democrats can't hide that fact.

But it is also interesting what he did say. He gave these epic words about Chicago welcoming immigrants. And he is right. Our country was built by legal immigrants, by people following the law, coming here the right way. My father came as an immigrant from Cuba. There is a right way to come following the rules.

I found it striking, though, that when he was saying how much Chicago loves illegal immigrants, that he somehow omitted that the mayor of Chicago has declared an emergency because of the crisis of illegal immigrants flooding into the city of Chicago; illegal immigrants taking resources from the residents of Chicago; being housed in Chicago O'Hare Airport.

We are seeing illegal immigrants in places like New York City being put in public schools and throwing Americans out of their facilities. The mayor of New York City—again, a liberal Democrat like the mayor of Chicago—has said illegal immigration is a crisis that is destroying New York City. And yet Senator DURBIN told us, in essence, the Democrats are the party of open borders.

He said farmworkers—we can't get anyone to work on the farm unless we have those open borders. Apparently, in the Democrats' view, Americans are lazy and don't want to work and the only way to grow our food is to open our borders to a full-on invasion. Listen, if some people have to die, if people have to get murdered by criminals and gangbangers released by Democrats day after day after day, that is an acceptable price to the Democrats.

Because, if you listen to his criticism of H.R. 2, you know what he said? Well, the people who are here illegally, they wouldn't be able to work. My God, it would stop illegal immigration. That is his objection. That is the Democrats' objection. They object to this bill because it would do what they say they want to do. And the truth is, they don't want to do that.

Joe Biden could secure the border today. He broke the border by unilateral action. Nothing prevents him from reversing those three decisions, from ending catch-and-release today. He won't do it. He doesn't want to do it. And every Democrat in this Chamber supports those open border policies.

(Mr. MARKEY assumed the Chair.)

I am going to close by observing the very real victims of the Democrats' open border policies. There are some Democrat policies that are victimless. This is not one of them.

We have heard a lot about Laken Riley, but it is worth reflecting on what exactly happened to her, because the murderer who murdered her came from Venezuela illegally, and we caught him. We had him. He was apprehended in El Paso, TX. All Joe Biden had to do was follow the law. If he followed the law, what would he have done with an illegal immigrant from Venezuela? He would have put him on a plane and flown him back. But he didn't do that because Joe Biden and the Democrats have decided they want open borders. Instead, they released this illegal immigrant. They let him go. Now, what did he do? He went to New York City, and we caught him again. He committed another crime. This time, he endangered the safety of a child. New York City caught him.

They arrested him. And what did New York have to do? All they had to do was follow the law and put him in jail. You know what, if they had done that, Laken Riley would still be alive. By the way, if Joe Biden and the Democrats had followed the law, Laken Riley would still be alive. But New York City is a sanctuary city, so they let him go again.

The murderer came down to Georgia, and Laken Riley—a beautiful 22-year-old woman, a nursing student—she went out jogging for what she thought was going to be a beautiful day and this murderer, this illegal immigrant the Democrats had released over and over again, picked up a brick and beat her to death. Mr. President, that is happening every week.

Another name you don't hear Democrats say is Jeremy Caceres. Jeremy Caceres is a beautiful 2-year-old boy. He was murdered in Prince George's County, MD, just a few miles from where we are now, by another illegal immigrant who Joe Biden and the Democrats released.

Mr. President, I want to finally point to a 15-year-old girl in your home State, in Boston, MA. Not only is the Biden administration allowing a completely open border and releasing illegal immigrants that are apprehended, but they are flying hundreds of thousands of illegal immigrants directly from their home countries into America.

In this case, the Biden administration flew an illegal immigrant from Haiti to Boston, MA. He didn't try to cross illegally. The Biden administration said: Come on, get on an airplane. We will bring you to Boston. You know what he did in Boston? He has been arrested now for violently raping a 15-year-old girl with severe mental disabilities.

This is sick. This is grotesque. And this is happening day after day after day. And we have a bill right now we could pass that would stop it. And the Democrats' answer is "I object." And another American is going to be killed next week and the week after and the week after and the Democrats—all in the name of power—are perfectly fine with this.

The good news is, an election is coming. In January 2025, with a new administration, we will solve this problem. We will secure the border. We will stop this invasion. And we will protect the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 685

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, if my Democratic colleagues were really serious about addressing the crisis unfolding on our border, they would demand Senator SCHUMER immediately take up H.R. 2 instead of this counterproductive and excessively, at best, weak bill that would, if anything, only make matters worse along the border.

Sadly, they are not. We know that by their actions—their actions today—actions we have seen just moments ago. We are still encountering close to 180,000 illegal immigrants at our southern border each and every month. Since President Biden took office, there have been over 9.5 million illegal immigrant encounters nationwide. Those are just the ones we know about. The actual estimates put it 12 to 13 million that may have crossed illegally. Over 350 individuals on the terrorist watchlist have been stopped while trying to cross the southern border. Over 27,583 citizens of communist China have been encountered at the southwest border in the last year alone.

By any metric, this administration has no interest in securing our border. In fact, quite to the contrary. The data suggests this administration wants as many illegal immigrants to enter the country as possible. My Democratic colleagues want us to pretend Republicans are somehow responsible for creating or prolonging the crisis. Why? Because we were unwilling to pass a bad immigration bill masquerading as a border security bill; a bill that would have normalized thousands of illegal entries at our border each month.

I continue to believe that H.R. 2 would solve most of our most vexing problems at our southern border. It is not that you have to have new legislation to fix it, but this would fix it. It would fix it because it would cabin President Biden's authority to allow this to continue to happen. He doesn't need legislation. He could do this all on his own.

But back to the point. If the Democrats were serious here, that is what Democrats would allow us to do is to take up and pass H.R. 2. Sadly, that offer was rejected moments ago. And so trying to find something that will work, I am offering a smaller, narrower bill; a bill that doesn't contain all the same provisions, but that would help alleviate the crisis by closing some of the most gaping loopholes in the law that are allowing this thing to continue. Again, cabining the President's discretion, forcing his hand so as to make it more difficult for him to perpetuate this cycle of illegal border crossings.

To be clear, this isn't the entire answer. But if my Democratic colleagues can't agree to those commonsense reforms found in H.R. 2, then if they can't agree to consider these reforms that are narrower than I am offering, how, honestly, can we take their concern about the border crisis seriously?

The Stopping Border Surges Act would address loopholes in our immigration laws which create some of the perverse incentives for illegal immigration. It would clarify that an adult cannot bring a child into this country expecting that child to be his or her ticket to avoid detention. This bill would help eliminate the disturbing recycling of children and babies by

coyotes and by international drug cartels. It would allow all unaccompanied children to be returned to their home countries, thus ending the incentive for parents to send their young children here alone.

Sadly, we see what is happening to those children under the supervision of the Biden administration and Secretary Mayorkas. They are trafficked either into child slavery, sex slavery, as drug mules, or some combination of the above.

My bill would require the Department of Health and Human Services to provide the Department of Homeland Security with biographical information about the persons to whom children are released. It would require asylum seekers to apply for and be denied asylum in at least one safe country on their route to the United States. It would combat the Biden administration's obliteration of the credible fear standard by tightening that standard back to where it should be. The correct application of this standard is pivotal to operation of our asylum system; for it to be there for those who need it and are entitled to it while protecting it from being abused as it has been. It has been corrupted over the last 3½ years. More recently, it has gotten much, much worse. In fact, the Biden administration has, you might say, destroyed it entirely. We must fix it. We have an obligation to do so.

This Stopping Border Surges Act would also close loopholes and restrict asylum to aliens who present themselves at an official port of entry. We must eliminate the loopholes, not allow this administration to continue to expand them and, indeed, to make more of them.

Congress must take back the authority to establish law. We can start that today with the Stopping Borders Surges Act. Ending the ambiguities in our current law will help mitigate the situation at the border and prevent unaccountable bureaucrats from acting with impunity as the despots in minature that they have become to enforce their own policy preferences at their own will and whim.

So I urge my colleagues to support what I am about to do here, which is to ask that we consider this bill. Keep in mind, just a moment ago, I had colleagues offer up to pass by unanimous consent H.R. 2. I am offering a narrower, more targeted fix and I am asking unanimous consent, not that it be passed right now, but just we be allowed to consider it. We bring it up, we debate it and discuss it, and dispose of it with votes.

To that end, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 685 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Recapping, we have a bipartisan bill. Republicans in the Senate said: We have a negotiator here. Don't bring anybody new to the table. His name is JAMES LANKFORD. He is a conservative Senator from the State of Oklahoma.

I respect him and I like him, and he headed up there to negotiate.

On our side, we had CHRIS MURPHY, Senator from Connecticut, and KYRSTEN SINEMA, Senator from Arizona, Independent Democratic. The three worked, not for weeks, but months to put together a bipartisan bill.

The bill that they put together was endorsed by the National Border Patrol Council. When I heard the stories said by the junior Senator from Texas about the terrible things that would occur if that bill would pass, I wondered: Did he consider stopping to talk to the Border Patrol agents who endorsed the bill and thought from a law enforcement perspective at the border that it made sense?

We were ready to go. We were getting a bipartisan bill and it was the beginning of negotiations to do something about the border. We need to do something about the border.

Then what happened? And this is a matter of record. Everyone has seen it, all the clips on television. They went to the punitive—I guess that is the word—Republican candidate for President of the United States, Donald Trump, and said: We have a bill, a bipartisan bill to consider in the Senate. He said: Kill it. Stop the bill. Don't vote for it. I would rather have the issue, and I don't want to give Joe Biden any credit for anything. Even though we endorsed this bipartisan bill, we are going to be against it, and everybody who is loyal to me needs to vote no. Guess what? Virtually all the Republican Senators voted no.

That was the end of the bipartisan conversation about the border.

Take a look at what is being proposed by my colleague and friend Senator LEE from Utah. This bill targets the most vulnerable people seeking safety and protection in the United States: children traveling to the United States without a parent or guardian, families with minor children, and asylum seekers fleeing persecution.

This bill would strip away protections for unaccompanied children. It would deport many of these kids back into the hands of smugglers who exploit them, keep others in detention up to 1 month. Do you know what detention on the border is for a child? It is a cage. I have seen them. That is exactly what would happen. They would sit in these cages for a month, keep them separated from adults who would care for them.

This bill would require families to be detained—“detained” is a nice word for “incarcerated”—a failed policy that

has disastrous effects on kids and doesn't make the border more secure.

This bill would impose multiple new restrictions on asylum, undermining our longstanding, bipartisan commitment to refugees seeking safety.

The Biden administration is doing what it can do now to secure the border under our outdated immigration laws. The Biden administration endorsed the bipartisan bill, which these Republican Senators all voted against. The administration has dramatically increased deportations of those who are not eligible, made tough changes to our asylum system, and improved access to lawful pathways to deter illegal immigration.

But, ultimately, do you know whose responsibility it is to write this bill? Congress's. Do you know what the best starting point is? The bipartisan Lankford bill that came to the floor of the Senate. That is what we are going to offer on the floor. If you want to negotiate from there, if you want to offer amendments to that, be my guest. That is what the Senate is all about. But the notion by the Senator from Utah that this ought to be the starting point I think is a bad idea.

Recently, a bipartisan group of Senators and the White House negotiated a good starting point. It was written by their negotiator. I respect him, and I think all Members of the Senate should. Yet, when it came to a vote, the vast majority of Republicans wouldn't support it.

I just want to close by saying this: This is an issue I have worked on for my entire career in the Senate. I introduced the DREAM Act over 20 years ago. I really believe this is a challenge which we can only solve on a bipartisan basis. I think that the Lankford bill is a good starting point.

Let's come together and work together on a bipartisan starting point, ignore Donald Trump, who says he doesn't want this to move forward, and let's do something the American people really want. To aspire to that goal, I object to this approach to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, this is unfortunate. Keep in mind what just happened here. I asked not that we pass this bill but that we move to its consideration, that we be allowed to debate it, discuss it, and ultimately dispose of it through votes after having an opportunity to review its merits and to consider amendments. That, too, drew an objection even though this would allow the body to work its will through amendments, and we could get to a point where perhaps we could agree on something.

Instead, we see absolute fealty pledged to this bill, what is being referred to as the bipartisan bill. Now, with all due respect to those who negotiated it, keep in mind, Senators in the room were two Members of the Democratic caucus and one Republican, and then you add to that the White House—

a significant player even if you don't weight the White House as more than just one Senator equivalent. Putting it generously, this is a 3-to-1 negotiation. Yet this negotiation went on for many months. During most of that time, most of us were unaware of what was being discussed. As soon as the details started to leak out, as soon as we started to become aware of them, many of us started publicly and privately expressing our concerns, first in private and then in public.

Look, separate and apart from what the 45th President of the United States had to say about it, many—I would say most of us in the Senate Republican conference had already formed our opinions and decided to oppose the bill based on its own terms long before the 45th President of the United States weighed in on it. Long before Donald Trump said a word about this, we were concerned. We always would have been concerned even had he not weighed in, based on the merits of the bill.

Look, the bill itself didn't do what it was supposed to do, and it kept referring to one of my colleagues as the designated authorized representative. Well, when you are authorized and designated as a representative of one or more individuals—in this case, 49 individuals—that still presupposes that you are negotiating something consistent with their express desires and subject to their approval.

When at last we became aware of the details of it, we decided this is not nearly what we talked about, not what we ordered, and so we rejected it. Again, this was underway long before President Trump ever said a word about it. So it isn't accurate to describe this bipartisan bill—which, by the way, at the end of the day, received only 4 out of 49 Senate Republicans supporting it on the Senate floor. I believe it would probably receive less than that even today. It is minimally bipartisan at best.

Now, as to the suggestion that my bill, the Stopping Border Surges Act, and bare consideration of it—not just that it be passed into law but that we be allowed to even consider it—he says that it somehow targets vulnerable people, including children, for inhumane treatment. Do you know what is inhumane? What is inhumane is perpetuating a system that incentivizes the kidnapping, the renting, the borrowing, the leasing, the recycling of children for the purpose of creating a ruse by which adults can avoid detention, sometimes sending the same kids back through the system over and over and over again as if they were poker chips or something like that. Look, children are not props. Children certainly are not there as currency to facilitate illegal immigration.

Are there human rights violations? Yes. Constantly, incessantly, directly as a result of this. Somewhere between, I don't know, 35 percent at the low end and 65 percent at the high end of the women and girls who are trafficked

into this country by the drug cartels—which are making tens of billions of dollars a year under the Biden administration's deliberately lax policy—are subjected to rape, to sexual assault, in many cases, to sex slavery.

In many instances, people can't afford the many thousands of dollars they have to pay to the cartels in order to be trafficked, so what do they do? Well, they work it off. How do they work it off? They do what they can, what they are told to. In many circumstances, we know exactly what that means.

So don't talk to me about this being an inhumane bill. This is a bill that would stop the inhumanity. This is a bill that would tighten the restrictions so that this doesn't happen anymore, so that kids aren't recycled, so that they are not kidnapped, sold, borrowed, rented, and recycled as props to facilitate illegal immigration.

Anyone who suggests this is humane isn't looking at the reality of the circumstances and at the lives lost even before you get to the Americans whose lives have been ended or have ended in tragedy or met with tragedy unnecessarily by people who should never have been in this country to begin with and then carry out crimes—some too heinous to describe on the Senate floor. Even before you get to those Americans who have met tragically with fate in those ways, just look at the inhumane treatment received by those who are being trafficked.

The humane thing to do here is not to perpetuate this cycle. There is nothing humane about allowing human beings to be trafficked on this scale, enriching international drug cartels whose object is lucre and whose means inevitably involve violence. Shame on all of us if we don't do this. Shame on the Senate for not being willing. Shame on the Senate Democrats not being willing today even to consider a bill that would bring that to an end.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4225

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I rise today to ask this body to immediately consider the Demanding Citizenship in D.C. Elections Act. Right now, we have over 11 million illegal immigrants here on U.S. soil. That is enough to replace the entire population of 36 States, including the population of Kansas, almost 4 times over.

When I am back home, I often get asked: Why does Joe Biden allow 5- to 10,000 people to cross our border illegally every day? Why would the Democrats rush millions of people—many unvetted—into our country over the past 3½ years? Why is our national security an afterthought? How can the President hear Laken Riley's story and the story of so many others who have died or been assaulted by the impacts of this border crisis and not do anything? How does he sleep at night?

When I think about his reaction to these questions, it becomes very clear

what is happening. The President is worried about the next election, not the next generation and not our national security.

Look, this White House has created the worst border crisis in our Nation's history and has incentivized the unlawful crossings at our southern border in hopes that these migrants will be future Democrat voters, with the expectation that the census, which is based upon population, will bring in more Democrat seats in Congress, with hopes of cooking the books for elections to come.

This is election interference by design, with the ultimate goal being the unravelling of our free and fair elections by engineering the largest scale invasion of our country and turning those people out at the ballot box. The Democrats are courting these 11 million people, including terrorists, dangerous drug cartels, and Chinese nationalists, as future voters. They are giving them free healthcare, pricey hotel stays, flights, cell phones, and more, and reminding them to pay it back. Where? At the ballot box.

If you don't believe me, look no further than what is happening right here in our Nation's Capital, in Washington, DC. Illegal aliens are now voting in local elections. Let me say that again. You can't make this up. Illegal aliens are now voting in local elections in our Nation's Capital.

Folks, this is just the beginning for the DNC and serves as the roadmap that they are building to tip the balance and dismantle the integrity of our electoral process across the entire country, and that is why I am asking this body to consider the Demanding Citizenship in D.C. Elections Act immediately.

Washington, DC, as we all know, falls under the jurisdiction of Congress. The intent of our Founding Fathers was to prevent any single State from gaining undue power by hosting the Federal Government. With the oversight powers bestowed on us here in Congress, it is our obligation and duty to stop this election interference.

The American people want free and fair elections. They want to trust that their vote won't be superseded by the millions of illegal aliens that have been transported across the United States. So I rise today to give my colleagues across the aisle the opportunity to show the American people that the Democratic Party believes in election integrity and our democratic electoral process. If they do, then they should have no problem supporting our legislation that explicitly states that illegal aliens cannot vote in DC elections.

Now, some of my colleagues across the aisle continue to deny that illegal aliens are voting in our elections. For the sake of this argument, let's take them at our word. If they say illegals are not voting in our elections, then what is the harm in passing legislation to ensure that it never happens? Let's

assure the American people that we have the same goal of citizen-only representation in our electoral process. Now, unfortunately, the left won't do this because they know it is factually incorrect, and they need those votes.

This is election interference by design, with the ultimate goal being the unravelling of our free and fair elections by engineering the largest scale invasion of our country and turning them out at the ballot box.

Unfortunately, when my colleagues across the aisle block this legislation today, they are showing their cards—that, for Democrats, the border crisis is not a crisis at all; it is their campaign trail to victory. This is the Democrats' playbook. If this call for unanimous consent fails, the American people will know the Democrats' true motivation for this border crisis.

We the people must fight back. Too much is at stake. Our democracy as we know it is under attack by this administration. This legislation is a good start on ensuring the integrity of our elections.

Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 4225 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Reserving the right to object, the question here is about the control by Congress over the District of Columbia governance and the right to self-govern.

There has been a tendency in this Congress, and there is debate in this Congress, about whether there should be home rule for Washington. I believe there should be. Many of my colleagues don't. And this Congress does have authority.

But what is really at stake here is the question of whether a law passed by the city council of the District of Columbia should be allowed to go into effect or overwritten by action here. My view is that the elected representatives have the right and the responsibility to pass laws that go with being a self-governing city council.

The question of the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act—that is what we are talking about—was passed by the city council. It is the will of the representatives of the people of this city, through their representatives, to allow this to happen.

This initiative has been something that has been taken up by other local governments in other States, where the prerogative is to make their own laws with respect to voting. And I believe that the District of Columbia should have that ability to pass these laws without interference from Congress.

Now, this was challenged in court. In March, the U.S. District Court for DC dismissed a constitutional challenge to the Local Resident Voting Rights Amendment Act of 2022.

Also, as a practical matter, voting has already begun in DC's 2024 primary elections. Senator MARSHALL's bill would absolutely cause chaos in the ongoing election.

So while folks can disagree on the policy, at the end of the day, this is settled local policy matter.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague's comments on this issue. I will point out a couple of important facts.

The Constitution clearly gives the U.S. Congress the power to govern Washington, DC. Washington, DC is not a State. It is a Federal district. Our Founding Fathers wanted it that way. They didn't want one State to have more control over the Federal Government than another.

And we think about the issues going on in Washington, DC, right now. This Federal district has turned into a war zone. It is no longer safe for our staff to walk to and from their jobs. Almost every week, we are seeing somebody physically assaulted, carjackings, stabbings. It is to the point where I am afraid for folks from back home to come visit us, and our folks from back home deserve the right to safely petition their government.

Look, the city council, the Mayor of Washington, DC, have blown it. They have not taken their responsibilities seriously, and that is why we need to usurp that power back. We need to do what the Constitution says. And we certainly don't want illegal aliens promoting this cashless bail, defund-the-police program. We need more security in Washington, DC, not less.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

S.J. RES. 58

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I would like to speak in support of the Biden-Harris administration's finalized furnace efficiency standards and against S.J. Res. 58.

The Department of Energy's finalized rule has been a long time coming, and we have not meaningfully updated the standards since the 1990s. Technology has advanced, but our regulations haven't kept up.

Now, let me just talk, first of all, about the importance of efficiency in the role that regulations can play in allowing efficiency to benefit consumers and our environment. When we have standards, it means that the manufacturers compete with the production of products that meet those standards. It is not a race to the bottom. It is a level playing field for those in the manufacturing industry that want to sell their products to consumers.

Having standards that are reasonable—and these are very reasonable—then allows these better products to be sold, and the competition is a restraint on the price that is charged.

So efficiency has always been something that can help us do the following:

No. 1, reduce carbon emissions. The less energy that is used, the less carbon emissions are created.

No. 2, it saves money. At the end of the day, you have a more efficient appliance. It is going to use less energy by whatever means that energy has been produced.

No. 3, it tends to create jobs. The folks who manufacture these have workers. They have good jobs, and it is really important.

In Vermont, we face very high heating bills, and one of the reasons we want and fully support more efficient furnaces is to get those bills down. With a furnace that isn't up to the new standard, a family can face \$600 in additional heating bills annually, and that is a lot of money for a lot of Vermonters.

The efficiency rule here has the potential to reduce the average household energy cost by \$50 a year and \$350 over the lifetime.

Many of the policies that we have worked on to pass through the Inflation Reduction Act will also help mitigate the costs. When you are doing an upgrade for some of your home appliances under the HOMES Act, you can get a taxpayer rebate, reducing the cost of what this will be.

These standards can also be especially helpful for lower income folks who rent their homes and, also, often face very high energy bills, largely because there is not an incentive for the landlord to provide a more efficient furnace.

By the way, the standards will make a major impact in our carbon emissions, cutting 332 metric tons over the next 30 years. And that is equivalent to the annual emissions from 34 percent of U.S. households.

So, for over a decade, Canada has had very similar furnace efficiency standards and has seen that there have not been significant issues with implementation. We should follow suit and implement the Department of Energy's standards to realize all of the important benefits I just mentioned.

I urge my colleagues to vote against S.J. Res. 58 and show strong support for the efficiency policy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELCH). The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in opposition to the Congressional Review Act resolution, which would overturn the Department of Energy's furnace efficiency standard. A vote for this resolution is a vote for higher costs for American families, a vote for higher temperatures for future generations, and a vote for scaremongering over science.

What you have just said on the Senate floor, Senator WELCH, is a complete reflection of my own views about this issue.

Families face high energy bills. They are afraid of climate chaos. But instead of tackling those problems head-on, we

are instead burying our heads in the sand. By attacking a commonsense upgrade to energy efficiency standards, this resolution seems to have come straight from the American Gas Association's playbook: Use more natural gas. That is their plan: Send greenhouse gases up into the atmosphere to dangerously warm our planet. That is the plan of the American Gas Association.

I am the House author of the National Appliance Energy Conservation Act, which was passed in 1987 and authorized the Department of Energy to set binding standards for appliance energy efficiency. And so that set the minimum standard of energy efficiency for 13 types of appliances: air conditioners, refrigerators, freezers, washers, dryers, gas furnaces.

And that law has been updated many times over the years and now covers about 60 products. And it is estimated that my appliance efficiency act, which became law over 3½ decades ago, has done more to save energy than any other Federal policy in buildings in our country's history.

And what is the central premise? It is just working smarter, not harder; using less electricity, using less energy—working smarter, not harder.

My mother always said to me: EDDIE, you have to learn how to work that way—that was before she would say that she was going to donate my brain to Harvard Medical School as a completely unused human organ—because if you don't work smarter, you are going to work harder.

That is what the American Gas Association wants. It wants to "drill, baby, drill." But it is drilling into the pockets of consumers. It is the result in greenhouse gases going up into the atmosphere, which, ultimately, are going to cause incredible storms, incredible climate consequences, when we could just reduce the amount of energy which we are consuming. How hard is that?

During the Trump era, the Department of Energy missed its 28 deadlines to update the appliance standards, as they are supposed to do by law every single 6-year period, and they left the backlog to President Biden. And the Biden administration has been making up for lost time, already completing 24 rules with about a dozen left in front of them this year, which, when finalized, will save consumers nearly \$1 trillion and 2.5 billion metric tons of carbon emissions over 30 years.

That is working smarter, not harder. You save money, and you reduce greenhouse gases.

Gas furnaces, as the Senator from Vermont was mentioning, have an outsized impact on household bills, as residential heating is the largest source of energy consumption for most families. And when a furnace is installed in a household, it lasts a very long time.

This resolution is directly at odds with the welfare of working-class families and renters, who often spend a dis-

proportionate amount of their income on energy bills. And renters don't even get to pick their furnace, just pay the bills for it.

Winter heating bills are a huge burden for families, with some forced to make impossible choices, nearly every month, between paying for food, medicine, and basic necessities like heat.

Before this new rule that the gas lobby—the natural gas lobby—would so desperately like to go up in smoke, we haven't seen any meaningful update on gas furnace efficiency standards since Congress first set them in my bill in 1987. That is the American Gas Association at work.

As much as it might be helpful for climate change, public health, and national security, the Department of Energy's standards do not phase out gas furnaces. The rule getting targeted by this resolution doesn't even address existing gas furnaces, nor is the rule effective immediately. Instead, this rule we are debating today will ensure that all new gas furnaces meet a 95-percent fuel efficiency threshold starting in 2028—plenty of running room for the industry, plenty of notice, but plenty of benefits, ultimately, for consumers in their home heating bills and a reduction in greenhouse gases for the next generation of Americans who are afraid that they are going to be left paying the bill for all of the consequences of out-of-control climate change, which these furnaces contribute to in a major way.

This provides for a slow phaseout of older, less efficient furnaces while leaving more efficient furnaces on the market that already make up nearly half of all current models. The furnace efficiency standards alone will cut 332 million metric tons of carbon dioxide emissions from furnaces over 30 years as well as other pollutants like methane and nitrous oxides. That is equal to taking 79 million gas-powered cars off the roads or cutting the annual emissions of 85 coal-fired powerplants. They won't be needed. The 85 coal-burning plants won't be needed because the electricity won't be needed because the furnaces will be so much more efficient.

Furnace manufacturers like this rule because it spurs innovation. Customers like this rule because it will save them money. Families like this rule because it would reduce the amount of toxic gas they are inhaling on a daily basis, reducing risks of asthma, heart disease, and premature deaths. The more you inhale, the more dangerous it is for the children in the house and for pregnant women in the house. Scientists like this rule because it will cut how much climate change-causing pollution we are sending up into the atmosphere.

The American Gas Association, which filed a legal challenge that is oddly similar to my colleague's CRA language, does not like this rule because it will cut how many customers are dependent on their product. It will eat into their already astronomical

profits. It is the wealthiest industry in the history of the world, but they want more even if consumers could save. They want the hot and toxic status quo to remain in place. They are afraid that our country will become ever more efficient or even decarbonized and continue on without them, so they are acting out of corporate fear to destroy our chance at a livable future. Repealing the standards would saddle millions of Americans with unnecessarily high heating bills for decades to come.

Let me be clear. Energy poverty is a racial justice issue. It is an economic justice issue. It is an environmental justice issue. We must take steps today to remedy this injustice.

Even though an efficient furnace may cost slightly more on the market today, costs will continue to fall, and households will be more than paid back in lower energy bills year after year after year. They will have much lower emissions that are being sent out. They will have more innovation. They will have more healthcare benefits. All of that will flow to ordinary Americans unless the American Gas Association has its way with this U.S. Senate.

So my colleagues will rant and rave about the need to constantly drill, baby, drill to get enough fossil fuels to keep our grid running. They love to fearmonger about reliability issues and how we can keep the lights on. But the cleanest, cheapest, and most reliable megawatt of energy is the one we never have to use. That is why everyone who supports a reliable grid should support energy efficiency standards—working smarter and not harder.

We shouldn't sacrifice savings, our grid, our health, and our climate on the altar of the American Gas Association. A moderate increase in energy efficiency for furnaces just makes sense. This radical proposal to reverse this energy efficiency standard should be rejected, and I urge my colleagues to vote no.

This today will be a vote for the future. It will be a vote for future generations. It will be a vote to say that finally the Senate is serious about dealing with this crisis that is affecting our planet and the next generation of children in our country.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his leadership on this issue, and I urge a rejection of this proposal coming from the American Gas Association.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss my resolution to disapprove of the Biden Department of Energy's final rule targeting gas furnaces.

In October of last year, the Biden Department of Energy announced a final rule on energy efficiency standards for gas furnaces, and in December, the Agency published the final rule mandating that gas furnaces achieve an efficiency standard of 95 percent when right now, residential gas furnaces

only require an efficiency standard of 80 percent.

This rule would remove up to 60 percent of current residential furnaces from the market and would impact 55 percent of American households. It would have a terrible, negative effect on families who are already struggling with historic inflation numbers under the Biden administration, and it would force consumers to spend thousands of dollars they don't have on renovations to accommodate a new gas furnace or to switch to an electric appliance, which could mean higher monthly utility bills for families.

In Texas, 25 percent of households have a natural gas furnace, and of those, over 45 percent would be negatively impacted, meaning they would spend more to retrofit their homes and to purchase and install a furnace than they would save over the life of the appliance.

Now, in every State and in the State of Texas, some Texans may choose to move to an electric appliance for a variety of reasons, and some may decide they would like to stick with a gas furnace, but with this Biden rule in effect, Texans won't have a choice, and neither will the residents of the other 49 States. The Biden administration will have made the decision for them.

Texans aren't alone in this. Other States are in a similar situation. For example, 39 percent of Arizonans with a natural gas furnace would lose money from this rule. Let me give you some percentages from some other States picked almost at random. These are the percentages of households with natural gas furnaces that would be negatively impacted in the following States: in Pennsylvania, 33 percent; in West Virginia, 47 percent; in Montana, 36 percent; in Wisconsin, 16 percent; in Michigan, 35 percent; in Nevada, a staggering 63 percent negatively impacted; in Maryland, 57 percent; and in the State of Ohio, 47 percent of those households would be negatively impacted.

This rule is a continuation of the Biden administration's capitulation to environmental radicals, who value following climate dogma more than helping families actually provide for their kids and save for the future.

Joe Biden, when he campaigned in 2020, told voters that if they elected him, he would halt drilling onshore and offshore in the United States. In his first week in office, he shut down the Keystone Pipeline and destroyed 11,000 jobs with a stroke of a pen, including 8,000 union jobs.

Joe Biden shut down all new leases on Federal land, onshore and offshore.

He shut down development in ANWR, putting in place banking regulators and SEC regulators to cut off debt financing and to cut off equity financing for energy exploration and development.

He put a tax—yes, a tax—on natural gas production despite the cost-of-living crisis many Americans are facing because of failed Democrat policies.

That is why I introduced this Congressional Review Act—to help alleviate the unending assault on American families from President Biden and the Democrats' radical energy agenda.

The average household in Texas has spent \$5,113 more on energy due to inflation since January 2021, and \$5,113 is a lot of money for a lot of families. This administration's answer to those struggling is that it is more important to appease the environmental radicals than to allow you to pay your rent or pay your mortgage or to save for your family or to put money away for your kids in a college fund.

What is maddening is that this is done, they say, to reduce carbon emissions and to help the environment, but why would Americans take them at their word on this? This is the same administration that has no problem burdening U.S. oil and gas producers, who maintain the highest environmental standards in the world, but refused to crack down on Iran for shipping 2 million barrels of oil a day all around the world. It is the same administration that in one breath wants to reduce emissions globally but will then ban new U.S. permits to ship liquid natural gas overseas, leaving our allies to fend for themselves and driving them to burn dirtier coal, emit more carbon, and pollute the environment even more.

So if you care about reducing emissions, this administration has been an abject failure. Instead of delivering actual solutions, it is their belief that putting a de facto ban on your gas furnace is more important than addressing record coal consumption in China—the biggest polluter on the face of the planet.

According to the Department of Energy's own estimate, 91 to 95 percent of furnace replacements will be at an annual fuel utilization efficiency rate of 92 percent or higher by 2028. So according to the Department of Energy's own estimate, this rule is unnecessary.

The folks who can already afford the higher cost of a new gas furnace can buy one, but Americans who can least afford another price shock after suffering under Bidenflation for years will be hurt the most.

I want the Presiding Officer to listen to these data. According to some estimates, the Department of Energy rule will lead to higher prices for 30 percent of senior citizen households, for 27 percent of small businesses, and for 26 percent of low-income households.

This rule represents the fundamental transformation of the Democratic Party. There was a time the Democratic Party called itself the party of the working class. That is no longer the case. Today's Democratic Party cares more about the money from California environmentalist billionaires than they do about the jobs or the monthly budgets of hard-working families in America.

Today, the blue-collar family in America is the Republican Party because the Democratic Party looked at

their union brethren and said: We don't care about you anymore. We are chasing the money.

That is why groups like the National Federation of Independent Business, which represents 300,000 small businesses across the country, strongly support this CRA.

Perhaps it should come as no surprise that the Biden administration is being sued for this illegal rule. The law that empowers the Department of Energy to set efficiency standards was passed during the energy scarcity of the 1970s, but the law also contains a prohibition against weaponizing efficiency standards to eliminate entire product categories like this rule seeks to do.

The American people are required to comply with Joe Biden's rule effectively banning affordable gas furnaces on December 18, 2028. Congress should come together and vote for the resolution to stop this rule. Doing so would save American families and American seniors thousands and thousands of dollars as well as save American jobs. We should do this without delay.

PROVIDING FOR CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL UNDER CHAPTER 8 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE, OF THE RULE SUBMITTED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY RELATING TO "ENERGY CONSERVATION PROGRAM: ENERGY CONSERVATION STANDARDS FOR CONSUMER FURNACES"

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 399, S.J. Res. 58.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKLEY). Under the previous order, the motion to proceed is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the joint resolution.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Furnaces".

VOTE ON S.J. RES. 58

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the joint resolution is considered read the third time.

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. CRUZ. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) would have voted "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 176 Leg.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—45

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

NOT VOTING—5

Hagerty	Menendez	Tillis
Hawley	Tester	

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) was passed as follows:

S.J. RES. 58

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 Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Furnaces" (88 Fed. Reg. 87502 (December 18, 2023)), and such rule shall have no force or effect.

APPOINTMENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to the provisions of S. Con. Res. 34 (118th Congress), appoints the following Senators to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies: the Honorable CHARLES E. SCHUMER of New York; the Honorable AMY KLOBUCHAR of Minnesota; and the Honorable DEB FISCHER of Nebraska.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4381

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4381) to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 22, 2024

Ms. HASSAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Wednesday, May 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 Martinez nomination, postclosure; further, that if cloture has been invoked on the Coggins nomination, all time be considered expired at 3:15 p.m.; further, that if any nominations are confirmed during Wednesday's session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Ms. HASSAN. 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 Senators LANKFORD and SANDERS.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). The Senator from Oklahoma.

BORDER ACT

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, so far this year, 1,624,790 people have illegally crossed our southwest border—1,624,790 so far. We have at least 1.6

million people who have also been designated “got-aways” in the last 3 years; that is, they crossed our southwest border, and the Border Patrol could see them, but they couldn’t get to them.

Let me give you some context on that. As this body knows well, because we have talked about it over and over and over again, in the first 3 years of this administration, we have had more illegal crossings on our southwest border than in the previous 12 years combined—more in the last 3 years than we had in the previous 12 years combined.

If you want to just drill down, 1 year under President Biden has as many illegal crossings as we had under 4 years of President Trump. Yesterday, we had more than 5,000 people illegally cross our southwest border—yesterday. That has been true every day, I believe, but 3, in the last 3 months, that we have had more than 5,000 people a day.

Now, the national news media has looked away from the southwest border, but those who live on the southwest border can’t look away. They are still facing it every single day. And in cities and communities across the entire country, it is still happening every single day, day after day, as this President has looked away from what is happening on our southern border.

As I have said to this Department of Homeland Security multiple times, if they would enforce the border the same as President Obama enforced the border, we would be in a very different place. But they don’t enforce the border like President Trump did, and they don’t enforce it like President Obama did. They just fail to enforce it.

The same law—the same law—existed under President Obama, when we had less than half a million people cross illegally in a year, that exists under President Biden, where we have had 1.6 million people so far this year, with still quite a few months to go—the same law, the same capacity to be able to enforce the border. But this President has said over and over again that he has nothing that he can do until something is passed.

I have been very clear with this body, and I have been very honest with my own party and with my friends on the other side of the aisle: Congress has a job to do. We need to clarify what asylum means. We need to add the funds that are needed. We need to speed up the process. We need to take away the forever appeals that are built into it that incentivize people coming and gaming the system. That is Congress’s job. We should do that.

And I have worked with everyone who is willing to work on that to get us to a place where we can get to 60 votes in this body to pass something to do our job. One party cannot resolve this issue. This has to be both parties sitting down and working on it together. That is the rule of 60 in this body.

But the President also has things that he could do that he has chosen not to do. In fact, this President has taken

94 Executive orders to weaken border security. He has created new parole authorities no President has ever used before to facilitate faster movement into the country. So instead of actually slowing the process down, he has actually sped it up. And they have done so intentionally.

In the past few weeks, the Department of Homeland Security has released a new memo and a new regulatory action that they are getting feedback for that they have admitted to me that will increase screening for, in their words, a handful of additional people—a handful when, yesterday, we had 5,000 people illegally cross.

But, currently, as right now Homeland Security is saying that they don’t have enough money to hire more agents, they are spending millions of dollars rebranding Homeland Security Investigation, or HSI. They are rebranding them and changing some of their focus on it. Now, we have yet to be able to find out how much they are spending on it, but we do understand it is in the millions. At the same time, they are saying they don’t have enough money to be able to handle greater enforcement.

This administration is focused on the things that don’t make a difference when we need them to focus on the things that do. This body is also focused on the things that are not making a difference on this.

Several of us sat down for months to be able to hash out in a bipartisan way: How do we solve this? We felt we had a solution that could pass. We did not.

Now, that same option that everyone in this whole body knows won’t pass is now coming back to this body again, exactly as it was. And many of us—including myself, who actually worked on the original language—are saying: Why? This is not about trying to pass something. This is about a show vote in this body to show: Look, we tried to vote on something, and those mean Republicans blocked it.

Well, I hate to tell you, this vote, when it comes up on Thursday—because that is when I understand it is coming—I will be interested in how many Democrats vote for this as well because I have already heard quite a few Democrats say: I am not sure I really want to vote for it if it doesn’t have Ukraine, if it doesn’t have Israel funding in it—because, originally, it was border security, Ukraine-Israel funding. And so some of my Democratic colleagues were voting for it. But now that it has none of those things, several have said to me: I am not sure I want to vote for that without the other portions of it in there.

Several Republicans are saying the same thing they said before: Hey, I wanted even more in that bill. I know there were a lot of good things in it, but I wanted even more in it.

So they are not willing to vote for it until it has even more.

So what would be the logical thing that should be done in this body? The

logical thing would be to say: That vote failed; so what would pass?

You see, we can play the same game because Democrats have blocked the bill from Senator SCOTT that would fund border security and enforcement of immigration laws at a different level. Democrats blocked that vote.

When MARCO RUBIO and Senator GRAHAM brought bills to enforce the “Remain in Mexico” program that President Biden walked away from, Democrats blocked that vote.

When Senator COTTON brought up a vote to stop aid for sanctuary cities that incentivize more people coming into the country and disappearing, Democrats blocked that vote.

When Senator GRASSLEY brought up a bill to deport criminal illegal aliens, Democrats blocked that bill.

When Senator HAGERTY brought up a bill to deal with increasing funding for ICE and to deport more criminal aliens that have already been designated criminal aliens in the United States, Democrats blocked that bill.

When I brought up a bill to be able to implement and fund the title 42 authority and to extend that, Democrats blocked that bill.

When Senator MARSHALL brought a bill to bring up H.R. 2 and Senator CRUZ brought up the bill for H.R. 2—the House bill that has a broad spectrum for border enforcement—Democrats blocked that bill.

When Senator HAGERTY again brought up a bill to ban Federal funds from being used to fly illegal aliens from other countries to be able to give them parole authority into our country, Democrats blocked that bill.

When Republicans—Senator BUDD—bring up the Laken Riley Act, Democrats blocked that bill.

When I brought up a bill dealing with special interest aliens, those the Department of Homeland Security designated as a potential national security risk—when I brought up a bill to say all those folks could not be released into the country, they had to be detained if they were declared a national security risk—Democrats blocked that bill.

We can play this game all day long. Somehow, this belief that if we bring up a bill that has failed before that is somehow a strong movement to be able to solve the issue doesn’t. It plays a political game, and we all know it.

So what should we do? Actually be grownups, sit down, and actually try to figure out what we can pass rather than bringing things up that we all know won’t.

Now, I don’t know if there is a belief that somehow, on Memorial Day week, Americans across the country can’t wait for the Senate to vote again on a bill that has already failed before that could come up again, as if something is going to be different. I have a message to all of my colleagues: The people of America are not, on Memorial Day week, focused on what the Senate is doing this week. They are just not.

They are thinking about their family member that was lost defending the country, or they are thinking about a sale at an appliance store. They are not thinking about this and this drama.

We should take seriously, though, the national security risk that all of us know about and do something about it.

Just as a side note that all of us know full well, the number of people designated by this administration as special interest aliens, those that are a national security risk by definition, who are coming across our border and being released into the country, is in the thousands.

We all know it. We should take that seriously. If we want to just deal with the people who are on the higher list, who are on the Terror Watchlist, if I go back to, let's say, 2017, there were two people who were apprehended on the Terror Watchlist in 2017. There were six people apprehended in 2018. There were three people in 2019. But if I take that to this past year, 2023, there were 172. We have people crossing our border who we know are a national security risk while we are playing political messaging games here.

Let's sit down and solve this. Let's not just vote on things that we know are going to fail. Let's not just do political messaging. Let's actually sit down and solve this.

Over the past 2 years, something has shifted on our southern border. It is not just people from the Western Hemisphere who are crossing illegally; it is people from all over the world. We went from having a handful of Chinese citizens who crossed the border to last year and this year—tens of thousands of Chinese nationals crossing our border.

I asked DHS: Are any of these Chinese nationals being deported?

They responded to me: Yes, we have started deporting Chinese nationals who are here illegally.

I said: Terrific. How many?

Their response: Fourteen so far.

Fourteen of the tens of thousands who have crossed in the last 2 years. We have deported 14 Chinese nationals.

Can I tell you, in Oklahoma, there are thousands of Chinese nationals who have come into my State who are working in illegal marijuana operations. Our Oklahoma Bureau of Narcotics has done a tremendous job of trying to be able to shut down all these illegal grow operations, but they continue to spring up. Over and over again, when they do a bust, it is Chinese nationals working, individuals who were trafficked over our southern border and individuals who are in our country illegally—over and over and over.

We know this is going on. We know we have a terror risk. We all see it. We know there are individuals by the thousands being released who are declared by this administration as special-interest aliens. We understand full well criminal activities that are happening. And we are doing messaging bills that everyone knows will fail.

Why don't we sit down and actually talk about it and work it out? Why don't we figure out how to solve this? That is what the American people expect us to do.

My friends in Oklahoma look at me and say "You guys go figure this out" because they feel the problem is there, and what they feel is correct. So let's sit down and figure this out.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, there has been a lot of attention and controversy attached to a recent action by the International Criminal Court, the ICC.

The core purpose of the ICC is to prosecute the most serious international crimes—genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and the crime of aggression. I believe that it is very important that all of us support accountability for these crimes and the important mission of the ICC.

Last year, the ICC declared that President Vladimir Putin, of Russia, was in violation of international law and that he was a war criminal. The ICC issued arrest warrants for Putin and one of his senior officials, saying there are reasonable grounds to believe that they had committed the war crime of unlawful deportation and transfer of population for their systematic kidnapping of thousands and thousands of Ukrainian children.

I supported the ICC decision. In fact, that is the tip of the iceberg of what Putin has done in Ukraine. Putin started the most destructive war in Europe since World War II. He has bombed civilians and devastated civilian infrastructure, killing at least 30,000 civilians and displacing millions more. Hundreds of thousands of Ukrainian and Russian soldiers have been killed or wounded as a result of Putin's horrific invasion of Ukraine.

On that occasion, when the ICC declared Putin a war criminal, the U.S. Government welcomed the ICC decision. A White House spokesperson said:

There is no doubt that Russia is committing war crimes and atrocities in Ukraine, and we have been clear that those responsible must be held accountable. The ICC prosecutor is an independent actor and makes his own prosecutorial decisions based on the evidence before him. We support accountability for perpetrators of war crimes.

That is what a U.S. Government spokesperson said in March 2023, and I agree. In my view, Mr. Putin is, in fact, a war criminal.

We live in a world of increasing division, tension, and hostility. Around the globe, countries are dramatically increasing their military budgets, and more countries are attempting to gain nuclear weapons and other dangerous weapons systems. It is in times like these that we most need international law. Without it, we will have an even

more violent world where might makes right and war criminals can act with impunity.

In recent years, the ICC has attempted to hold governments and political leaders accountable for crimes against humanity. That is what they do. That is what they are supposed to do.

All wars are terrible, and very often, civilian casualties are unavoidable. But after the horrors of the Second World War, countries throughout the world came together to try to establish rules to govern the conduct of war and to limit civilian casualties. The ICC's role is to enforce these limits.

Yesterday, the ICC prosecutor announced that he was requesting arrest warrants for three top Hamas leaders, including Yahya Sinwar, the group's leader in Gaza.

To my mind, Sinwar and his Hamas accomplices are clearly war criminals. The horrific October 7 terrorist attack on Israel began this war and included the mass murder of 1,200 innocent men, women, and children, the taking of hundreds of hostages, and sexual violence against captives. These war crimes are well documented, and very few people would dispute the merits of those charges.

The ICC prosecutor also asked for arrest warrants for Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu and Defense Minister Gallant. The ICC charges focus on the use of starvation of civilians as a method of war as well as international attacks against the civilian population. Those are the charges—the use of starvation of civilians as a method of war, really a war crime, as well as intentional attacks against the civilian population.

Specifically, the prosecutor says that Netanyahu is responsible for "depriving [civilians] of objects indispensable to their survival, including willfully impeding relief supplies as provided for under the Geneva Conventions."

Now, many people here in the beltway in Washington have responded negatively to this decision from the ICC prosecutor. It seems that some folks here were comfortable with what the ICC did in terms of Putin and in terms of Sinwar but not with Netanyahu.

Some have argued that it is unfair to compare the democratically elected head of the Israeli Government to Putin, who runs an authoritarian system, or Sinwar, the head of a terrorist organization, but that is not what the ICC has done. In fact, the ICC prosecutor has looked at what each of these leaders has done, looked at their actions and then compared those actions to established standards of international law.

In other words, the ICC is not making some claim of equivalence, as some have charged, but is, in fact, holding both sides in this current war to the same standard.

Yes, democratically elected officials can commit war crimes. Let me repeat.

Democratically elected officials can commit war crimes.

The ICC is doing its job. It is doing what it is supposed to do. We cannot only apply international law when it is convenient. And the independent panel of international legal experts the ICC appointed to help with this case unanimously—unanimously—agreed with the charges.

People may be uncomfortable to see the Prime Minister of Israel charged with war crimes, but let us take a hard look at what he has actually done, and we must determine whether his actions meet the standard of being a war crime.

In 7½ months, more than 35,000 Palestinians have been killed and almost 80,000 injured. Thousands more are still under the rubble, but their bodies have not been fully identified. Some 60 percent of the victims are women, children, or the elderly. More than 250 aid workers have been killed, including 193 U.N. staff—more than in any previous conflict.

There are 2.2 million people living in Gaza. More than 1.7 million of them have been forced from their homes—75 percent of the population. I am trying to think of my own State and what it would be like if three-quarters of the people—400,000 people—were just driven out of their homes, and these are, by and large, poor people, desperate people.

In just the last 2 weeks, more than 900,000 have been displaced, many of whom have been forced to move many times during this war—chased out of one place, gone to another place; chased out of that place, gone to another place—and many of these people are children. Gaza has a very young population. Many of them are elderly, and many of them are sick. These are people who have been forced out of their homes, who have moved and moved and moved again and again, often without adequate food, without adequate water supplies, and certainly without adequate healthcare.

When we talk about war crimes and when we talk about attacks on civilians, let's understand Gaza's housing stock has been demolished. Again, I try to think of my own State and what it would mean if 60 percent of the housing was destroyed. Now, if these people who have been chased from their homes—displaced from their homes—are ever able to return to their communities, where are they going to live? Over 60 percent of the housing units in Gaza have been damaged or destroyed, including 221,000 housing units that have been completely destroyed, leaving more than a million people homeless. Entire neighborhoods have been wiped out both by bombings and by planned detonations of explosive charges.

In other words, we are looking at a war. We understand Hamas is a very difficult enemy that often uses civilians to protect their own people—I have got it—but what we are talking

about here is over 60 percent of the housing units in Gaza that have been destroyed. It is hard for me to believe that there is a terrorist in every one of those buildings. Israel has destroyed the civilian infrastructure of Gaza. It has wiped out their ability to have electricity. There is virtually no electricity in Gaza right now, and there is virtually no clean water, and raw sewage is running through the streets, spreading disease. Now, if that is not an attack on civilians, I don't know what is.

The healthcare system in Gaza has been systematically annihilated. There are 21 hospitals that have been made inoperable. In fact, of the 36 hospitals in Gaza, only 4 have not been damaged by bombardment, raided by the Israeli military, or closed. More than 400 healthcare workers have been killed. Well, what do we say when we have a war in which the healthcare system is annihilated at a time when you have tens and tens of thousands of people who are wounded, many of them seriously?

The education system in Gaza has been virtually destroyed. Every one of Gaza's 12 universities has been bombed. More than 400 schools have suffered direct hits, and 56 schools have been totally destroyed. Today, 625,000 children in Gaza have no access to education at all.

I will tell you something else. When you talk about what is going on in Gaza, what is not talked about almost at all—I think I read one article on this. I want you to think about the psychic damage done to the children—to the children who see housing being destroyed and their parents or relatives being killed; who see drones flying around them, some of which have guns; who are being pushed out of their homes; who experience deafening noise, inadequate food, inadequate water; who are pushed, shoved into any place and every place. What kind of psychic damage is there? If there is one child in Gaza who does not suffer psychic damage from this horror, I will be very surprised.

As a result of the destruction and Israeli policies restricting the entry of humanitarian aid into Gaza, more than a million people today face catastrophic levels of hunger, and Gaza remains on the brink of famine. Hundreds of thousands of children face starvation. Even now—more than 7 months into this war—Israel's invasion of Rafah has severely disrupted the humanitarian relief operation by closing the two main border crossings and making it almost impossible for the U.N. to access its warehouses or to distribute aid. Very little aid has gotten in for more than 2 weeks. Bakeries have had to shut down, and hospitals are running low on fuel.

Just today—today—the U.N. announced that it has been forced to hold all food distribution in Rafah after running out of supplies.

The World Food Programme said that humanitarian operations in Gaza

are “near collapse.” It said that, if food and other supplies don't resume entering Gaza “in massive quantities, famine-like conditions will spread.”

Now, Mr. Netanyahu has been on TV today and elsewhere. He denies it all. Ain't true, says Mr. Netanyahu. He claims that Israel is deeply worried about the civilian population and is worried about the children and that Israel is not blocking humanitarian aid at all—not at all. Well, it turns out that the United Nations and virtually every other humanitarian group involved in the humanitarian disaster in Gaza strongly disagrees with Mr. Netanyahu.

Now, we can trust the words of a Prime Minister under criminal indictment in Israel or we can trust the people whose function in life is to provide humanitarian aid.

The U.N. Secretary General says that much more aid is urgently needed “to avert an entirely preventable human-made famine” and that “there is no alternative to the massive use of land routes.”

Cindy McCain—the wife of our former Republican colleague John McCain and who is now the head of the World Food Programme—said of Gaza that “there is famine—full-blown famine—in the north, and it's moving its way south.”

A month ago, more than 50—five, zero—humanitarian organizations called on Israel to allow greater humanitarian access and to stop unnecessarily restricting aid. These are 50 humanitarian organizations. Mr. Netanyahu says one thing, but 50 organizations that are desperately trying to get food to hungry people say something else. Let the world decide who is telling the truth. This group of humanitarian organizations included Catholic Relief Services, CARE, Mercy Corps, Oxfam, Save the Children, Refugees International, and scores of other well-respected humanitarian organizations. They say that Netanyahu and his team have blocked humanitarian aid.

Two of our colleagues—Senator VAN HOLLEN and Senator MERKLEY—visited Rafah in January, and I heard their presentation to the Democratic caucus. Upset by the unreasonable Israeli restrictions on aid, they talked about trucks being inspected, inspected, sent back, and that things that should have been allowed to get through were not allowed to get through. They said afterward that the United States must “demand that the Netanyahu government lift the impediments to the delivery of basic goods needed to sustain life in Gaza.” Netanyahu denies it, but two of our colleagues who were there say that Israel was blocking aid.

The U.S. Government also disagrees with Netanyahu. USAID Administrator Samantha Power said:

Food has not flowed in sufficient quantities to avoid this imminent famine in the south and these conditions that are giving rise already to child deaths in the north.

In March, Secretary of State Blinken said:

The bottom line is food is getting in, but it's insufficient.

In April, he said that there had been progress, "but it is not enough. We still need to get more aid in and around Gaza."

And, in a formal report this month, the State Department said:

Israel did not fully cooperate with the United States Government's efforts and United States Government-supported international efforts to maximize humanitarian assistance flow to and distribution within Gaza.

I got a kick out of hearing Mr. Netanyahu this afternoon. He talked about airlifts. My God, they are supporting airdrops. They are supporting food coming in from the sea. Well, the reason that the United States is spending millions of dollars to get food in from the sea is precisely because Israel is blocking the ability to get trucks in. The reason that Jordan and other countries and the United States are doing airdrops is, once again, because trucks cannot get through. Netanyahu is taking credit. Yet the reason we are having to do those is precisely because of the policies of his government.

President Biden himself has said that "a major reason why distributing humanitarian aid in Gaza has been so difficult [is] because Israel has not done enough to protect aid workers trying to deliver desperately needed help to civilians. . . . Israel has also not done enough to protect civilians."

This was from President Joe Biden.

So it is fair to say that most of the world disagrees with Mr. Netanyahu.

Think about all that destruction. Think about the tens of thousands of civilians killed and of the schools and hospitals blown up. Take a look at the pictures of emaciated children who are starving to death while food just sits miles away.

One of the things that is interesting, to my mind, is we don't see enough of those pictures. Maybe that has something to do with the fact that Israel—the Israeli military—has killed dozens and dozens of journalists.

I just met with some journalists last week. One was a young man who happens to come from my own State of Vermont who had no doubt that he was targeted along with other press people. They had big press symbols on their coats, and they were attacked. He was slightly injured. One of his colleagues was killed. Another one was severely injured.

Now, if you add all of that stuff up, are these actions war crimes? Yes, I believe that they are. I believe that there is substantial evidence that the extreme rightwing Israeli Government, led by Netanyahu, has used starvation as a weapon of war and has clearly targeted civilians and civilian infrastructure.

As I think we all agree—I certainly do—Israel had the right to defend itself against the Hamas terrorist attack of October 7, but it did not—and this is where we get into the issue of war

crimes. Yes, you have the right to defend yourself. Yes, Israel has the right to go after Hamas—very few people doubt that—but Netanyahu and his government do not have the right to wage an all-out war against the children, against the women, against the innocent people of Gaza. And, for that, there must be consequences.

What the ICC has done is important not only for the global community in the sense that we cannot allow the human race to descend into barbarity. Somebody has got to say: Look, war is terrible. It is a little bit embarrassing as a human being that we have been at war for thousands of years and do not seem to make progress in eliminating war, but if there is war, let us learn from what happened in the past and do our best to protect the women, the children—the innocent people.

So Israel had a right to defend itself against a terrible enemy in Hamas, but it does not have the right to wage an all-out war against the people of Gaza.

Now, what the ICC is doing is important for the world. It is to tell leaders all over the world—dictators, people in democratic countries—that if you go to war, you just cannot wage all-out war against civilians. That is what the ICC is doing. That is important.

It is also important for those of us in the United States. Our Nation claims to be the leader of the free world—the free world. At our best, we try to mobilize countries to uphold international law and prevent crimes against humanity. That is what we do and have done.

But how can or how will the United States be able to criticize any country in the world—whether it is Russia, China, Saudi Arabia, or anyone, any other country in the world—if we pretend that what is happening in Gaza is acceptable, if we actually believe what Netanyahu is saying?

If we turn our backs and ignore the crimes against humanity that are being committed in Gaza right now, what credibility will we ever have in criticizing the actions of any country no matter how terrible those actions may be? Because people will say: Oh, really, you are attacking China or Turkiye or anyone else, really, really, deeply concerning. But, apparently, for Netanyahu, we don't believe it.

I don't want to see this great country of ours be in that position. I want to see this country respected all over the world as a country that does believe in human rights, that does believe in international law.

The ICC, as I see it, is trying to uphold international law and minimum standards of decency. Our government should do no less.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

(At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I was absent due to a personal matter when

the Senate voted on vote No. 172 on confirmation of Seth Robert Aframe, of New Hampshire, to be United States Circuit Judge for the First Circuit. Last week, I voted to invoke cloture on Mr. Aframe. On vote No. 172, had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was absent due to a personal matter when the Senate voted on vote No. 173 on the motion to invoke cloture on Krissa M. Lanham to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona. On vote No. 173, had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was absent due to a personal matter when the Senate voted on vote No. 174 on confirmation of Krissa M. Lanham to be United States District Judge for the District of Arizona. On vote No. 174, had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was absent due to a personal matter when the Senate voted on vote No. 175 on the motion to invoke cloture on Angela M. Martinez to be U.S. District Judge for the District of Arizona. On vote No. 175, had I been present, I would have voted yea.

Mr. President, I was absent due to a personal matter when the Senate voted on vote No. 176 on passage of S.J. Res. 58, providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Furnaces". On vote No. 176, had I been present, I would have voted yea.●

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I submit to the Senate a budget scorekeeping report. The report, which covers fiscal year 2024, was prepared and submitted as a letter by the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. This information assists the Senate Budget Committee in determining if budgetary points of order lie against pending legislation.

CBO's report shows the effect on spending and revenues of congressional action through April 15, 2024. Between CBO's last report on December 13, 2023, and April 15, 2024, Congress passed eight pieces of legislation with effects on direct spending or revenue. These include two appropriations bills passed in March, P.L. 118-42 and P.L. 118-47, that completed the fiscal year 2024 appropriations cycle in line with the bipartisan agreement enacted last summer.

CBO's report included three tables, tables 1, 2, and 3. Tables 1 and 2 show that current budgetary levels are within allowable amounts for budget authority and outlays. The allowable levels include an adjustment for the Senate-passed national security supplemental, P.L. 118-50, which had not yet

been enacted into law when the table was prepared. These tables also show that revenue is below the allowable amount, due to the rescissions of IRS mandatory funding in the last appropriation bill, P.L. 118–47, which reduces revenue and increases the deficit.

Table 3 shows the Senate's Pay-As-You-Go scorecard, which reflects \$36.4 billion of net deficit increase, entirely due to IRS funding rescissions.

The Democratic staff of the Budget Committee prepared three addendum tables to supplement CBO's report, tables A, B, and C.

Table A compares the mandatory spending of each authorizing committee against the enforceable allocations under section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act. It shows that 11 of the 16 authorizing committees are compliant with their allocations, either because no legislation with significant budgetary costs was enacted, the legislation was deficit-neutral and qualified for an allocation adjustment that was subsequently filed, or the legislation reduced spending.

Table B updates CBO's table 1, the Senate current level report for spending and revenues, to reflect the enactment of P.L. 118–50, the national security supplemental, which was passed by the House and Senate and was signed into law by the President after CBO prepared its report.

Table C updates CBO's table 3, updating the Senate Pay-As-You-Go scorecard to reflect six bills that have passed by the House and Senate since the release of CBO's report, five of which have been signed into law by the President.

I ask unanimous consent that CBO's letter, accompanying tables, and the addendum be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, April 17, 2024.

Hon. SHELDON WHITEHOUSE,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2024 budget and is current through April 15, 2024. This report is submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the *Congressional Record* on March 22, 2024, pursuant to section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (FRA, Public Law 118–5).

Since our last letter dated December 13, 2023, the Congress has cleared the following legislation that has significant effects on budget authority, outlays, or revenues in fiscal year 2024:

An act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to extend the Administrative Fine Program for certain reporting violations (P.L. 118–26);

5G SALE Act (P.L. 118–27);

National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (P.L. 118–31);

Further Additional Continuing Appropriations and Other Extensions Act, 2024 (P.L. 118–35);

Overtime Pay for Protective Services Act of 2023 (P.L. 118–38);

Extension of Continuing Appropriations and Other Matters Act, 2024 (P.L. 118–40);

Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 (P.L. 118–42); and

Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 (P.L. 118–47).

Sincerely,

PHILLIP L. SWAGEL,
Director.

Enclosure.

TABLE 1.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024, AS OF APRIL 15, 2024

[In billions of dollars]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over (+) or Under (-) Resolution
On-Budget:			
Budget Authority	5,036.2	4,944.6	–91.6
Outlays	5,097.4	5,044.2	–53.2
Revenues	3,651.8	3,650.6	–1.3
Off-Budget:			
Social Security Outlays ...	1,322.7	1,322.7	0.0
Social Security Revenues	1,195.5	1,195.5	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

TABLE 2.—SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024, AS OF APRIL 15, 2024

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted:			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	3,651,961
Permanents and Other Spending Legislation ^a	3,244,781	3,216,941	n.a.
Prior-Year Outlays		815,333	n.a.
Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (P.L. 118–5)	200	–1,903	–123
Offsetting Receipts	–1,262,969	–1,262,967	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,982,012	2,767,404	3,651,838
Enacted Legislation: ^b			
Authorizing Legislation			
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2024 and Other Extensions Act (P.L. 118–15)	642	257	n.a.
Further Continuing Appropriations and Other Extensions Act, 2024 (P.L. 118–22)	1,589	954	n.a.
An act to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to extend the Administrative Fine Program for certain reporting violations (P.L. 118–26)	0	0	1
5G SALE Act (P.L. 118–27)	–60	–60	n.a.
National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (P.L. 118–31)	2,629	178	n.a.
Further Additional Continuing Appropriations and Other Extensions Act, 2024 (P.L. 118–35)	656	315	n.a.
Overtime Pay for Protective Services Act of 2023 (P.L. 118–38)	1	1	n.a.
Extension of Continuing Appropriations and Other Matters Act, 2024 (P.L. 118–40)	–184	–48	n.a.
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 (P.L. 118–42)	5,901	5,041	n.a.
Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 (P.L. 118–47)	807	807	–1,273
Subtotal, Authorizing Legislation	11,981	7,445	–1,272
Appropriation Legislation			
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2024 and Other Extensions Act (P.L. 118–15)	16,000	979	n.a.
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 (P.L. 118–42)	668,501	386,365	n.a.
Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 (P.L. 118–47)	2,120,423	1,715,937	n.a.
Subtotal, Appropriation Legislation	2,804,924	2,103,281	n.a.
Entitlements and Mandatories			
Total Current Level	145,677	166,024	n.a.
Total Senate Resolution ^c	4,944,594	5,044,154	3,650,566
Current Level Over (+) or Under (–) Senate Resolution	5,036,175	5,097,363	3,651,838
–91,581	–53,209	–1,272	
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2024–2033:			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	45,293,716
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	45,331,755
Current Level Over (+) or Under (–) Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	–38,039

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = public law.

For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (P.L. 93–344) in the Senate, the aggregate spending and revenue levels for 2024 published in the *Congressional Record* on June 21, 2023, by the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (FRA, P.L. 118–5) do not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, amounts in this current-level report do not include those items.

In keeping with the 21st Century Cures Act (P.L. 114–255), certain funding for the Department of Health and Human Services is excluded from estimates for the purposes of both the Budget Act and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (BBDCA, P.L. 99–177), as amended. As a result, this report excludes \$457 million in budget authority and \$770 million in outlays. Similarly, in keeping with section 14003 of the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (P.L. 116–136), as modified by section 101 of division AA of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (P.L. 116–260), certain funding provided to the Army Corps of Engineers is excluded from estimates for the purposes of both the Budget Act and the Deficit Control Act. As a result, this report excludes \$2,829 million in budget authority and \$2,829 million in outlays.

^aReflects a correction to account for the interest effects of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (FRA, P.L. 118–5), which were inadvertently excluded from the current-level report filed on December 13, 2023, because of a database error. As a result of that correction, previously enacted budget authority and outlays alike are \$1,347 million less than previously indicated.

^bCurrent-level amounts and allocations include budgetary effects designated as an emergency requirement in keeping with section 251 of the Deficit Control Act. However, they exclude budgetary effects designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001 of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022. In consultation with the Senate Committee on the Budget and in keeping with section 103 of the FRA, current-level amounts and allocations also exclude amounts previously enacted and designated as an emergency requirement for 2024 for allocation enforcement under the Budget Act. Excluded amounts are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Authorizing Legislation:			
Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 (P.L. 118-5)	0	-2,331	n.a.
Appropriation Legislation:			
Congressional non-BBEDCA Emergencies	70,983	2,798	n.a.
Changes to Congressional non-BBEDCA Emergencies	0	358	n.a.
Total, Emergency-Designated Budgetary Effects	70,983	825	n.a.

©Section 121 of the FRA requires the Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget to publish the aggregate spending and revenue levels for fiscal year 2024; those aggregate levels were first published in the *Congressional Record* on June 21, 2023. The Chair of the Senate Committee on the Budget has the authority to revise the budgetary aggregates for the budgetary effects of certain revenue and spending measures pursuant to the Budget Act and the FRA.

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Aggregates Printed on June 21, 2023:	4,878,570	5,056,741	3,651,838
Revisions:			
Published in the <i>Congressional Record</i> on September 12, 2023	61,854	23,541	n.a.
Published in the <i>Congressional Record</i> on October 24, 2023	16,642	1,219	n.a.
Published in the <i>Congressional Record</i> on November 29, 2023	1,589	954	n.a.
Published in the <i>Congressional Record</i> on March 8, 2024	95,070	21,606	n.a.
Published in the <i>Congressional Record</i> on March 22, 2024	-17,550	-6,698	n.a.
Revised Senate Resolution	5,036,175	5,097,363	3,651,838

Revised Senate Resolution

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF APRIL 15, 2024

[In millions of dollars]

	2024	2024-2028	2024-2033
Beginning Balance ^a	0	0	0
Enacted Legislation ^{a,b,c} , Pro- viding Accountability			
Through Transparency Act of 2023 (S. 111, P.L. 118-9)	*	*	*
250th Anniversary of the United States Marine Corps Commemorative Coin Act (H.R. 1096, P.L. 118-10)	0	0	0
Continuing Appropriations Act, 2024 and Other Extensions Act (H.R. 5860, P.L. 118-15) ^d ..	*	*	*
An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend and modify cer- tain authorities and requirements relating to the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes (S. 2795, P.L. 118-19) ...	0	1	-1
Further Continuing Appropriations and Other Extensions Act, 2024 (H.R. 6363, P.L. 118- 22) ^e	*	*	*
National Guard and Re- servists Debt Relief Extension Act of 2023 (H.R. 3315, P.L. 118- 24)	*	*	*
Duck Stamp Moderniza- tion Act of 2023 (S. 788, P.L. 118-25)	*	*	*
An act to amend the Federal Election Cam- paign Act of 1971 to extend the Administra- tive Fine Program for certain reporting viola- tions (S. 2747, P.L. 118-26)	-1	-5	-10
5G SALE Act (S. 2787, P.L. 118-27)	-60	-85	-85
National Defense Author- ization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (H.R. 2670, P.L. 118-31)	178	1,410	-1,487
Airport and Airway Extен- sion Act of 2023, Part II (H.R. 6503, P.L. 118-34)	*	*	*
Further Additional Con- tinuing Appropriations and Other Extensions Act, 2024 (H.R. 2872, P.L. 118-35) ^f	*	*	*
Overtime Pay for Protec- tive Services Act of 2023 (S. 3427, P.L. 118-38)	1	1	1
Extension of Continuing Appropriations and Other Matters Act, 2024 (H.R. 7463, P.L. 118-40) ^g	*	*	*
Airport and Airway Extен- sion Act of 2024 (H.R. 7454, P.L. 118-41)	*	*	*
Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2024 (H.R. 4366, P.L. 118-42) ^h ..	-	-	-
Further Consolidated Ap- propriations Act, 2024 (H.R. 2882, P.L. 118- 47) ⁱ	1,273	17,586	37,971

TABLE 3.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF APRIL 15, 2024—Continued

[In millions of dollars]

	2024	2024-2028	2024-2033
A joint resolution pro- viding for congres- sional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule sub- mitted by the National Labor Relations Board relating to "Standard for Determining Joint Employer Status". (H.J. Res. 98)	*	*	*
Increase (+) or Decrease (-) in the Deficit	1,391	18,908	36,389
Total Change in Outlays	119	1,327	-1,572
Total Change in Revenues	-1,272	-17,581	-37,961

Source: Congressional Budget Office.
P.L. = public law; — = excluded from PAYGO scorecard; * = between
-\$500,000 and \$500,000.

^aOn June 21, 2023 the Chairman of the Senate Committee on the Budget
reset the Senate's Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard to zero for all fiscal years.

^bThe amounts shown represent the estimated effect of the public laws
on the deficit.

^cExcludes off-budget amounts.

^dSection 2401(b) requires the budgetary effects of division B to be ex-
cluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard; however, the revenue effects
from the immigration extensions included in division A are included in the
scorecard because division A does not fall within the exclusion in section
2401 of division B.

^eSection 701(b) requires the budgetary effects of division B to be ex-
cluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard; however, the revenue effects
from the immigration extensions included in division A are included in the
scorecard because division A does not fall within the exclusion in section
701 of division B.

^fSection 401(b) requires the budgetary effects of division B to be ex-
cluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard; however, the revenue effects
from the immigration extensions included in division A are included in the
scorecard because division A does not fall within the exclusion in section
401 of division B.

^gSection 102(b) requires the budgetary effects of division B to be ex-
cluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard; however, the revenue effects
from the immigration extensions included in division A are included in the
scorecard because division A does not fall within the exclusion in section
102 of division B.

^hSection 401(b) of division G requires the budgetary effects of that division
to be excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard.

ⁱSection 401(b) of division G requires the budgetary effects of that division
to be excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard; however, the revenue effects
of rescinding amounts provided to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) in P.L.
117-169 are shown here because divisions B and D do not fall within the
inclusion in section 401(b) of division G.

TABLE A.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE SPENDING
COMPARED TO ALLOCATIONS

[\$ in millions; positive numbers represent spending above enforceable
limits]

	2024	2024-2028	2024-2033
Agriculture, Nutrition, and For- estry:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Armed Services:			
Budget Authority	2,629	3,321	721
Outlays	178	1,410	-1,487
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation:			
Budget Authority	747	3,338	5,368
Outlays	748	795	-30
Energy and Natural Resources:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0

TABLE A.—SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE SPENDING
COMPARED TO ALLOCATIONS—Continued

[\$ in millions; positive numbers represent spending above enforceable
limits]

	2024	2024-2028	2024-2033
Outlays	3	3	3
Environment and Public Works:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Finance:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Foreign Relations:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Govern- ment Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Intelligence:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Judiciary:			
Budget Authority	1	1	1
Outlays	1	1	1
Rules and Administration:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Small Business and Entre- preneurship:			
Budget Authority	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs:			
Budget Authority	0	1	-1
Outlays	0	1	-1
Memo—all committees, total over allocation:			
Budget Authority	3,377	6,661	6,089
Outlays	930	2,210	-1,514

TABLE B.—SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPEND-
ING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024, AS OF
MAY 20, 2024

[\$ in billions]

	Budget Resolution	Current Level	Current Level Over (+) Under (-) Resolution
On-Budget:			
Budget Authority	5,036.2	5,039.9	3.7
Outlays	5,090.4	5,057.4	-32.9
Revenues	3,651.8	3,650.6	-1.2
Off-Budget:			
Social Security Outlays ...	1,322.7	1,322.7	0.0
Social Security Revenues	1,195.5	1,195.5	0.0

Memo: This table is an updated version of CBO's Table 1 above, incorporating the budgetary effects of H.R. 815, the national security supplemental, which was signed into law on April 24, 2024 (P.L. 118-50).

TABLE C.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO
SCORECARD AS OF MAY 20, 2024

[\$ in millions]

	2024	2024-2028	2024-2033
Beginning Balance ^a	1,391	18,908	36,389

TABLE C.—SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD AS OF MAY 20, 2024—Continued
[\$ in millions]

	2024	2024–2028	2024–2033
Legislation That Has Cleared Congress Since April 15, 2024:			
Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes (H.R. 815, P.O. 118–50) ^b ..	—	—	—
Revising Existing Procedures On Reporting via Technology (REPORT) Act (S. 474, P.L. 118–59) ..	*	*	*
Prohibiting Russian Uranium Imports Act (H.R. 1042, P.L. 118–62) ^c ..	—	—	—
Eliminate Useless Reports Act of 2023 (S. 2073) ..	*	*	*
Airport and Airway Extension Act of 2024, Part II (H.R. 8289, P.L. 118–60) ..	*	*	*
Securing Growth and Robust Leadership in America Aviation Act (H.R. 3935, P.L. 118–63) ..	0	54	63
Total Change in Outlays ..	0	54	63
Total Change in Revenues ..	0	0	0
Final Balance ..	1,391	18,962	36,452

P.L. = public law; — = excluded from PAYGO scorecard; * = between \$500,000 and \$500,000.

^aThe beginning balance reflects CBO's Table 3, above.

^bSection 1(b) of division T requires the budgetary effects of division D and each subsequent division to be excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard.

^cH.R. 1042 increases direct spending from budget authority originally designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to a budget resolution by the infrastructure investment and jobs Act (P.L. 117–58), and therefore is excluded from the Senate's PAYGO scorecard.

ASIAN AMERICAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AND PACIFIC ISLANDER HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander Heritage Month. Each year, this month gives us the opportunity to celebrate the diverse group of peoples who make up Asian America. And there is much to celebrate; today, we see Asian Americans in every part of American society, from books and movies, to the highest halls of government.

President Biden has appointed AANHPI leaders to key positions in the administration, including Ambassador Katherine Tai, Acting Secretary of Labor Julie Su, and White House Office of Science and Technology Policy Director Arati Prabhakar.

At the same time, we recognize the many barriers broken by those who came before, to pave the wide road which we now traverse today.

The AANHPI civil rights movement is inextricably tied with the Black civil rights movement that defined the mid-20th century, giving rise not only to well-known African-American activists like Martin Luther King, Jr., John Lewis, and Malcolm X, but also leaders like Grace Lee Boggs, Larry Itliong, and Patsy Mink.

For many of us, these latter three names are not as familiar; only now are we as a country beginning to truly recognize the importance of the Asian-American movement, and to teach its history to the next generation. Asian-

American activists played a key role in calling out U.S. involvement in colonialist conflicts like the Vietnam war, as well as racist housing and development projects at home.

As we have seen time and again, failing to understand our history as a nation puts us at risk of repeating its mistakes. Our context in the 21st century is undoubtedly distinct from the challenges faced by the earliest Asian Americans. Yet hate crimes against the AANHPI community increased 167 percent from 2020 to 2021, in large part because of racist rhetoric echoed by the highest levels of government during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Though incidences of anti-Asian hate have decreased overall from 2021 to 2022, racially motivated incidents against Sikh and Muslim Americans have continued to rise.

Janelle Wong, a contemporary Asian-American activist and researcher for the nonprofit AAPI Data, said that “Anti-Asian hate crimes . . . are often tied to national security or other kinds of U.S. foreign policy that heightened attention to Asian Americans in the U.S. We will expect them to go up again at some point, depending on what the national and international context is and the degree to which places in Asia are cast as a threat to the U.S.”

As the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I will be the first to tell you that the Chinese Communist Party poses a significant national security threat to the United States in many arenas. But we as a country must be able to distinguish between China as a geopolitical entity and Chinese Americans and Chinese people with their own unique beliefs, hopes, and dreams. Sinophobia, and all other forms of racism and discrimination, cannot be excused in the name of geopolitical circumstance.

As a nation of immigrants, we should know better than to label people as “un-American” because they or their families were born someplace else.

The Biden administration has taken significant, meaningful steps to address anti-Asian racism over the last 3 years, including signing the COVID-19 Hate Crimes Act to make reporting hate crimes easier and hosting the first-ever White House summit against hate-fueled violence, alongside significant actions to address gun violence.

The administration also launched the first-ever National Strategy to Advance Equity, Justice, and Opportunity for AANHPI communities, addressing issues like anti-Asian hate and enhancing accessibility to government services in multiple languages.

Of particular note to me as a member of the Small Business Committee, Biden has provided over \$22 billion in loans to AANHPI entrepreneurs through the Small Business Administration, achieving the highest Asian-American employment and entrepreneurship rates in over a decade.

And finally, recognizing the importance of honoring and protecting tradition-

tional cultures, the President signed legislation to establish a National Museum of Asian Pacific American History and Culture.

I am proud to join 400,000 Asian American, Native Hawaiians, and Pacific Islanders in calling the State of Maryland my home. I recognize that the last few years have been difficult for the AANHPI community, and as a Jewish American, I want to take a moment to grieve with you in the face of what at times can feel like an overwhelming rise in hate and discrimination.

But I would urge you to keep pushing toward a fairer, more just future—and I will be right there with you.

In this last week of AANHPI Heritage Month, I invite my colleagues to join me in celebrating the triumphs of this community in the face of great adversity and to continue our work to lift up and address their unique needs to ensure that we all can thrive.

40TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WYOMING WILD SHEEP FOUNDATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 40th anniversary of the Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation.

On June 7, 2024, the Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation will celebrate its 40th anniversary. The celebration will be held in conjunction with its summer convention at the Little America Hotel and Conference Center in Cheyenne, WY. The foundation is dedicated to preserving Wyoming's bighorn sheep herds and their habitats, to conservation education, and to hunter's rights.

The 1960s saw a drastic decline in bighorn sheep populations and their habitats throughout the country. This prompted the formation of the Foundation for North American Wild Sheep in 1974. It is now known as the Wild Sheep Foundation. The foundation aimed to restore and manage sheep herds and their ranges.

In 1983, Dave Steger, Ron Ball, Alex Wolfer, John Suda, and Terry Reach established the Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation. The Wyoming foundation sought the same goals as the national group, but solely within the borders of the State.

Wyoming's rugged mountains and western plains are home to 15 bighorn sheep herds. With over 5,900 wild sheep, Wyoming is a mecca for bighorn sheep.

The Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation plays a critical role in maintaining the health and vitality of each herd and the habitat in which they thrive. Conservation efforts to preserve these herds includes bighorn sheep reintroduction, recreational trail closure, and prescribed burns.

The re-establishment of the Ferris-Seminole herd near Rawlins proves to be one of the most successful transplant efforts for bighorn sheep in Wyoming. The low population prompted the Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation, in partnership with the Wyoming Game

and Fish, to capture and transplant bighorn sheep from the Whiskey Mountain and Devil Canyon herds to augment and re-establish the Ferris-Seminole herd. Those continued efforts help the herd thrive and reach population objectives set forth by the Wyoming Game and Fish.

Similar to the Ferris-Seminole herd, the Sweetwater Rocks herd was completely decimated by 1907 and again in 1980. Recently, the foundation established the Sweetwater Rocks Initiative to reintroduce sheep into the region. The foundation is collaborating with the Wyoming Game and Fish and local ranchers to “put wild sheep back on the mountain.”

The snowcapped peaks and rocky mountains in northwestern Wyoming are home to the Teton Range herd. The herd nearly died out in the 19th and 20th centuries due to over harvest, disease, habitat depletion, and disturbance of their migration routes. The foundation’s mitigation efforts include working with the Wyoming Game and Fish and Grand Teton National Park to close recreation areas in important bighorn sheep habitats and to collar the sheep to track survival patterns.

The survival and growth of the herds, the vitality of the habitat, and the endless dedication of every member are a testimony to the importance of the Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation.

The foundation partnered with the Wyoming Big Game License Coalition to establish five Governor’s Bighorn Sheep hunting tags. This collaboration helps fund conservation projects for bighorn sheep and ensure hunting remains an integral part of Wyoming’s heritage. Since the partnership began in 2003, bighorn sheep tags have raised over \$5 million for conservation.

In 2015, one of Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation’s lifetime members Gary Butler approached the foundation to establish a permanent bighorn sheep conservation fund. The plan was to ensure long-term projects were sustainable into the future. Due to the popularity of this fund, it has already exceeded the original goals. As of 2022, the fund generated more than \$400,000 and awarded 11 lifetime memberships to youth. Gary’s dedication to bighorn sheep is a testament to the caliber of this organization and to each member’s unwavering devotion to the long-term survival of Wyoming’s wild sheep.

The Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation is an incredible asset for conservation efforts in Wyoming. No project is too small. Each of the foundation’s members bears a resolute commitment to the strength of the herd and the habitat, all while maintaining the values of hunting. The Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation is led by:

Katie Cheesbrough, Executive Director
Dean DiJenno, Deputy Director
Zach McDermott, President
Scott Butler, Vice President
Bralli Clifford, Treasurer
Bruce Perryman, Secretary
John W. Harris, Board Director
Kurt Eisenach, Past President

Sam Lockwood, Board Director
Scott Smith, Board Director
Jimmy Owens, Board Director
Matt Hoobler, Board Director
Greg Pope, Board Director

It is an honor to rise in recognition of this significant milestone for the Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation. The impact and opportunities the foundation has created for bighorn sheep, hunters, and youth leaves an astonishing mark on the outlook of bighorn sheep in Wyoming. Congratulations to the Wyoming Wild Sheep Foundation on their 40th anniversary.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE WRIGHT MUSEUM OF WORLD WAR II

• Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Wright Museum of World War II in Wolfeboro, NH. This local landmark, educational institution, and national repository for WWII items and memorabilia will be holding events throughout the summer in celebration of its 30th anniversary. I join in saluting the hard-working Wright Museum staff, its enthusiastic volunteers, and its generous supporters who give so much of their time and effort to fulfilling the vision of founder David Wright: to be the preeminent history museum that preserves and promotes a comprehensive understanding and appreciation of the enduring contributions made by World War II-era Americans.

The Wright Museum of World War II is unmistakable to people who venture down Center Street near Wolfeboro’s historic downtown. They turn the corner to find a genuine M3A1 Stuart tank positioned almost as if it just broke through the building’s brick frontage. The tank is just one current piece of an extensive military vehicle collection that once belonged to museum founder David Wright, a U.S. marine during the Korean war and a proud son of a World War II veteran. David would offer pieces of his collection for parades and special events throughout the Northeast, but he knew his vehicles represented a small part of a vast war effort that mobilized millions of Americans in a variety of ways. He had an idea for a permanent building that would tell the full story of the people who made these enormous contributions. He envisioned a museum that contextualized this time period so Americans today could thoroughly grasp the forces on the battlefield and the home front that propelled our country to victory.

In 1992, David found an ideal site at the former location of a Diamond National sawmill in Wolfeboro. He uncovered a perfect natural setting adjacent to the Smith River and nearby Lake Winnipesaukee, and he identified a community filled with people who would eagerly donate their time and resources in support of the museum’s

mission. The Wright Museum of World War II opened its doors in 1994. Since then, museum staff and volunteers have guided nearly 300,000 visitors, including my family and me, on an interactive and thought-provoking journey that captures American life in the early 1940s and depicts the enduring impact of the Greatest Generation.

The Wright Museum hosts guest lectures and rotating exhibits in a flexible space, including its current offerings of “D-day: A View from Above” and “Women in Uniform,” alongside its popular permanent exhibits. One permanent display is a military gallery that showcases World War II-era uniforms and weaponry in addition to David Wright’s collection of tanks, half-tracks, jeeps, and motorcycles. These vehicles are still drivable and operational thanks to the Wright Mechanics, a group of volunteers who educate themselves on the inner workings of 80-year-old equipment. The military gallery is complemented by a home-front gallery that sheds light on everyday life in 1940s America while the war was waged overseas. It includes dozens of artifacts as well as full-scale replicas of a typical kitchen and soda fountain. Another illuminating exhibit is the time tunnel. Visitors are able to walk through rooms dedicated to each year from 1939 to 1945 and learn through audio and visual means about the culture and prevailing mood of the country. There is even a Victory Garden outside of the museum that grows produce for a local food pantry.

These exhibits come together at the Wright Museum of World War II to craft a compelling and enlightening narrative of the homefront contributions to the American war effort. The museum is always finding creative ways to engage patrons of all ages, and everyone learns something new about the World War II experience after talking with a passionate volunteer, listening to an expert speaker, or interacting with a thoughtfully placed display. These efforts ensure that current and future generations will appreciate all of the people who played a role in this formative chapter of our American story. United as one and fighting for a common purpose, these incredible citizens achieved victory, protected our way of life, and reintroduced freedom and democracy to distant parts of the world. Their legacy of commitment, duty, and sacrifice should inspire all of us as we confront modern-day challenges and threats to global peace and security.

On a personal note, the last outing I took with my 94-year-old mother, a member of the Greatest Generation, before her passing was to the Wright Museum. I have wonderful memories of that visit and the thoughtfulness of everyone at the museum. Thank you for your stewardship of World War II memorabilia.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in celebrating

the 30th anniversary of the Wright Museum of World War II.●

MEASURES DISCHARGED PETITION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, hereby direct that the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 58, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Furnaces", and, further, that the joint resolution be immediately placed upon the Legislative Calendar under General Orders.

Ted Cruz, Kevin Cramer, Bill Cassidy, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Lindsey Graham, Tommy Tuberville, Joni Ernst, Mitt Romney, Ted Budd, John Barrasso, Chuck Grassley, Katie Boyd Britt, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, Mike Rounds, Ron Johnson, Marsha Blackburn, Jerry Moran, Mike Lee, James Lankford, Thom Tillis, Cynthia M. Lummis, Eric Schmitt, Mike Braun, Dan Sullivan, Roger Marshall, John Hoeven, John Cornyn, John Boozman, Marco Rubio.

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following joint resolution was discharged from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, by petition, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 802(c), and placed on the calendar:

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Energy relating to "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Consumer Furnaces".

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 8369. An act to provide for the expeditious delivery of defense articles and defense services for Israel and other matters.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 4381. A bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

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-4611. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4612. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4613. A communication from the General Counsel, Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy Act Procedures" (RIN3240-AA05) received in the office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2024; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4614. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4615. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to waiving the Full-Up System Level requirement for survivability and lethality testing for the E-XX Take Charge And Move Out (TACAMO) aircraft; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4616. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4617. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twenty-six (26) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4618. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4619. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4620. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of eight (8) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4621. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of eight (8) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4622. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of seven (7) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4623. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4624. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of thirty-one (31) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general or major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4625. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of nine (9) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4626. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of ten (10) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general or major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4627. A communication from the Senior Official performing the duties of the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of twelve (12) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777, this will not cause the Department to exceed the number of frocked officers authorized; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4628. A communication from the Director of Congressional and Public Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to expenditures pursuant to the national emergency declared by Executive Order 13873 as well as Executive Orders 14034 and 13984; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4629. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to Existing Controls on Russia and Belarus Under the Export Administration Regulations Adding New License Exception Medical Devices; Corrections" (RIN0694-AJ59) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 26, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4630. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and

Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision of Investing Lenders and Investing Mortgagees Requirements and Expansion of Government-Sponsored Enterprise Definition” (RIN2502-AJ60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4631. 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 13067 with respect to Sudan; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4632. 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 13413 with respect to the Democratic Republic of the Congo; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4633. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to Export, Reexport, and Transfer (In-Country) Controls for Nicaragua under the Export Administration Regulations” (RIN0694-AJ34) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4634. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to the Unverified List” (RIN0694-AJ33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4635. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Additions of Entities to the Entity List” (RIN0694-AJ54) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4636. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Additions to the Entity List” (RIN0694-AJ28) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4637. 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 13405 with respect to Belarus; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4638. 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 13959 with respect to the threat from securities investments that finance certain companies of the People’s Republic of China; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4639. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report

entitled “Chief Counsel’s Interpretation Clarifying: (1) Authority of a Bank to Engage in Certain Cryptocurrency Activities and (2) Authority of the OCC to Charter a National Trust Bank”; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4640. A communication from the Director, Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Inflation Adjustment of Civil Monetary Penalties” received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4641. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of President, Government National Mortgage Association, Department of Housing and Urban Development, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4642. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Export Control Revisions for Australia, United Kingdom, United States Enhanced Trilateral Security Partnership” (RIN0694-AJ58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4643. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Export Control Measures Under the Export Administration Regulations to Address Iranian Aggression Against Israel and Military Support for Russia” (RIN0694-AJ61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4644. A communication from the Regulatory Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Community Reinvestment Act; Supplemental Rule” (RIN1557-AF26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4645. 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 12978 with respect to significant foreign narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4646. 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 13611 with respect to Yemen; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4647. 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 13303 with respect to the stabilization of Iraq; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4648. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of the Treasury, received in the Office

of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4649. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes, Department of Treasury received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4650. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Securing the Information and Communications Technology and Services Supply Chain; Connected Software Applications” (RIN0605-AA62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4651. 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 “Zimbabwe Sanctions Regulations” received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 22, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4652. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Addition of Entities to and Revision of Entry on the Entity List” (RIN0694-AJ47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4653. 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 “Community Reinvestment Act; Supplemental Rule” (RIN7100-AG75) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 24, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4654. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision of Firearms License Requirements” (RIN0694-AJ46) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 26, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4655. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fair Lending, Fair Housing, and Equitable Housing Finance Plans” (RIN2590-AB29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4656. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Floodplain Management and Protection of Wetlands; Minimum Property Standards for Flood Hazard Exposure; Building to the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard” (RIN2506-AC54) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4657. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Community Planning and Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Final Determination: Adoption of Energy Efficiency Standards for New Construction of HUD- and USDA-Financed Housing” (RIN2506-AC55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4658. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Public and Indian Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Housing Opportunity Through Modernization Act of 2016—Housing Choice Voucher and Project-Based Voucher Implementation: Additional Streamlining Changes” (RIN2577-AD06) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4659. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, proposed legislation entitled “To repeal the MOX production objective reporting requirement, and for other purposes”; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4660. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, proposed legislation entitled “To expand the Secretary of Energy’s authority to counter threatening unmanned aircraft systems for the protection of covered nuclear facilities and assets, and for other purposes”; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4661. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Office of General Counsel, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Procedures” (RIN1990-AA48) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4662. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Solar for All”; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4663. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Office of Manufacturing and Energy Supply Chains, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Interpretation of Foreign Entity of Concern” (RIN1901-ZA02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4664. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Federal Energy Management Program, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Clean Energy for New Federal Buildings and Major Renovations of Federal Buildings” (RIN1904-AB96) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4665. A communication from the Division Chief of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Conservation Landscape Health Final Rule” (RIN1004-AE92) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 3, 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4666. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for Miscellaneous Refrigeration Products” (RIN1904-AF62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 9, 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4667. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Building for the Future Through Electric Regional Transmission Planning and Cost Allocation” (RIN1902-AF87) (Docket No. RM21-17-000) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 15, 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4668. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Implementing Statutory Addition of Certain Per- and Polyfluoroalkyl Substances to the Toxics Release Inventory Beginning with Reporting Year 2024” (RIN2070-AL04) (FRL No. 9427-1-01-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4669. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Missouri: Final Approval of State Underground Storage Tank Program Revisions, Codification, and Incorporation by Reference” (FRL No. 11446-02-R7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4670. A communication from the Senior Attorney Advisor/Regulations Officer, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition for Federal and Federally Assisted Programs” (RIN2125-AF79) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4671. A communication from the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “2022 Clean Watersheds Needs Survey Report to Congress”; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4672. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Section 355 PLR Procedures” (Rev. Proc. 2024-24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 10, 2024; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4673. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Expansion of Prohibition of Interment or Memorialization of Persons Who Committed Certain Crimes” (RIN2900-AS06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-4674. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Update and Clarify Regulatory Bars to Ben-

efits Based on Character of Discharge” (RIN2900-AQ95) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-4675. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “CHAMPVA Coverage of Audio-Only Telehealth, Mental Health Services, and Cost Sharing for Certain Contraceptive Services and Contraceptive Products Approved, Cleared, or Granted by FDA” (RIN2900-AR55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-4676. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Veteran and Spouse Transitional Assistance Grant Program” (RIN2900-AR68) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 5, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-4677. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled “Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) Quarterly Report to Congress; First Quarter of fiscal year 2024”; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-4678. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Loan Guaranty: Regulation Servicer Changes” (RIN2900-AR97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-4679. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “VA Servicer Handbook M26-4, Chapter 9: VA Purchase [Note: VA has concluded that this handbook is not a ‘rule’ within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 804(3). Nevertheless, out of an abundance of caution, VA is submitting it to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General consistent with the procedures set forth in 5 U.S.C. 801(a).]” received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-4680. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “VA Manual M26-3, Chapter 9: VA Purchase [Note: VA has concluded that this handbook is not a ‘rule’ within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. 804(3). Nevertheless, out of an abundance of caution, VA is submitting it to each House of Congress and to the Comptroller General consistent with the procedures set forth in 5 U.S.C. 801(a).]” received in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 17, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

EC-4681. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “VA Veteran Readiness and Employment Program Removal of Regulation Regarding Repayment of Training and Rehabilitation Supplies” (RIN2900-AR90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the

President of the Senate on April 23, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4682. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Changes in Rates VA Pays for Special Modes of Transportation; Delay of Effective Date" (RIN2900-AS03) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4683. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Exceptions to Applying the Bilateral Factor in VA Disability Calculations" (RIN2900-AR51) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4684. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustment Act Amendments" (RIN2900-AR89) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4685. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Active Service Pay" (RIN2900-AP86) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4686. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "85/15 Rule Calculations, Waiver Criteria, and Reports" (RIN2900-AR56) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 23, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4687. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Commemorative Plaques and Urns" (RIN2900-AR88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 14, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4688. A communication from the Regulations Coordinator, Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Outdated Regulations" (RIN0917-AA24) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 25, 2024; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-4689. A communication from the Administrative Specialist, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Acquisition Regulations; Buy Indian Act; Procedures for Contracting" (RIN1090-AB21) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on April 29, 2024; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-4690. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "FOIA Improvement Act" (Notice 2024-13); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-4691. A communication from the Associate Administrator, Congressional and Legislative Affairs, Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Criminal Justice Reviews for the SBA Business Loan Programs, Disaster Loan Programs, and Surety Bond Guaranty Program" (RIN3245-AI03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 1, 2024; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-111. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging the United States Congress to expand the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children to cover the purchase of menstrual products; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the members of the 82nd Session of the Nevada Legislature hereby urge Congress to expand the eligible uses of benefits from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children to include the purchase of menstrual products to improve the access of persons with low incomes to such necessary products; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the Vice President of the United States as the presiding officer of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM-112. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Nevada urging the federal government to address the issue of spouses of members of the military losing retirement benefits due to frequent relocations by creating a retirement plan that is funded by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 6

Whereas, Historically, the State of Nevada has honored the sacrifices that members of the military and their families have made to protect our freedoms by providing veterans and members of the military certain benefits and rehabilitative services; and

Whereas, Nevada state law currently requires the Director of the Department of Veterans Services to assist veterans and those persons presently serving in the Armed Forces of the United States who are residents of the State of Nevada and their spouses, domestic partners, widows, widowers, children, dependents, administrators, executors and personal representatives; and

Whereas, According to the RAND National Defense Research Institute, research has found that spouses of members of the military have lower earnings and employment than comparable persons who are married to civilians and that relocating because of military service is associated with lower spousal earnings; and

Whereas, Permanently relocating because of a change of duty station has been shown by the RAND National Defense Research Institute

to reduce earnings of spouses of members of the military and may threaten the ability of such persons to support themselves financially in retirement; and

Whereas, A study by the RAND National Defense Research Institute suggests that programs designed to mitigate the adverse impacts on careers of spouses of members of the military associated with permanent relocation because of a change of duty station may have meaningful impacts on the financial well-being of families of members of the military by improving current earnings and the ability of members of the military and their spouses to support themselves financially in retirement; and

Whereas, The United States Department of Defense, through the Defense Finance and Accounting Service, administers the military retirement system, which is a government-funded benefit system that includes monthly compensation for qualified retirees from the active duty and reserve forces of the military, disability benefits for those deemed medically unfit to serve and a survivor annuity program for the eligible survivors of deceased retirees; and

Whereas, The United States Department of Defense currently offers several programs to assist military spouses advance their careers and educational goals, such as the Military Spouse Employment Partnership and My Career Advancement Accounts, mainly through the Office of Military Community and Family Policy of the Department; and

Whereas, The Department of Defense Appropriations Act appropriates funding to the United States Department of Defense for military activities; and

Whereas, The United States Department of Defense does not currently have a plan or program that provides retirement benefits to spouses of members of the military; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly, That the members of the 81st Session of the Nevada Legislature express support for the creation of a retirement plan to resolve the issue of the loss of retirement benefits for spouses of members of the military due to frequent relocations; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of the 81st Session of the Nevada Legislature urge the Federal Government to create and implement a retirement plan that addresses the loss of retirement benefits for spouses of members of the military due to frequent relocations that is funded by the Department of Defense Appropriations Act; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate prepare and transmit a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, Vice President of the United States as presiding officer of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each member of the Nevada Congressional Delegation, the United States Secretary of the Department of Defense and the Governor of the State of Nevada; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution becomes effective upon passage.

POM-113. A concurrent memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging the United States Congress to enact legislation establishing a Space National Guard; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL NO. 1004

Whereas, the space domain has been a critical part of defense and combat operations necessary for the continued security of the United States symbolized by strategic importance and the multifaceted value of space operations to both national security and technological advancement;

Whereas, Arizona is home to significant aerospace and defense industry contributions, with its citizens and economy benefiting greatly from the technological innovations and jobs these sectors provide; and

Whereas, establishing a Space National Guard would enhance the capabilities of the United States in space by offering a cost-effective, ready and innovative force that leverages the talent and resources of states like Arizona; and

Whereas, the collaboration between the United States Department of Defense, the United States Space Force and state National Guards would strengthen national security, foster international partnerships and ensure that the United States remains at the forefront of space domain operations; and

Whereas, the integration of National Guard space operations into a formal Space National Guard would optimize resources, ensuring every dollar invested yields significant returns in combat capability and technological advancement; and

Whereas, the Air National Guard's Space Operations have demonstrated unparalleled expertise, readiness and economic efficiency and have proved the vital role they play in the nation's defense and space exploration efforts; and

Whereas, the establishment of the Space National Guard would recognize and leverage the existing Infrastructure, talent and innovation present in states like Arizona and would foster a collaborative environment between federal and state entities to advance the nation's space objectives.

Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, the House of Representatives concurring, prays:

1. That the United States Congress enact legislation to immediately establish a Space National Guard to harness and expand the capabilities, readiness and economic efficiency of the Air National Guard's Space Operations, thereby ensuring that the United States maintains its competitive edge in space domain security and exploration.

2. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-114. A concurrent memorial adopted by the Legislature of the State of Arizona urging the President of the United States and the United States Congress to reevaluate proposed restrictions on the chemical industry; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

HOUSE CONCURRENT MEMORIAL NO. 2001

Whereas, the State of Arizona recognizes the vital role played by the chemical industry in the economic development, national security and technological innovation of the United States; and

Whereas, the chemical industry is a cornerstone of our nation's economy, contributing over \$600 billion in economic impact, supporting more than half a million jobs and constituting 25% of the gross domestic product; and

Whereas, the chemical industry is instrumental in providing essential products and innovations that drive progress in areas such as housing, infrastructure, health care, telecommunications and clean energy solutions; and

Whereas, the success of the chemical industry is crucial to maintaining America's global competitiveness and achieving national priorities; and

Whereas, recent regulatory actions and proposed restrictions by the Biden Adminis-

tration and its agencies have raised concerns about the impact on the chemical industry's ability to innovate, create products and contribute to the nation's economic growth; and

Whereas, these new restrictions have the potential to limit access to and increase the cost of essential products, negatively impacting the United States economy, jeopardizing American competitiveness and delaying progress in industries with urgent and growing needs; and

Whereas, there are currently 13 proposed new restrictions with the potential to directly impact the chemical industry, ranging from outright bans on certain chemistries to regulations that may render manufacturing unviable or impossible; and

Whereas, these restrictions may have detrimental effects on the supply chains for vital technologies, including semiconductors, electric vehicles and modern health care applications; and

Whereas, the proposed restrictions contradict policy priorities set forth by laws such as the Inflation Reduction Act, the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and the CHIPS and Science Act; and

Whereas, responsible regulation that prioritizes science, promotes innovation and supports supply chain resiliency is essential to achieving national goals.

Wherefore your memorialist, the House of Representatives of the State of Arizona, the Senate concurring, prays:

1. That the Members of the Legislature urge the President of the United States, federal agencies and the United States Congress to reevaluate proposed restrictions on the chemical industry and to ensure that regulations are based on sound science, promote innovation and support supply chain resiliency.

2. That the Members of the Legislature urge the President of the United States, federal agencies and the United States Congress to support frameworks that celebrate innovation and accelerate progress in the chemical industry.

3. That the Secretary of State of the State of Arizona transmit copies of this Memorial to the President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the directors of relevant federal agencies and each Member of Congress from the State of Arizona.

POM-115. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio urging the United States Congress to repeal the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBSTITUTE HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

NO. 6

Whereas, The Windfall Elimination Provision was enacted in 1983 to equalize the earned Social Security benefits of workers who spend part of their careers in exempt public service and workers who spend their entire careers participating in Social Security; and

Whereas, The Windfall Elimination Provision reduces the Social Security benefits of public servants who receive a pension for public service that was not subject to Social Security taxes; and

Whereas, The Windfall Elimination Provision's flawed practical application diminishes nearly 150,000 Ohioans' retirement security and fails to recognize their rightfully earned Social Security and public pension benefits; and

Whereas, The Government Pension Offset reduces the Social Security spousal or survivor benefit paid to an individual's spouse who receives a government pension based on

the spouse's own public employment not covered by Social Security; and

Whereas, The Government Pension Offset reduces an individual's Social Security spousal or survivor benefit by two-thirds of the individual's own government pension, leaving many without adequate retirement income; and

Whereas, It is estimated that the Government Pension Offset affects and undermines the financial security of more than 100,000 Ohioans; and

Whereas, There are 1.7 million participants in Ohio's public retirement systems and over 450,000 beneficiaries and recipients; and

Whereas, Members of the 118th United States Congress have introduced legislation to repeal the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset; now therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the 135th General Assembly of the State of Ohio, in adopting this resolution, urge the Congress of the United States to repeal the Windfall Elimination Provision and the Government Pension Offset; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the members of the Ohio Congressional delegation, and the news media of Ohio.

POM-116. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California urging the federal Office of Management and Budget to update its Uniform Guidance in order to improve job creation, quality, and equity; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Senate Joint Resolution No.5

Whereas, Since 1988, the federal Office of Management and Budget (OMB) established federal grant rules, now known as the Uniform Guidance (2 C.F.R. Part 200), that have severely limited state and local governments from implementing substantive procurement standards that promote good jobs and equity; and

Whereas, State and local governments are prohibited from using local hire (hiring people from a specific geographic region) in federally funded procurements; and

Whereas, The Uniform Guidance has impeded the implementation of policies, including targeted hire provisions and project labor agreements:

Whereas, This language has hindered state and local governments efforts to put local or disadvantaged residents to work rebuilding infrastructure in their own communities; and

Whereas, No empirical evidence has been cited that shows local hire has an adverse impact on bid competition or cost; and

Whereas, The United States Congress itself has never prohibited local hire or targeted hire; and

Whereas, The 2015 Obama-Biden Administration's Local Labor Hiring Pilot Program allowed grant recipients to use local hire programs to successfully increase social, economic, and racial equity in their communities; and

Whereas, The Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act allowed for local hire to be used in transportation construction projects; and

Whereas, Local hire programs address the fundamental goal of having residents participate in infrastructure investments in their own towns and cities; and

Whereas, Targeted hire programs can also increase opportunities for workers of color, women, veterans, returning community

members, and others historically excluded from meaningful employment; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature urges the Office of Management and Budget to update its Uniform Guidance to explicitly allow states and localities to implement strong procurement standards that advance high-quality jobs and equitable hiring, including lifting the local hire prohibition on federally funded projects, and in so doing empower California lawmakers and agencies to create equitable infrastructure jobs that can strengthen our cities, counties, and state; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the federal Office of Management and Budget, and to the author for appropriate distribution.

POM-117. A joint resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee urging the federal government to do all within its power to secure the border and protect our country; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 801

Whereas, recent events in Texas have demonstrated the federal government's disinclination to fulfill a duty imposed by the United States Constitution and federal statutory law, namely the protection of the several states from illegal immigration; and

Whereas, the security of our nation's borders and the safety of our citizens are paramount to protecting the American way of life; and

Whereas, due to the present administration's abrogation of its duty to secure the border, more than six million illegal immigrants have crossed our southern border in the last three years; and

Whereas, Article 1, §10, Clause 3, of the United States Constitution reserves to the states the right of self-defense, including the right to secure a state's border against an invasion; and

Whereas, the state of Texas has acted properly in declaring an invasion pursuant to such constitutional provision and invoking Texas's constitutional authority to defend and protect its citizens and sovereign property; and

Whereas, the Texas National Guard, Texas Department of Public Safety officers, and other qualified Texas personnel have been deployed to secure the Texas border; and

Whereas, federal government officials and agencies have since encroached upon Texas's constitutional right to protect against threats to the public safety; and

Whereas, the members of this General Assembly have consistently taken steps to address illegal immigration in Tennessee and support the state of Texas in doing likewise; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the One Hundred Thirteenth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, The Senate Concurring, that this General Assembly stands in support of the state of Texas's efforts to secure its border against illegal immigration and affirms the several states' constitutional right to protect and defend their citizens and property against any threat to public safety and security; and be it further

Resolved, that this General Assembly commends Governor Lee for previous support of securing the Texas border and urges him to send continued support; and be it further

Resolved, that this General Assembly urges the federal government to do all within its power to secure the border and protect our country; and be it further

Resolved, that certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the

United States, the U.S. Secretary of Homeland Security, the Governor of the State of Tennessee, the Speaker and the Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President and the Secretary of the United States Senate, each member of the Tennessee Congressional delegation, and the Governor of Texas.

POM-118. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Maine requesting the United States Department of Veterans Affairs to provide access to medical care and assistance to members of the Maine National Guard who trained at the military support base in Gagetown, New Brunswick, Canada; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SENATE PAPER 998

Whereas, Resolve 2023, chapter 95 established the Gagetown Harmful Chemical Study Commission; and

Whereas, the commission was tasked with studying the impacts of exposure to harmful chemicals, including 2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin, or TCDD, as well as other dioxins including that known as Agent Orange, on veterans who served at the Canadian military support base in Gagetown, New Brunswick, Canada; and

Whereas, the commission has striven to demonstrate through scientific evidence the connection between exposure to those chemicals while training and subsequent negative health outcomes, but it is the responsibility of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs to make this determination and provide care and assistance; and

Whereas, the United States Department of Veterans Affairs has determined that Vietnam War veterans who were exposed to tactical herbicides, including Agent Orange, suffered harmful effects and were subsequently diagnosed with conditions or illnesses associated with that exposure; and

Whereas, those who served at the Gagetown military support base include members of the United States National Guard, who were never deployed but were nevertheless exposed to these harmful chemicals, which are known to have been tested at Gagetown; and

Whereas, access to medical care and assistance through the United States Department of Veterans Affairs is therefore unavailable for these National Guard members; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That We, your Memorialists, respectfully urge and request that the United States Department of Veterans Affairs recognize the effects of exposure to harmful chemicals, including TCDD and other dioxins, on members of the United States National Guard who trained at Gagetown and who are diagnosed with conditions or illnesses associated with that exposure as has already been done for Vietnam War veterans and others; and be it further

Resolved, That We further urge and request that the United States Department of Veterans Affairs review the most recent scientific reporting on the effects to human health of exposure to dioxins, to conduct independent environmental sampling and analysis at Gagetown related to dioxins and risks to human health, to examine health outcomes for individuals who trained there and to provide access to medical care and assistance for those individuals; and be it further

Resolved, That suitable copies of this resolution, duly authenticated by the Secretary of State, be transmitted to the Honorable Joseph Biden, President of the United States; the President of the United States Senate; Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States; the Honorable Denis Richard McDonough, Secretary of Veterans Affairs; and each Member of the Maine Congressional Delegation.

POM-119. A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Urbana, Illinois, calling for the end of the Gaza war and a lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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 Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 4370. A bill to amend the Tribal Forest Protection Act of 2004 to improve that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 4371. A bill to amend the Investor Protection and Securities Reform Act of 2010 to provide grants to States for enhanced protection of senior investors and senior policyholders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 4372. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay costs associated with the delivery of automobiles or other conveyances to eligible persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 4373. A bill to provide for congressional approval of national emergency declarations; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4374. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to include screening for loneliness and coordination of supportive services and health care to address the negative health effects of loneliness, to require a report on loneliness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 4375. A bill to establish a critical supply chain resiliency and crisis response program in the Department of Commerce, and to secure American leadership in deploying emerging technologies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 4376. A bill to increase Government accountability for administrative actions by reinvigorating administrative Pay-As-You-Go; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 4377. A bill to require U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to facilitate naturalization services for noncitizen veterans who have been removed from the United States or are inadmissible; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. 4378. A bill to require on-time delivery of periodicals to unlock additional rate authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4379. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to change certain grant requirements for certain students with disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Ms. BUTLER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. PADILLA, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4380. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to promote matriculation, and increase in the graduation rates, of individuals with disabilities within higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BUTLER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. Kaine, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. OSSOFF, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TESTER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNER, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 4381. A bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception; read the first time.

By Mr. OSSOFF:

S. 4382. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 to provide for environmental infrastructure in East Point, Georgia; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 4383. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 to provide for environmental infrastructure in coastal Georgia; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. OSSOFF:

S. 4384. A bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 to provide for environmental infrastructure in Columbus, Henry, and Clayton Counties, Georgia; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. Kaine):

S. Res. 700. A resolution supporting the efforts of the United States and international partners to facilitate a security environment that is conducive to holding free and fair elections in Haiti and promoting a durable return to democratic governance; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 161

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Nebraska

(Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 161, a bill to extend the Federal Pell Grant eligibility of certain short-term programs.

S. 597

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 597, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 711

At the request of Mr. BUDD, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 711, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the invaluable service that working dogs provide to society.

S. 793

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 793, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical therapists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the "Hello Girls".

S. 895

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 895, a bill to provide for further comprehensive research at the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke on unruptured intracranial aneurysms.

S. 1064

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1064, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a national project to prevent and cure Parkinson's, to be known as the National Parkinson's Project, and for other purposes.

S. 1661

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1661, a bill to establish the Strength in Diversity Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1867

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1867, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out an initiative to develop, expand, and improve rural childcare, and for other purposes.

S. 1950

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1950, a bill to extend the tem-

porary order for fentanyl-related substances.

S. 2360

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2360, a bill to establish an Interagency Collaborative and Innovation Pilot Program to Address Hunger and Promote Access to Healthy Food Among Older Adults and Adults with Disabilities.

S. 2539

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2539, a bill to clarify that, in awarding funding under title X of the Public Health Service Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services may not discriminate against eligible States, individuals, or other entities for refusing to counsel or refer for abortions.

S. 2881

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2881, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to provide notice to students participating in a State or federally financed work-study program about potential eligibility for participation in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 2913

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2913, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to deny Federal retirement benefits to individuals convicted of child sex abuse.

S. 3047

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3047, a bill to award payments to employees of Air America who provided support to the United States from 1950 to 1976, and for other purposes.

S. 3260

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3260, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a working group to formulate recommendations for standardizing the measurements of loneliness and isolation, and for other purposes.

S. 3428

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3428, a bill to terminate the membership by the United States in the United Nations, and for other purposes.

S. 3716

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 3716, a bill to create children's lifetime savings accounts, and for other purposes.

S. 3764

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) were added as cosponsors of S. 3764, a bill to extend and authorize annual appropriations for the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom through fiscal year 2026.

S. 3832

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) were added as cosponsors of S. 3832, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure appropriate access to non-opioid pain management drugs under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 3889

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3889, a bill to prohibit defense contracting with companies that employ lobbyists who represent Chinese military companies or human rights abusers, and for other purposes.

S. 4051

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4051, a bill to prohibit transportation of any alien using certain methods of identification, and for other purposes.

S. 4096

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4096, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the random assignment of certain cases in the district courts of the United States.

S. 4296

At the request of Mrs. BRITT, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 4296, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide more opportunities for mothers to succeed, and for other purposes.

S. 4307

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4307, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to modify requirements for citizen suits under those Acts, and for other purposes.

S. 4337

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4337, a bill to provide for the expeditious delivery of defense articles and defense services for Israel, and for other purposes.

S. 4368

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from Wyoming

(Ms. LUMMIS) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) were added as cosponsors of S. 4368, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to require, as a condition of receiving Federal Medicaid funding, that States do not prohibit in vitro fertilization (IVF) services, and for other purposes.

S. 4369

At the request of Mr. COTTON, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 4369, a bill to require the Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center to develop a strategy and conduct outreach to United States industry, including shipping companies, port operators, and logistics firms, on the risks of smartport technology of the People's Republic of China and other related risks, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 76

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 76, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Short-Term, Limited-Duration Insurance and Independent, Noncoordinated Excepted Benefits Coverage".

S.J. RES. 79

At the request of Mr. BUDD, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 79, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to "Retirement Security Rule: Definition of an Investment Advice Fiduciary".

S. RES. 638

At the request of Mr. COONS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 638, a resolution calling for the immediate release of Ryan Corbett, a United States citizen who was wrongfully detained by the Taliban on August 10, 2022, and condemning the wrongful detention of Americans by the Taliban.

S. RES. 687

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 687, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2758 (XXVI) and the harmful conflation of China's "One China Principle" and the United States "One China Policy".

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 700—SUPPORTING THE EFFORTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS TO FACILITATE A SECURITY ENVIRONMENT THAT IS CONDUCIVE TO HOLDING FREE AND FAIR ELECTIONS IN HAITI AND PROMOTING A DURABLE RETURN TO DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. KAINES) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 700

Whereas, on July 7, 2021, Jovenel Moïse, the former President of Haiti, was assassinated in his home, aggravating a complex and dynamic political crisis which has debilitated the capacity of the country;

Whereas, in the absence of a functioning and democratically elected central government in Haiti, criminal gangs have flourished, often with the backing of the country's political and economic elites, creating a security vacuum and humanitarian crisis that has exposed Haitians to the overwhelming threat of indiscriminate violence, including rampant gender-based violence;

Whereas widespread gang violence in Haiti has culminated in killings and kidnappings of civilians, including at least 1 United States citizen;

Whereas criminal gangs have seized control of up to 80 percent of Port-au-Prince and critical infrastructure, including health care providers, schools, and transit facilities;

Whereas, according to the International Organization for Migration, more than 350,000 Haitians are internally displaced, with gang violence accounting for 93 percent of such displacement;

Whereas, according to the United Nations, 3,334 Haitians were victims of intentional homicide between January 1 and September 30, 2023, while the projected homicide rate per 100,000 people doubled compared to the 2022 homicide rate;

Whereas gangs in Haiti have routinely engaged in kidnaping for ransom, abducting 1,787 people between January 1 and September 30, 2023;

Whereas, as of March 2024, there were 79,411 suspected cases of cholera in Haiti and the risk of a cholera outbreak has been exacerbated by the gangs' control of critical infrastructure, including hospitals and health clinics;

Whereas endemic corruption in Haiti, which ranked 171 out of 180 countries in Transparency International's 2022 Corruption Perceptions Index, which is worse than the 2017 ranking of 157 out of 180, has entrenched criminal gangs, deprived Haitians of economic prosperity, and presents significant obstacles to lasting government reform;

Whereas the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs issued an appeal for \$674,000,000 in February 2024 to meet the needs of an estimated 3,600,000 Haitians who require humanitarian assistance (12 percent more Haitians than were supported in 2023) and are highly vulnerable as a result of the worsening security situation and near-collapse of basic services in Haiti;

Whereas, according to the World Food Programme, 4,950,000 Haitians were food insecure as of September 2023, and 68 percent of the country's population had insufficient food consumption as of March 2024;

Whereas the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime has documented that illicit firearms and drug trafficking from the United States to Haiti have, in part, fueled the cycle of violence across Haiti;

Whereas on June 25, 2022, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act (Public Law 117-159) made gun trafficking a Federal offense and granted the government new authorities to hold firearms smugglers accountable and to prosecute perpetrators;

Whereas Homeland Security Investigations, in coordination with the Department of State, has utilized these new authorities to set up a Transnational Criminal Intelligence Unit in Haiti to work with the Haitian National Police to investigate and prosecute transnational crimes, including firearms and ammunition smuggling, human trafficking, and transnational gang activity;

Whereas, in July 2023, the Department of Justice appointed the first United States Coordinator for Caribbean Firearms Prosecutions to ensure collaboration with the Department of State and investigate gun-related crimes in the region;

Whereas, on November 16, 2023, Haiti and the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives signed a memorandum of understanding to facilitate cooperation through the eTrace system, an investigative tool used by the bureau to track firearms used in criminal activity, including their purchase history and manufacturer or importer;

Whereas the interim government of Prime Minister Ariel Henry was not duly elected to office and lacked the constitutional or public legitimacy to unilaterally organize free and fair elections;

Whereas the expiration of the terms of the majority of the members of the Parliament of Haiti on January 10, 2023, without elected officials to succeed them, led to the suspension of the legislature's activities and have left the Haitian people without a functioning government;

Whereas, in February 2023, the interim government appointed members to the High Transition Council, which is charged with facilitating a roadmap for eventual democratic elections, but progress was hampered by gang violence and a failure by Prime Minister Henry to reach political consensus with major opposition parties;

Whereas, on October 6, 2022, Prime Minister Henry and 18 members of the Council of Ministers issued an appeal to the international community for security assistance and technical support to assist the Haitian National Police's efforts to combat gang violence;

Whereas, on October 2, 2023, the United Nations Security Council overwhelmingly voted to adopt Resolution 2699/2023, which authorizes the formation and deployment of a Multinational Security Support (referred to in this preamble as the "MSS") mission to re-establish security and the Government of Kenya has subsequently agreed to lead the MSS mission in close coordination with the Government of Haiti;

Whereas United Nations Security Council Resolution 2699/2023 authorizes the MSS mission to provide operational support to the Haitian National Police—

(1) to support the provision of security for critical infrastructure and transit locations;

(2) to help to ensure unhindered and safe access to humanitarian aid; and

(3) to build security conditions that are conducive to holding free and fair elections in Haiti;

Whereas the Government of Kenya has volunteered to send 1,000 police officers to support the MSS mission and the Kenyan parliament has subsequently voted to approve this action;

Whereas, on April 25, 2024, Ariel Henry resigned as prime minister and a 9-member transitional presidential council, composed of representatives from political parties and civil society, was sworn in and charged with—

- (1) selecting a new prime minister;
- (2) appointing members to an electoral commission to facilitate the election; and
- (3) swearing in a new president by February 7, 2026;

Whereas Caribbean Community (commonly known as "CARICOM" member states are vital partners in supporting the MSS mission and Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Benin, Chad, Guyana, and Jamaica have each publicly committed to contributing personnel or resources to the MSS mission;

Whereas the MSS mission is not a substitute for a sustainable, professional, and well-equipped Haitian National Police that protects and serves the entirety of the Haitian people;

Whereas Congress, through the passage of the Haiti Development, Accountability, and Institutional Transparency Initiative Act (division V of Public Law 117-103), has previously directed the Secretary of State to prioritize the protection of human rights and anti-corruption efforts in Haiti and urges the Department of State to integrate these priorities into oversight and accountability mechanisms for the MSS mission;

Whereas a Haitian-led, inclusive, and sustainable political solution is the only path forward for the country to restore security, the rule of law, democratic institutions, and economic stability; and

Whereas the international community and those contributing to the MSS mission must ensure that—

(1) the MSS mission does not inadvertently support nondemocratic actors who would attempt to seize on improved security conditions to entrench their own power or perpetuate instability; and

(2) lessons learned from previous international missions in Haiti, including the need to promote respect for human rights and promote accountability, are applied: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the urgent need to restore peace and security and alleviate the humanitarian crisis in Haiti as part of an overarching strategy—

(A) to promote a return to democratic governance in the country; and

(B) to ensure that Haitians enjoy their right to liberty and security of person;

(2) supports a MSS mission, as authorized by the United Nations Security Council on October 2, 2023, which adequately—

(A) complies with international law, including international human rights law, as applicable;

(B) takes all necessary steps to protect civilians and respect the rule of law;

(C) maintains the popular support of the Haitian people;

(D) consults with and incorporates feedback from impacted populations, with attention to vulnerable communities, including women, children, and the economically disadvantaged; and

(E) is bound by strict time constraints and is subject to oversight and renewal by the United Nations Security Council in specified increments;

(3) applauds the assistance and other support the Department of State and the Department of Defense have provided to secure intelligence, airlift, communications, and medical support for the MSS mission;

(4) commends the support offered to-date by CARICOM and international partners, in-

cluding Antigua and Barbuda, the Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Chad, Guyana, and Jamaica, which is necessary to operationalize the MSS mission;

(5) calls on other members of the international community to pledge financial assistance, logistical and operational support, and personnel to the MSS mission to the greatest extent possible;

(6) endorses international election monitoring in Haiti in support of free and fair elections; and

(7) encourages additional assistance from the United States and the international community to address Haiti's humanitarian needs, including through additional contributions to the United Nations Humanitarian Appeal for fiscal year 2024 and for subsequent fiscal years.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2067. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4361, making emergency supplemental appropriations for border security and combatting fentanyl for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2067. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4361, making emergency supplemental appropriations for border security and combatting fentanyl for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 165, after the undesigned matter following line 5, insert the following:

SEC. 302. SOUTHERN BORDER WALL CONSTRUCTION FUND.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the "Build the Wall Act of 2024".

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a separate account, which shall be known as the "Southern Border Wall Construction Fund" (referred to in this section as the "Fund").

(c) **DEPOSITS.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, there shall be immediately deposited into the Fund all of the unobligated amounts in the Coronavirus State and Local fiscal recovery funds established under sections 602 and 603 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 802 and 803).

(d) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Amounts in the Fund shall be used by the Secretary of Homeland Security to construct and maintain physical barriers along the southern international border of the United States.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I have 10 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 COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the

Senate on Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 2:30 p.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 Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 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 Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE, CUSTOMS, AND GLOBAL COMPETITIVENESS

The Subcommittee on International Trade, Customs, and Global Competitiveness of the Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON STRATEGIC FORCES

The Subcommittee on Strategic Forces of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 21, 2024, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:46 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 22, 2024, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 21, 2024:

THE JUDICIARY

KRISSA M. LANHAM, OF ARIZONA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA.