



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, MAY 23, 2024

No. 90

Senate

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

PRAYER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Today's opening prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Pastor Adam Weber, of Embrace Church, from Sioux Falls, SD.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious Lord, we thank You for this day. Help us to not take this day or any day for granted.

Thank You for the breath in our lungs. Thank You for hearing our voice when we cry out, for hearing our voice when we ask for Your wisdom. Today, I lift up the Senate body to You. Would You fill them with Your love, Your joy, Your peace, Your grace, and Your truth. Fill them with Your wisdom which starts and ends with You, O Lord. Would You guide and lead and direct them. Help their thoughts, their conversations, and their decisions today to be pleasing to You.

I am so grateful that You are all-powerful Lord, and we are mere instruments in Your hands. Today, we dedicate this day, our country, and our lives to You, and we pray this in Your holy and precious 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 23, 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.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, let me just say a word of welcome today to Pastor Adam Weber. You heard him offer the opening prayer today. I am very privileged to have him here, and Adam is someone whose family I have known for a long time. I sort of watched him grow up, if you will. He is a Milbank, SD, native, a graduate of Augustana College, and at the young age of 24, started a church called Embrace Church in Sioux Falls, SD. And at that time, I think their first service had 32 people.

His office was a Chevy Cavalier, and a decade later, it was one of the fastest growing churches, literally, in this entire country. They have continued to grow through the years and they will do it the same way they always have and that is one person at a time.

Embrace's heart is to relentlessly reach the next person for Jesus. It is something that Adam lives out. He seeks out strangers. He goes for what he calls "nonfluff" conversations, and he reaches people, lots and lots of people, with the good news of the Gospel.

And I have had the opportunity to attend services at Embrace along with my wife. Adam also has a podcast

which reaches literally thousands and thousands of people that I have listened to.

He interviews people from all walks of life and talks to them about their spiritual formation, and it is very meaningful to his listeners and certainly has been important in my life, too, as we try to apply the truth of the Scriptures at a time when we face enormous challenges as a country and in a lot of our communities across the country.

So I am delighted to have Adam here, thankful for his ministry, and grateful to Chaplain Black for making it possible for him to be Chaplain for the day. And I would tell my colleagues what I have said many times before, and that is that we do have a Bible study the Chaplain leads on a weekly basis, Thursday at noon, and encourage all of my colleagues to attend.

It has been enormously important to me through the years in keeping me anchored and grounded on the solid rock at times when things can be very uncertain and sometimes tumultuous around us. So I am grateful for the Chaplain for his leadership here and delighted to have Pastor Adam Weber from Sioux Falls, SD, and Embrace Church with us here today in the U.S. Senate.

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.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3861

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

BORDER ACT OF 2024—MOTION TO PROCEED

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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.

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first let me add my greetings to our Chaplain from South Dakota and welcome him under JOHN THUNE's auspices. So welcome, Pastor. Pastor, welcome.

Three months ago, something truly stunning happened here on the Senate floor. Senate Republicans filibustered the strongest, most comprehensive border security bill Congress has seen in a generation. And they did it because Donald Trump wanted to exploit the border for political gain on the campaign trail.

Well, today, we are going to try again. We will vote to move forward on a border security bill that Democrats and Republicans spent months on together. I hope our Republican colleagues join us to reach a different outcome.

We all know the situation at the border is unacceptable and demands attention from Congress. Democrats believe that, our Republicans have been saying it, and that is why 3 months ago we sat down with them to write a strong and necessary and bipartisan border security bill.

Poll after poll shows that a large majority of Americans across party lines support our position of getting a bipartisan bill done, and only 8 percent are in opposition.

When Republicans like Donald Trump say: Don't support a bipartisan bill, wait till next year, they are in a distinct minority with the American people from one end of the country to the other.

People want us to get things done. People want us to come together. And when they hear that the only reason Republicans backed away from this bill is not that it wasn't strong enough but that Donald Trump said he wanted chaos at the border, they don't like that.

This is our bill. The public is on the same page, and in polling data, Democrats, Republicans, and Independents are all on the same page: act on a bipartisan bill; get something done; don't play political games.

And this is a bill that will hire thousands of new border agents, a bill that will finally reform asylum, a bill that will commit billions to stop the flow of

fentanyl, a bill endorsed by the National Border Patrol Union, the Chamber of Commerce, and the very conservative Wall Street editorial page.

So to my Republican colleagues, you wanted this border bill. Today, we vote on this border bill, and it is time to show you are serious about solving the problem.

Look, I understand that today's bill is not going to win every single Democratic vote or every single Republican vote. That was never the goal of this bill. The goal was rather to come up with something that could get 60 votes, a majority on both sides of the aisle. That is how it was crafted.

And it is far different than what the Republicans have done. Look at what happened to H.R. 2. It didn't get a single Democratic vote here in the Senate. It did not even get the support of every Senate Republican.

If anything is political theater, it is H.R. 2. It is not designed to solve the problem. It is designed to make a political point. The bill we are bringing up was designed to solve the problem. And Republicans and Democrats labored together in good faith to get that done, and it would have gotten done had Donald Trump not said: I don't want this done. Blame it on me. I want chaos at the border so I can win reelection.

That is not what the American people want, as I mentioned. The polling data is clearly on our side.

The bipartisan border bill is something so different than H.R. 2 because it is a serious attempt at legislation that Republicans helped put together.

Now, people might forget, but there was actually a lot of bipartisan interest in getting this bill passed before Donald Trump killed the bill and told the country, "Please blame it on me." That is what he said, blame it on him.

My friend the Republican leader openly admitted that "it's actually our side that wanted to tackle the border issue. We started it." That is what Leader MCCONNELL said.

My friend, the Senator from Texas, similarly said: "It makes no sense to me for us to do nothing when we might be able to do things better."

That is just what we are doing today, I would say to my friend the Senator from Texas.

A few weeks before our bill was released, our colleague from Iowa warned:

We stand the risk of losing the chance to actually get something done on the border now, because I don't see this opportunity coming up again any time soon.

Again, that is what we are doing, just what our Republican Senators asked us to do for months. And I would be remiss not to include the good observation of my friend from South Carolina.

He said:

H.R. 2 was unable to get any Democratic support in the House; we lost one Republican in the Senate. So to the conservative world: you have a unique opportunity to get border security reform.

And he added:

This moment will pass. Do not let it pass.

I can't say it any better. And what they said then is perfectly applicable now. What made them change when they had such conviction that we had to get something done in a strong bipartisan way? One thing. Donald Trump said turn around, reverse yourself, 180-degree reversal, and they did.

The words I have mentioned are not the words of Senators who think this was all political theater. They sound like the words of Senators who were hoping to get something done. But as I mentioned, it wasn't until after Donald Trump swooped in that they changed their tune.

So we are going to try again today. I hope Republicans join us on today's vote to reach a different outcome than the one in March. If Republicans were truly serious about calling the situation at the border an emergency, they shouldn't delay any longer. You can't call something an emergency one day and then suddenly kick the can down the road the next day.

Let me finish with this: America is proud of its immigrant tradition. We always have been—and always will be—a nation comprised of people who come from across the world looking for an opportunity here in this country, knowing that there is no place better than America. If you work hard, you can provide a good life for yourself and your family. That is what has importuned people for generations. We should never let go of that.

We must always work to give people more opportunity to come here to treat them humanely and embrace people who want to contribute to our economy. There is nothing more American than that.

Immigration has been one of the great causes of mine since my earliest days in the Senate. Over 10 years ago as part of the bipartisan Gang of 8—led by myself and my late friend, the late John McCain—that wrote comprehensive immigration reform.

We passed that historic bill because both sides were able to work together. The lesson of that bill is—passed the Senate with 68 or 69 votes bipartisan—we can only do these things in a bipartisan way, only.

So today, knowing that lesson, we need to try and work again together. We know our Nation is stronger because of immigration. We know that the status quo at the southern border is unacceptable, the results of decades of neglect going back administrations on both sides. So to all those who said for years we must act on the border, this is the chance to show you are serious about fixing the problem.

This is our chance to show the American people that we are willing to reach across the aisle and work to solve one of the most vexing problems that affects our country and what the public overwhelmingly wants in poll after poll.

I urge my colleagues on both sides to join us in moving forward today. A

chance like this, sadly, only comes once in a blue moon.

To my Senate Republican colleagues: Please, do not let this moment pass.

BIG OIL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it is a disturbing tale as old as time: While Big Oil companies bask in record-breaking profits, hard-working Americans are feeling the pinch of high prices at the pump. Instead of working to lower gas prices for Americans ahead of a busy Memorial Day weekend, Big Oil executives seem to be huddling to find ways to keep gas prices high and keep profits soaring.

One of those ways included Big Oil executives spending their time cozying up to Donald Trump who, as we all know, is no enemy of Big Oil. A few weeks ago, the Washington Post released a disturbing account of a meeting Donald Trump held with Big Oil executives at Mar-a-Lago, where Donald Trump promised Big Oil Executives that he will gut the clean energy investments and jobs made possible by the legislation we Democrats passed in exchange for \$1 billion for his reelection efforts.

This is sickening. Donald Trump would quite literally be bought by the biggest polluters in the world and be totally beholden to the fossil fuel agenda and Americans will pay the price at the pump. Donald Trump is not even hiding it. Sadly, Big Oil's greediness doesn't stop with Donald Trump.

A recent report showed that big oil companies were also among the biggest perpetrators of stock buybacks, using their soaring profits to further line the pockets of wealthy executives and shareholders.

Stock buybacks aren't good for the economy. Stock buybacks aren't good for workers. Stock buybacks aren't good for anyone but the wealthy oil executives and shareholders. It shows that instead of investing and finding new energy—which we would hope they would do it with clean energy—they are instead just raising their stock prices.

There is something deeply wrong with big oil companies continuing to rake in the cash at the expense of the American people. So Democrats will keep working to shine a spotlight on oil companies' unfair practices and hold them accountable.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on choice, next month America will mark a dark and somber anniversary. June 24 will be 2 years since a radical MAGA majority on the Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*. It was one of the worst—if not the worst—Supreme Court decision of modern times. In one fell swoop, MAGA justices pulled off one of the most draconian reversals of individual liberty ever.

Today, at least 20 States have near-total bans or severe restrictions on abortion.

Senate Democrats will put reproductive freedoms front and center when we return after the Memorial Day State work period.

Two days ago, I began the process for the Senate to consider the Right to Contraception Act, led by Senators MARKEY and HIRONO. We will consider that bill in June, and there will be more action to come after that.

At a time when tens of millions of Americans are worried about reproductive health—tens of millions of American women are worried about reproductive health, although many male Americans are worried as well—Senate Democrats will focus on protecting fundamental freedoms like the right to vote, access to IVF, continued access to contraception, and more. Democrats will never relent until we reverse the immense damage that the Supreme Court has inflicted on this country, and the American people have the right to know where their elected officials stand on protecting the rights and reproductive care.

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.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, we are nearing the end of President Biden's term, and the American people's patience for his failure to secure our southern border is running thin. After 3 years in office, nearly every conceivable metric has distinguished the Biden administration from its predecessors for all of the wrong reasons. Since the President took office, Customs and Border Protection has seen the highest annual total for border encounters on record. CBP has reported more than 7.8 million encounters with illegal immigrants at the southern border, and this doesn't even count the 1.6 million known "got-aways."

Fentanyl and other lethal drugs pushed by China through Mexico and across our border are the primary cause of death among American adults between ages 18 and 45.

And reports of individuals on the Terror Watch List trying to sneak across the southern border have literally soared on President Biden's watch. Five years ago, CBP didn't encounter a single individual on the list between southern border ports of entry. Last year, they encountered 169.

This is what broken borders look like. This is humanitarian and national security failure of the highest degree.

And it is no mystery how we got here. President Biden and Vice President HARRIS were promising open borders 4 years ago on the campaign trail, and they started following through, literally, on day one. The Biden administration rescinded policies like "Remain in Mexico" that helped CBP hold the crisis at bay. They froze construction of physical barriers at the border out of spite for their predecessor, a move that most Americans now say they want to see reversed.

Every Senate Democrat voted to let President Biden repeal title 42, a pandemic-era policy that represented border officials only meaningful tool to stem the flow of illegal arrivals.

The administrations supposed border czar traveled widely to discuss the root causes of migration, but for months, she couldn't find time to visit the border itself. And for years, Washington Democrats have refused to call the situation what it obviously is: a crisis.

At every step, the American people have been left, literally, scratching their heads. In some cases, they have been left with unimaginable grief, like the family of Laken Riley, the student murdered by a man who shouldn't have been allowed into the country in the first place. And in every case, they have wondered why their elected leaders are missing in action.

Families are wondering why Senate Democrats opposed Senator BLACKBURN's proposal to allow State and local law enforcement to cooperate with ICE to detain and deport criminals; why they voted down Senator BUDD's legislation that would have prohibited granting legal status or citizenship to individuals who have assaulted a law enforcement officer; why they blocked the proposal that would have required that individuals DHS deemed to be "special interest aliens"—potential national security risks—are detained at the border and not released into the interior by the thousands. They are wondering why leftwing groups are exploiting the crisis to line their own pockets.

But one thing the American people don't have to wonder about is why Washington Democrats are suddenly chomping at the bit to convince their constituents that they care about border security. After all, working families are the ones telling pollsters the border is their very top election-year concern. The American people aren't fooled. They know that the President's summary reversal of commonsense border authorities is what started the crisis, and they know the solution is not cynical Senate theater.

The solution is a President who is willing to exercise his authority, to use the tools he already has at his disposal, and to start cleaning up this mess. If Senate Democrats wanted to start fixing the crisis tomorrow, they would be urging the President to do exactly

that. The American people have every right to expect secure borders, along with safe streets and stable prices. They don't have time for distraction, and neither do Senate Republicans.

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.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Melissa Griffin Dalton, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota. MILITARY APPRECIATION MONTH AND MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, May is a month dedicated to honoring our military. We have Armed Forces Day, which we celebrated this past Saturday; Memorial Day, which will be observed on Monday; and the entire month is observed as Military Appreciation Month.

Ronald Reagan is reported to have said:

Some people live an entire lifetime and wonder if they have ever made a difference in the world. The Marines don't have that problem.

I would just expand on that a little bit and say that our military members don't have to ask that question and don't have that problem. If you want to see people living a life of purpose, just look to the men and women of the U.S. military—the men and women who get up every day ready to defend our freedom, to the point of laying down their lives if necessary.

Many of our military members enter right after high school or college. At an age when their counterparts are thinking about graduations and internships and taking the first steps toward careers, these men and women take a different path. They embrace a life of regimentation and rollcalls, of tough physical and mental demands, a life that asks them to forgo comfort for sacrifice, up to and including the sacrifice of their lives, and they do it willingly.

Most of us don't often see the sacrifices our military men and women make, so it can be easy for us to forget, as we go about our daily lives, that those lives are only possible because these men and women spend their lives working to defend our country.

During this Military Appreciation Month, my thoughts turn to those South Dakotans serving in our Armed Forces and particularly to the men and women of the South Dakota National Guard and our airmen at Ellsworth Air Force Base. Our South Dakota military members represent the very best of our State, and I am grateful every day for their service and sacrifice.

I am proud to report that the 28th Bomb Wing at Ellsworth Air Force Base was named the best bomb wing in Air Force Global Strike Command during the past year. I am excited that Ellsworth broke ground this spring on a new weapons generation facility—part of the construction to prepare the base to become the first home of the B-21 Raider.

I am also proud that the Black Hills region, home to Ellsworth and the South Dakota National Guard's Camp Rapid, was named to the 2024 Class of Great American Defense Communities. South Dakotans know and value the sacrifices made by our military men and women, and I am tremendously proud of how the Black Hills region has worked to support our airmen and National Guard members.

A discussion of Military Appreciation Month would not be complete without mentioning our military families. It is not just our men and women in uniform who serve and sacrifice; it is their families as well.

Life as a military spouse or as a son or daughter of a military member is often challenging. There are frequent moves and deployments, and most of all, there is the knowledge that one day your husband or wife, your mom or your dad could be asked to give up their life for their country. So, as we honor our military members this month, it is right that we honor and remember the sacrifices of their families as well.

In his 1941 proclamation of Bill of Rights Day, President Franklin D. Roosevelt said:

Those who have long enjoyed such privileges as we enjoy forget in time that men have died to win them.

Those who have long enjoyed such privileges as we enjoy forget in time that men have died to win them.

As we go about our lives in peace and safety, it can be all too easy to forget that that peace and safety have been purchased at a price, that they have been purchased with the blood of the men and women who have laid down their lives to secure them. On this Monday above all, on Memorial Day, we should resolve to remember—to remember and to recommit ourselves to living lives worthy of their sacrifice.

May God take to Himself all those who have fallen in the service of our

country, and may He comfort their families, and may He bless and protect the men and women of the U.S. military. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

NOMINATION OF MELISSA GRIFFIN DALTON

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise to express my support for Ms. Melissa Dalton's nomination to be Under Secretary of the Air Force.

Ms. Dalton is an exceptionally qualified leader with a long and distinguished career in service to the United States. She has more than two decades of experience in defense and intelligence policy, including an extensive background in Department of Defense strategy, policy, operations, processes, and workforce issues. Ms. Dalton currently serves as Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Hemispheric Affairs and served previously by performing the duties of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Strategy, Plans, and Capabilities.

The Armed Services Committee held a nomination hearing for Ms. Dalton 4 months ago, on January 23, and it is critical that we approve her nomination now.

If confirmed, Ms. Dalton will face a number of pressing challenges for the Air Force. The service has operated at a high tempo for the past two decades, supporting around-the-clock operations in the Middle East and around the world. This mission has strained Air Force personnel and aged the combat aircraft fleet more quickly than anticipated. This high "op-tempo" also challenged Air Force leaders to adequately invest in modernization efforts. With China posing new, unprecedented challenges to our airpower in the Indo-Pacific and with emerging technologies like hypersonic weapons and uncrewed aerial systems, or UAS, creating new threats around the world, the Air Force must adapt quickly to stay ahead.

In particular, the Air Force must continue to strengthen and improve its acquisition system. In order to field new capabilities to match the speed of technological change, the next Under Secretary will need to take steps to ensure that the Air Force has a secure and reliable industrial base and a trained and qualified workforce. At her confirmation hearing, Ms. Dalton pledged her immediate, unwavering attention to these issues. This was an important commitment and one that I support.

If confirmed, Ms. Dalton will help lead the Air Force at a critical moment as we continue our long-term strategic competition with China and Russia. This will require thoughtful, resolute leadership with a deep understanding of the issues. Throughout her career, Ms. Dalton has developed and implemented just these sorts of leading-edge defense policies, and she reemphasized her commitment to them during her confirmation hearing.

Ms. Dalton is an outstanding nominee to serve as Under Secretary of the

Air Force, and I am proud to support her nomination.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes and confirm this great leader.

With that, 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. REED. 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.

VOTE ON DALTON NOMINATION

The ACTING PRESIDENT Pro Tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Dalton nomination?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

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

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 181 Ex.]

YEAS—56

Baldwin	Heinrich	Reed
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rounds
Booker	Hoeven	Sanders
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Butler	Kaine	Schumer
Cantwell	Kelly	Shaheen
Cardin	King	Sinema
Carpenter	Klobuchar	Smith
Casey	Lujan	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Merkley	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Moran	Warner
Cramer	Murkowski	Warnock
Duckworth	Murphy	Welch
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Ossoff	Wyden
Gillibrand	Padilla	Young
Hassan	Peters	

NAYS—39

Barrasso	Ernst	Ricketts
Blackburn	Fischer	Risch
Boozman	Graham	Romney
Braun	Grassley	Rubio
Britt	Hawley	Schmitt
Budd	Johnson	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (SC)
Cassidy	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Lummis	Tillis
Crapo	Marshall	Tuberville
Cruz	McConnell	Vance
Daines	Paul	Wicker

NOT VOTING—5

Hagerty	Menendez	Warren
Manchin	Mullin	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). 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.

The Senator from California.

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, when I was a kid growing up, the last thing I thought I would do when I grew up was to be involved with government and politics. But when I returned home from college, I came home to California to find hateful TV ads warning of an "invasion" at our border. These were in support of a ballot measure demonizing immigrant families and communities like mine.

A generation of Latinos in California grew up knowing that officials who were elected to represent us were actually more than happy to scapegoat our families as the root cause of the State's challenges. But instead of just putting our heads down and waiting for the political tides to turn, my generation decided to get involved, and we started a movement that put more people from our communities into positions of power.

Now, three decades later, the State of California is not just home to more immigrants than any other State in the Nation; we also represent the largest economy of any State in the Nation. That is not a coincidence.

But, sadly, today, we are also seeing some of the same hateful rhetoric once again. And when I hear it, I feel it, and I think about my children and a whole new generation of Latinos across the country that see leaders of the Republican Party demonizing immigrants and people who look like us.

Yes. The Republican Presidential nominee warned that immigrants are "poisoning the blood of our Nation," echoing rhetoric from Nazi Germany. That is happening.

I have had to come down to this Chamber earlier this year, just a couple of months ago, to object to one of our colleagues seeking to declare an "invasion at our southern border." That is the moment that we are in, and it is an undeniable part of the context in which the bill that we are going to be voting on soon was written.

The proposal before us was initially supposed to be a concession, a ransom to be paid to Republicans to pass urgent and critical aid to Ukraine—not my words, theirs. The proposal was 3 months ago.

But guess what? We passed the foreign aid. It was the right thing to do. And so I can't help but ask: What is this concession for now? Because it surely cannot be the new starting point for negotiating immigration reform.

I am disappointed because this bill contains some of the same tried-and-failed policies that would actually make the situation worse at the southern border. It includes arbitrary border closures and practically eliminates the right to seek asylum for people fleeing for their safety or for their very lives.

Now, many of us have acknowledged—both sides of the aisle in both

formal conversations and informal conversations—that one of the biggest reasons that so many people come to the southern border is because it is so hard to come to the United States legally. So I look at this bill. And guess what. It fails to address the root causes of migration or to establish more lawful pathways.

And it is not just what is in the bill that troubles me; it is what is not in the bill. If enacted, this bill would fail to provide relief for a single Dreamer, for a single farmworker, or a single essential worker or long-term resident of the United States who has been here for years—in some cases decades—working, paying taxes, contributing to the strength of our communities and our country and the success of our economy.

So the Senate is voting on this package now for a second time? But still no votes on the Dream Act—which, by the way, does enjoy bipartisan support? It is hard to swallow.

And there is more. We hear that there are some extreme Executive actions coming soon. Now, for as much as has been accomplished by this body, this Chamber has also served as a backdrop for some of the most vile rhetoric in our Nation's history. The same hatred that met Irish and Italian immigrants coming through Ellis Island permeated these walls to help pass the Chinese Exclusion Act, before spreading west to villainize immigrants from Mexico and Latin America at our southern border.

And every time political leaders villainize immigrants, communities like mine feel the effects. Just ask any Latino kid who has been told to go back to where they came from. Ask anyone speaking Spanish in America who has been told to speak English. Ask any Asian American who was harassed during the COVID-19 pandemic.

Colleagues, what chapter of our Nation's history are we choosing to write today? I ask because, yes, there will come a time when history judges us. And what will you say? Will you say that you worked to defend the American dream for future generations? Or settled and denied opportunity for future generations?

Today, countless immigrants and children of immigrants will ask whether Republicans and Democrats will leave them behind once again. Colleagues, I urge you to vote no today and to be more thoughtful in how we address border safety.

I urge you to join me in staying true to our values in modernizing our immigration system. I urge you to join me today in doing what is right for Dreamers, farmworkers, and other long-term undocumented members of our communities. They deserve better, and we—we—should be better than this.

I yield the floor.

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

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, it has been more than 100 days since Republicans killed a border deal that they

specifically demanded and they actively helped to write. From start to finish, this bill is not some partisan Democratic wish list. In fact, the previous speaker, the senior Senator from California, is correctly upset at our lack of attention to legal immigration, to the plight of DACA individuals, and to try to anchor our policy and our core values of understanding that we are a Nation of immigrants and maybe even, separate and apart from that, immigration is one of the most effective anti-inflation policies out there.

But the vote we are about to take is not about immigration. It is about border security, and it is fair to say that the Democratic conference has come a long way on border security. We negotiated with one of the most conservative Members of the U.S. Senate, JAMES LANKFORD. And when I heard that CHRIS MURPHY and JAMES LANKFORD were negotiating, I was not hopeful—not because I don't think they are serious legislators, but I just figured they were too far apart. And so when they came to a conclusion, I didn't love everything in that bill; but I still support it, and here is why: because it makes real reforms and meaningful investments to address a real crisis at the border that needs to be fixed.

There is no contradiction between believing in legal immigration and believing in the core values of the United States and believing in the need for order and security on our northern and southern borders.

And so this bill will expedite the asylum process; it would provide immediate work authorizations; it would expand legal immigration pathways; it would provide billions of dollars to law enforcement to stop the flow of fentanyl.

Those are all necessary measures, but the reason the bill failed back in February, the reason the border continues to be the way it is today, is Donald Trump. Donald Trump woke up one day and decided that doing nothing on the border would help him politically. He literally said: Blame me. Blame me.

And so the funny thing about this situation is if you describe what happened exactly accurately, which is that we—with CHRIS MURPHY and KYRSTEN SINEMA and JAMES LANKFORD—negotiated the toughest border package in many generations that has a chance to pass, a bipartisan bill where Democrats were understandably uncomfortable, that when this thing came out, I was in conversations with Republican Members of the Senate, and they were saying they expected a vote in the high 70s, close to 80 votes. They were very comfortable that this was going to win going away. And then Donald Trump said: Kill it. And that is what happened; it got killed.

And so the thing about describing things factually in this instance is it sounds like I am trying to, you know, lob rhetorical bombs or make a partisan statement, but that is just lit-

erally what happened: We negotiated this thing. They told us: Work with JAMES LANKFORD. They told us: Reform the asylum process. They told us: CBP needs more resources. They are overwhelmed. They told us: We need technology.

We did all those things. CHRIS MURPHY negotiated all those things. It is not easy for—I am not sure if he would like to be called this—an unreconstructed progressive to negotiate such a bill.

He is looking at me right now. I think he doesn't love that term.

But they voted to kill it anyway. Republicans chose to preserve chaos at the border, and now this crisis is on them. So spare me the crocodile tears. Spare me the press conferences. Spare me the unanimous consent requests. Spare me the cable news hits. Spare me the memes. Spare me the TV ads. You had your chance.

And now the beauty of this is you have your chance again. An hour and 45 minutes from now, you can decide: Am I going to vote for the strongest border package in a generation? Or am I going to vote no because my boss is Donald Trump and he doesn't want this to pass? The choice is theirs.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 160

Ms. ERNST. Mr. President, President Biden has opened our homeland to the world's criminals. Under his leadership, over 9 million illegal immigrants have crossed our southern border—9 million people. That is more people than the population of 75 percent of our States.

Month after month and year after year, the Biden administration is shattering all the wrong records. For example, CBP has reported 1.6 million known "got-aways" in the last 3 years, a stark increase from the 1.4 million known "got-aways" we saw in a 10-year span from 2010 to 2020. And that is just the known "got-aways." Who really knows how many people have gotten past CBP undetected?

And these aren't just plain old numbers, folks. OK? They are people that, too often, include violent criminals who harm Americans. Hardly a day goes by without hearing of another American who has fallen victim to crimes perpetuated by the illegal immigrants the Biden administration has let flood into our country.

We all read the stories of the illegals arrested on serious criminal charges and post bail, never to be heard from again.

Everyone knows the story of Laken Riley, the 22-year-old nursing student, beaten to death by an illegal immigrant who was in police custody in New York City before being let go.

But the crisis only continues. Just last Friday, news broke that Raul Santana, a Mexican national who is in the United States illegally, had his bail dropped from \$1 million to \$100,000. What did he do? Well, he struck and

killed Washington State Trooper Christopher Gadd while driving drunk and high at 112 miles per hour.

For more than 8 years, I have warned against the dangers of letting illegal immigrants—who have already broken our laws—roam the country and continue their lawlessness.

I have repeatedly called on this body to step up and protect innocent Americans from criminals who are in our country illegally and pass my bill, Sarah's Law.

Eight years ago, Iowans Michelle and Scott Root woke up to every parent's worst nightmare. Their daughter Sarah was killed by a drunk driver.

Sarah, a 21-year-old from Council Bluffs, had just graduated from Bellevue University in Nebraska with a 4.0 GPA. She had a bachelor's degree in criminal investigations.

She was headed home after celebrating her important life milestone with her friends and her family. She had her entire life ahead of her. But like Trooper Gadd, she was struck and killed by an illegal immigrant drunk driving.

Before the Root family could even lay Sarah to rest, her murderer posted a \$5,000 bond, was released, disappeared, and has never been seen again.

These tragedies don't have to continue happening. Today, we can act to ensure no family will be subject to the pain and anguish Sarah's parents have experienced every day for the past 8 years.

My bill, which is named for Sarah, would close the appalling loophole that let Sarah's killer go free. It would merely require ICE to detain otherwise deportable illegal immigrants charged with killing or seriously injuring another person. It also requires ICE to inform victims and family members of necessary information pertaining to the investigation.

Had Sarah's Law been on the books when Sarah and Laken and Trooper Gadd were murdered, law enforcement would have to detain their killers instead of opening the door for them to simply flee. The Roots, the Rileys, and the Gadds would have been kept up-to-date on Federal immigration authorities' efforts to remove their loved one's murderers from the country.

Simply put, folks, this should be easy. This should be easy. Sarah, Laken, and Trooper Gadd's deaths are tragic and, unfortunately, doomed to be repeated, thanks to the administration's broken and ill-informed policies and my Democrat colleagues' refusal to take up this very simple legislation.

Those who come here illegally and harm our citizens should, without question, be a priority for removal. It is just common sense, folks. Otherwise deportable illegal immigrants who commit violent crimes in the United States should face justice.

We can no longer prioritize illegal immigrants over public safety. We must pass Sarah's Law to send this

message loud and clear for Sarah's family and for countless American families that Sarah's Law would protect.

As in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 160 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I don't think we are in disagreement on the Senate floor on this matter. I think we all agree that noncitizens who are convicted of serious violent crimes—who have committed serious violent crimes—should be detained, and they should be subject to removal proceedings.

The good news is that is the current law. That is the current law. This bill is a reiteration of current law.

Let me tell you what current law requires.

Current law requires the detention of any individual with serious criminal convictions, including those who have committed crimes of violence or theft offenses, including murder, rape, and assault. That is the current law.

Furthermore, this administration has given specific direction to the Department of Justice to prioritize the detention or removal of individuals who have committed violent offenses.

And so, as with earlier unanimous consent requests, this unanimous consent request is essentially a reiteration of current law.

I have a great deal of respect for my colleague. We worked together on a number of important matters. But I find myself asking the question, Why are we being asked to simply restate current law when it comes to the detention or removal of immigrants who have committed violent crimes who right now are subject to removal for those crimes?

And I come to two conclusions: The first is that it is a means of distracting the conversation from the vote that is going to happen in an hour and a half.

We went through a painstaking process to negotiate a bipartisan compromise. That process was begun at the request of Senate Republicans. In the room was their appointed negotiator and representatives of their chosen leader of the conference. It couldn't be more official than that: their appointed negotiator, Senator LANKFORD, and the leader of their caucus, Senator MCCONNELL, in the room for 4 months negotiating a bipartisan border security bill.

At the end of that process, we achieved a result. We got an agreement with the people that the Senate Republican caucus told us to get an agreement with. Within 24 hours, almost every Senate Republican had sided against that bill.

I submit, everybody probably had different reasons for it, but it was very clear that up until the point where Donald Trump said: Don't do anything; I want the border to be a mess, there were plenty of Senate Republicans who were very invested in that process. Included in that bipartisan compromise are important reforms in the way that we try to make sure that anyone with a violent history never enters the United States.

Under current law, if you have a criminal history outside of the United States or a previous criminal history inside of the United States, that doesn't become relevant to your asylum claim until you present before an asylum judge.

Under the bipartisan bill, that question of whether you have a violent history and whether you should enter the United States happens at the border as part of your credible fear screening. That would be a really important bipartisan reform to make to make sure that anybody with a violent history never enters the United States.

The current law isn't good enough. The bipartisan bill would have made that law better and made this country safer. But Republicans are going to, almost to an individual, vote against that later today.

And so what we are left with are these unanimous consent agreements that don't come close to providing the kind of security that the bipartisan border bill does.

But it also serves a second purpose. It also has a secondary impact. I wish my Republican colleagues didn't care only about crimes committed by immigrants. I know they care about crimes committed by others, but it seems that there is a disproportionate amount of energy on this floor dedicated to crimes committed by immigrants, which gives the impression to the American public that there is a specific problem related to immigrant communities; that they commit crimes at rates that are higher than natural-born Americans, when in fact the opposite is true.

I worry that there is an effort afoot to try to turn us against each other, to make us fear immigrants, when in fact immigrants commit crimes at a rate much lower than natural-born Americans. U.S. citizens are over two times more likely to be arrested for violent crimes than immigrants are. Immigrants are 60 percent less likely to be incarcerated in this country than natural-born Americans are.

The mass shooter in Las Vegas wasn't an immigrant. The mass shooter at Pulse Nightclub wasn't an immigrant. The mass shooter at Sandy Hook wasn't an immigrant. The mass shooter in Uvalde wasn't an immigrant. The mass shooter in El Paso wasn't an immigrant. The mass shooter in Sutherland Springs wasn't an immigrant. The mass shooter in Lewiston, ME, wasn't an immigrant. The mass shooter in Parkland wasn't an

immigrant. And yet there wasn't a rush to the floor by my Republican colleagues after those mass shootings to try to fix the problem.

I grieve for every single victim of crime in this country. And I think we should be all working on ways to better protect our citizens. But I worry that these UC requests are an effort, one, to try to paper over the fact that Republicans are about to vote against a bipartisan border bill that would make this country safer and being in facilitation of an effort—whether intentional or unintentional—to try to make us specifically afraid of immigrants, when in fact the truth is that the people who are coming to this country are fleeing economic destitution, trying to save their children's lives, are coming from places in which they were victims of terror and torture and violence and when they get to the United States are actually less of a threat to our public safety than those who were born in the United States.

For that reason, I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I will just respond briefly to a number of points made by my colleague in opposition to this bill.

And, one, I just want to say that this UC—this bill—I am not trying to detract or distract from the vote that will happen this afternoon. This is an effort I have engaged on for 8 years. I have brought this bill to the floor many times in an effort to see it passed for Sarah, for her family and for others who are in this similar situation.

So I would hope that we would be able to pass it today. I know that I will again, in the future, be bringing this bill to the floor.

As my colleague pointed out, we do—we do—appreciate the fact that there is crime all across the United States. And for those who are impacted by that crime, we do wish that they had not had to go through that crime. But the fact of the matter is, there is a difference between American citizens who are committing crimes and illegal immigrants who are committing crimes against American citizens.

The difference is that many times those illegal immigrants whom, in my bill, I am asking ICE to detain so that they can go to their hearings—I am asking ICE to detain them—not voluntarily detain, maybe have someone release them early, but they will be detained to face justice. Many times those illegal immigrants are operating under assumed names, under assumed Social Security numbers. We don't know their true identities. Many times they don't have roots in communities.

So what has happened—and we know this to be true because it happened in the case of Sarah Root and her killer—is that Edwin Mejia—that is at least one of the names that this gentleman used while he was in the United States—when he was released on bond,

he was able to slip into the shadows, and the authorities were not able to trace him. They were not able to find him.

Why? Because he was an illegal immigrant, operating under many assumed names, operating out of many different communities, with who knows which family or what contacts.

When American citizens are committing crimes, oftentimes we can trace them. We know who they are. We know who their family members are. We know where they have worked. It is very different with those who enter the country illegally. We can't trace them. We can't find them. The families like Sarah Root's family—Michelle Root and Scott Root will never see justice for their daughter because the man who killed her was released and slipped right back into the shadows where he came from. This family in Council Bluffs, IA, will never see justice for their daughter. Many of these other families will never see justice for their loved ones because our law does not require ICE to detain and hold those murderers—those killers—until they have been seen by a court of law.

That is what my bill does. It requires the detention. It does not allow ICE to voluntarily keep them. It requires them to keep them—justice for our families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3933

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will be making a unanimous consent request here in a second, and Senator BRITT will be joining me in that endeavor.

We are going to have a vote at 2 o'clock about a bipartisan bill. I applaud the effort to change our immigration laws and get control of an out-of-control situation. Unfortunately, it doesn't matter what law is on the books, if the administration is not going to enforce the ones that already exist.

We had a vote in February on this bill. One of the problems I had the entire time is that parole is being abused by this administration. Since February until now, April, 77,800 people have been paroled in the United States, and I believe that is an abuse of the statute that is on the books. There were 1.3 million in fiscal year 2023. Over 1.2 million were paroled by the CBP alone.

Now let's talk about the parole statute, if we have that. If we don't, well, let me tell you what the law says.

It basically says you can be paroled for two reasons: a unique humanitarian need or a special benefit to the country. The statute that they are using to parole all of these people has limitations as to how it can be used. On average, the statute in question during the Obama-Trump years was used—about 6,000 people, on average, were paroled in the United States using the statute that the Biden administration has been abusing. In fiscal year 2019, it was 7,525;

in fiscal year 2018, 6,466; in fiscal year 2015, during the Obama years, 4,598; in fiscal year 2019, again, 7,500. In fiscal year 2022, the Biden administration paroled 795,561 and, in fiscal year 2023, 1.2 million plus.

Why are they doing parole differently than Obama and Trump? They are abusing the statute. Why are they just waiving so many people into the country? That is for the voters to decide. I think they are just basically abusing the statute because they don't want to turn anybody around and send them back. So they just let people come into the country in violation of the law.

Again, the parole statute in question is limited to two circumstances: a unique benefit to the country or a special benefit to the country. A unique humanitarian situation is that your mother is dying. A special need to the country is you are a witness in a trial, and we need to get you in for a limited situation. Parole is not permanent status.

As for Laken Riley—and we will ask unanimous consent to vote on the bill authored by Senator BRITT—the man accused of murdering her and who was indicted in Georgia, Mr. Ibarra, in September 2022, was apprehended by the Border Patrol. He was released through parole. And it took me forever to find this out, the reason for parole: The subject was paroled due to detention capacity at the central processing center in El Paso, TX. The reason for parole: The subject was paroled due to detention capacity at the central processing center in El Paso, TX. They had no room for the guy, and he is now being charged with murdering this young woman in Georgia. He was arrested in 2024.

Senator BRITT will tell us what her bill does here in a moment. She is trying to find a way to make sure this never happens again. The two crimes he was charged with should result in an immediate expulsion from the country. That is what her bill does. But I want the country to know that the man accused of killing this young lady in Georgia was released into our country by the DHS—illegally, in my view. They violated the statute. They gave him parole for a reason that doesn't exist in the statute.

And you wonder why we don't want to pass another bill. The reason we don't want to pass another bill is we don't trust you, the Biden administration. Why create a new law that isn't going to be any more effective than the current law?

From the time we had this debate until the end of April, did things get better? No. There have been 77,800 people paroled from the original debate until now. So, clearly, they haven't changed their idea or policies regarding the abuse of parole. The average for Obama-Trump was around 6,000 for the entire year using the parole statute in question. This is 77,800 since February. So why are we skeptical? Because of the way they do business in the Biden administration.

Secretary Mayorkas has all the power he needs to stop this. You will never convince me that 77,800 people were individually screened. They have a program to waive people through based on country, not individual status. They promised me that an individual analysis was done on each parolee. I asked him that, and he said yes. Well, we found one parolee accused of murdering a young lady in Georgia who was not individually analyzed and released based on the criteria of the statute. He was released because they had no place to put him. So what we want to do today is try to find a way to deal with the situation that led to the murder of this young lady.

The law has a loophole in it, I guess, for lack of a better word. I am going to recognize Senator BRITT now to tell us what her bill does, because what do we know about the Georgia case? We know the man charged with the murder of Ms. Riley was released into the United States under parole, not based on statutory requirements but just because we were full. If I were the Riley family, I would be pretty upset. They might want to think about suing.

Right now, I would like to yield to Senator BRITT from Alabama, who has tried to find a solution to this problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mrs. BRITT. Mr. President, first, I would like to say thank you to my colleague from South Carolina for his leadership on this critical issue.

The Laken Riley Act is the bipartisan border bill that should be on the Senate floor today. I am proud to be the lead Senate sponsor of this critical legislation along with my colleague from North Carolina.

The Laken Riley Act passed the House of Representatives in an overwhelmingly bipartisan fashion. The gentleman from Georgia, from Congressional District 10, secured 37 Democratic votes for this bill on the House floor, and here in the Senate, this bill is bipartisan and has a cosponsor list of 47 Senators. I am confident that a bipartisan majority of Senators supports the Laken Riley Act and would vote for it today. The House already did its work in a bipartisan fashion on this legislation, and now it is our turn here in the Senate. Frankly, it is well past time.

We should send this bipartisan bill to the President's desk immediately. If this bill had been the law of the land, Laken Riley would still be alive today. Now this body has an opportunity and a responsibility, in my opinion, to prevent this kind of unimaginable tragedy from happening to more families across America.

The Laken Riley Act is straightforward. It says that ICE would be required to detain and deport illegal aliens who commit theft offenses. It would also allow States to seek an injunction against any action taken by the Secretary of Homeland Security or

the Attorney General that violates immigration law to the detriment of the State or its citizens.

My colleague from South Carolina has been at the forefront of exposing the Biden administration's unprecedented abuse of immigration parole, which is directly relevant to the Laken Riley case.

Under the Trump administration and the Obama administration, parole was granted at our southern border, on average, to fewer than 6,000 people a year. However, under President Biden, grants of parole have skyrocketed, and now we know that over 1.3 million people have been paroled in the past year. One of those grants of parole went to Laken Riley's alleged killer after he crossed the southern border illegally in 2022. This abuse of parole continues to have devastating consequences for families and communities in every corner of our Nation.

President Biden could stop this abuse of parole today, if he wanted to, but he doesn't, and he won't. The President refuses to reverse course. It is past time to force his hand on that and pass the Laken Riley Act. It will secure our homeland. It will help to safeguard our streets. It will help to defend our families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I will be making the unanimous consent request in just a minute, as I am just about to wrap up.

I sent a letter yesterday to Secretary Mayorkas, wanting to know about the two people who tried to get into the Marine base, Quantico. Apparently, both of them were illegal, claiming to be Amazon contractors but were not. There is a lot of mystery around this, and I want a response to my letter.

Who are these people? What do we know about them? Have they any affiliation with terrorist groups? What were they up to?

I think we need to know as a nation what went on, because I find it very odd that two fighting-age illegal immigrants joined together to try to falsely get into a Marine base. That sends shivers up my spine.

So I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD, if I may.

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

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,
Washington, DC, May 21, 2024.

Secretary ALEJANDRO MAYORKAS,
U.S. Department of Homeland Security,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY MAYORKAS: I am writing today to seek information from your agency regarding the reported arrest of two Jordanian nationals posing as delivery drivers while attempting to infiltrate Marine Corps Base Quantico on May 3, 2024.

As soon as possible, please inform me and the committee on the status of these two individuals. Please explain how they came to the United States. Were they here illegally? Are either of them on any terrorist watchlist?

Please provide the committee with the answers to these questions and any other information relevant to their background and intent, including copies of the complete and most current alien files for each individual. This will allow us to make an informed decision about how to address the recurring threat posed to our national security by this kind of incident, which is not isolated.

I would hope for and expect an immediate reply.

Sincerely,

LINDSEY O. GRAHAM,
Ranking Member,
Senate Judiciary Committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 3933 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, 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 Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we all agree that noncitizens who are convicted of violent crime should be detained and removed from the United States—period. Sadly, the Laken Riley Act does nothing to address violent crime.

Under current law—current existing law—noncitizens who enter the country illegally, violate the terms of their status, or have their visas revoked can be detained now, under the law, by officials of the Immigration and Customs Enforcement, better known as ICE.

Current law also requires—requires—the detention of individuals with serious criminal convictions—those who have committed murder, rape, or any crime of violence or theft offense—with a term of imprisonment of at least 1 year.

The law also gives ICE discretion beyond that to detain a noncitizen in any case in which a noncitizen has been charged with a crime. To make this decision, ICE assesses the individual's circumstances in the case, ensuring the Agency's limited resources are used effectively to protect national security and public safety.

The reality is that Congress has never appropriated nearly enough money for ICE to detain every—every—undocumented immigrant who is charged with a crime.

And, remember, the vast majority of Senators on the other side of the aisle—including the sponsors of this measure—blocked the bipartisan national security supplemental in February that would have given ICE more funding to detain more undocumented immigrants who might pose a threat to our country. They voted against it.

They will have another chance to vote to provide that additional funding in just a short time today. I hope they will finally take this opportunity. Vote for more ICE agents if you want more ICE enforcement of existing laws that are serious on the books.

Here is the reality: The sweeping approach in this bill would actually harm national security. Why? Because it

would eliminate ICE's discretion to prioritize dangerous individuals—certainly, people who are being convicted of a violent crime or charged with a violent crime or more serious offenders than, perhaps, those who are guilty of theft. We don't know the circumstances in each case.

This proposal would, instead, require ICE to treat those arrested for non-violent crimes the same as individuals who are actually convicted of violent crimes. With limited ICE agents, you have to make a choice: What is the priority? Who is the most dangerous individual?

This proposal before us would overwhelm ICE facilities and make us less—not more—safe.

For example, this law would require ICE to detain every immigrant who is simply arrested for shoplifting—arrested—even if it quickly becomes clear the person is innocent, because this bill does not require a charge or conviction.

Tell me, does it make sense to treat a noncitizen arrested for shoplifting the same as someone convicted of murder? I think we all know the answer.

This bill would also grant State attorneys general the standing to sue Federal immigration authorities if a State disagrees with immigration enforcement decisions made by the Federal Government.

For example, this bill would give a State attorney general the standing to challenge the use of the parole authority—like Uniting for Ukraine, which allows Ukrainians fleeing Putin's war to temporarily come to the United States—if the State can show harm of \$100.

Let me tell you, they talk a lot about parole and how many—70,000 or so in the last 6 months or so. Among those were the Ukrainian refugees. They were brought to the United States from the war-torn zone because of Vladimir Putin's invasion. And 36,000 of them came to Chicago. The conditions of their coming to Chicago: a background check; secondly, they had a sponsoring family so that they have someone who will help them assimilate into the United States; and, third, they were given the right to work.

We have had little or no publicity, negative publicity, about these Ukrainians. We are a very proud Ukraine-American community. They are absorbing these individuals who are the victims of the war in Ukraine. These are part of the parole numbers that have just been alluded to.

In contrast, we have received 46,000 migrants sent by the Governor of Texas on over 880 buses to Chicago without any warning, without any preparation. That has been a difficult situation, and it has really put a taxing strain on the governments in the area. But to argue that parole for Ukrainian refugees is wrong—I disagree with that. It was a humanitarian

gesture on the part of the United States, and it has worked well, at least in our community. The situation with the Governor of Texas is a sharp contrast in this circumstance.

Laken Riley's murder, by any standard, was a tragedy. Every description I have read about this young woman suggests she was an amazing person, and the fact that she lost her life is terrible. There are no excuses. We must do everything possible to prevent crimes like this from happening. But this legislation before us makes our system less orderly and less safe. It does nothing to help the situation, the circumstances that affected her.

The reality is that most immigrants in the United States are law-abiding individuals who are seeking a better life in our Nation.

Many studies have shown that immigrants are less likely to commit crimes than natural-born U.S. citizens. But Donald Trump recently said that undocumented immigrants were "poisoning the blood of our country"—a phrase that closely mirrors one used several times in Hitler's "Mein Kampf." He has also promised to round up and deport every single undocumented immigrant in our country, including Dreamers who grew up here.

When the bipartisan border supplemental came to a vote, the vast majority of Republicans opposed it at the request of Donald Trump. Do you know what he said publicly and clearly? "Blame it on me" if the bill fails. I am blaming it on him.

The former President has made it clear he does not want a solution to our challenges at the border—he wants a campaign issue for November.

I urge my colleagues to reject Donald Trump's advice, support the actual solutions which will be before us in the next hour and a half.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, to my colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, we do a lot of things together. I enjoy working with you. But, here, we have a fundamental disagreement.

No. 1, you are entitled to your opinion but not your facts. There were 77,800 people paroled in the U.S. since February who came from Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Venezuela. That doesn't count the people from Ukraine. They all showed up at the border. They were paroled in. There is no way that two statutory requirements were applied to 77,800 people.

Why did they just wave them through? All I can tell you is that parole has been abused. The average was 6,000 per year for Trump and Biden during their Presidency. From April to now, it is 77,800—nothing to do with Ukraine.

As to the people from Ukraine, I want to help them, but we have a refugee law where you can apply for refugee status if you are in a war zone or

things are bad where you live. They are taking the parole statute and just granting to anybody and everybody they choose to grant. The bottom line is we are either a rule-of-law nation or we are not.

This has nothing to do with ICE funding. We were not talking about funding ICE here. This is a decision by the executive branch to abuse the law on the books.

The tools available apparently are not being used by anybody.

Why does Senator BRITT offer legislation? Because we have a real-world example where the system failed. Let's make it stronger.

Why did this bill pass overwhelmingly in the House? Because it makes sense.

If you learned nothing from the Laken Riley case, learn the following: She is a victim. Her family is a victim of a broken immigration system. Her family is a victim of willful disregard of the law by the Biden administration.

The man accused of murdering this young lady was allowed to come into the country on parole based on "we have no place to put you," not the statutory requirements to get paroled.

This is a big issue. We should learn from the death of this young lady. We should change our parole system. We are not. That is why we are not going to add a new law that won't be enforced.

Until you prove to me you are serious about following the law as written, you are going to have a problem with us on this side of the aisle and, hopefully, a few Democrats.

We should learn from the Laken Riley case and do what Senator BRITT encourages us to do, which is to change the law, to address the situation so we have no other Laken Riley cases.

Apparently, the death of this young lady has taught us nothing as a body. We have learned nothing from this case. We are doing nothing different, and it breaks my heart.

It looks like the murder of this young lady should be a wake-up call to a parole system broken and to fix this never-ending catch-and-release—you are caught for crimes, and you are released before the Sun goes down to commit more crimes. It needs to come to an end.

We will have a chance, as a democratic people, to vote in November. If you think the system is working the way it is intended to work, and you are OK with what is going on, vote for Biden. You are going to get more of the same. If you think this is broken, it needs to change, you ought to think about voting for somebody else.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I know there is another unanimous consent request to be made, so I will be very brief.

I have always taken Senator GRAHAM's concerns about parole at face

value. In fact, the last 30 days of the negotiations over the bipartisan border bill were dedicated to this question of reforming parole.

In fact, the bill we are going to vote on in a matter of minutes involves the most significant, most serious reform of parole likely in the history of the country.

We entered that conversation at the urging of Senator GRAHAM. He was intimately involved in the negotiations over the reform of parole.

The reforms are significant: an elimination of 236(a) parole, the parole that is used between the borders; a substitution for that process with a new rigorous examination of every individual who is arriving credentialed for asylum; major reforms to the humanitarian parole program to make sure that it is truly used only for humanitarian purposes.

So the irony of the complaints that are being made about the overuse of parole is that the bipartisan border bill—negotiated with Senator GRAHAM—involves the most significant reforms to parole, the most significant restrictions to the President's parole authority, that anyone here in this Senate has likely ever negotiated.

That is why it is regrettable that we are debating unanimous consent agreements instead of coming together to vote on a proposal that addresses many of the concerns raised by my colleagues.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. MURPHY. I would yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Senator from Connecticut yield for a question?

Mr. MURPHY. I would.

Mr. DURBIN. What intervening event prohibited or stopped this bipartisan measure from passing on the floor of the Senate?

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you for the question, Senator DURBIN.

As I mentioned, we negotiated this bill in good faith. We negotiated it with the appointed representatives by the Republican conference. Senator GRAHAM was amongst those in those conversations.

We thought we had achieved a product that could get the broad support of the Republican conference because they ticked off to us their priorities.

And they were legitimate priorities. We heard them loud and clear. They said: We want to reform the asylum system. We want to raise the standard for a credible fear. We want more detention beds. We want to reform parole. We want to give the President a new authority to shut down the border at times of emergency.

Obviously, Democrats came to that conversation with priorities as well. We wanted to expand the number of family visas and work visas. We wanted to make sure that immigrants can exercise their legal rights.

We achieved a compromise, an old-fashioned compromise.

The night we released that bill, Senator DURBIN, I thought that we were on a path to passage. But it was President Trump who intervened and said, plain and clear, as Senator McCONNELL has admitted: I want nothing to pass before the election. He said I want nothing to pass before the election, because President Trump's team decided that it would be better for the border to be a mess to help his political prospects instead of solving the problem.

I hear Senator GRAHAM when he says: Well, we don't trust the Biden administration. Well, we didn't trust the Trump administration. That is a road to nowhere.

If we don't pass reform legislation when the other party's President is in power, we will never do the business of the people. We had a chance to do that until the intervention of President Trump.

I wish—I wish—that instead of choosing his political prospects this November, we were choosing to secure the border in a bipartisan way.

Mr. DURBIN. At 2 o'clock this afternoon, we are going to have a vote on that bipartisan measure. It will be an opportunity for those who have amendments to come forward with those amendments after we pass it; is that not correct?

Mr. MURPHY. That is correct. And, of course, this is a motion to just proceed to debate.

So this isn't final passage. If Members think there are imperfections in this bill, if they want additional restrictions on parole authority, they could vote to proceed, and then we could get into a process by which we could try to solve any remaining differences that have arisen since the announcement of the bipartisan bill with Republican leadership with their designated negotiator.

I wish we could just get onto this bill so we could try to sort this out instead of allowing this issue to become a perpetual political football, as seems to be the interest of many of my Republican colleagues.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I have found this conversation so interesting.

I will remind my colleagues that H.R. 2, a border security bill, actually did come to the Senate, and it has been here since May 15 of 2023—an actual border security bill—and the fact that the provisions in front of us are not border security provisions are things that are of concern.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1843

Mr. President, I have come to the floor to talk about the Biden administration ending a policy that we had during the Trump years, and it was familial DNA testing at the southern border.

Now, they chose to end this. Nobody has benefited more from this reckless decision of the Biden administration

than these cartels that are abusing and recycling minors to help illegal aliens. Yes, indeed, they are recycling children. They are recycling children who have no relationship to the adults that are bringing them in, because these illegal aliens, being pushed by the cartels, are attaching children to the adults so that they appear as a family unit at the border, and that will help them to get asylum.

While more than 400,000 migrant children have crossed our border under this administration, reports show us that as many as 30 percent of those children that are DNA-tested by border agents are not related to the illegal aliens who are posing as their family members.

So I come to the floor to call for a motion to proceed to S. 1843, the End Child Trafficking Now Act, to restore familial DNA testing at the border. The bill would criminalize child recycling. It would require DHS to deport illegal aliens who refuse a DNA test. It would mandate a maximum 10-year sentence for illegals who fabricate family ties to a minor and require HHS to process such children as unaccompanied minors.

Protecting migrant children should not be controversial. If my Democrat colleagues object, they are making their position clear on this issue.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session; further, that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 1843 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETERS). Is there objection?

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand this bill is intended to "require a DNA test to determine the relationship between" asylum-seeking adults at the border and "any accompanying children." However, it fails to accomplish this goal, and our current laws already include provisions to allow for DNA testing.

Under current law, as written, DHS and the State Department already have the necessary authority to collect DNA when there is any question about the familial relationship between a noncitizen and a minor child traveling with them.

At the southwest border, the Department of Homeland Security currently conducts DNA testing when there is any question about the validity of the parent-child relationship, and additional scrutiny is placed on individuals who are not related to the child to ensure that a child is not being trafficked.

Due to what I assume is a drafting error in this proposal before us, I have to note that this bill will not even apply to families seeking asylum at the border. As it is currently written, this bill only applies to someone who is "admitted" to the United States, but under our immigration laws, asylum

seekers at the border "enter" the United States but are not usually "admitted." There is a big distinction here. That means that this bill would apply to any noncitizen family coming to the United States through our legal immigration system but not families crossing the border to claim asylum—exactly the opposite of what the Senator says she wanted to achieve.

The family relationships of those who are coming to our country through the legal immigration system are usually validated by multiple agencies before applicants are issued a visa. For example, assume that a family from Mexico wanted to come to Disney World in Florida and applied for visitors visas for that purpose for themselves and their children. They would need to prove at the airport, under this bill, that they are the relatives or guardian of the children or submit to a DNA test. Is that what we are going to expend our energy on? If the family refuses, the adults may be arrested. The children would be treated as unaccompanied children and placed in custody. Is that what we want to achieve?

This bill would require every such family to prove their relationship with their children at the airport or other ports of entry. The burdensome requirements in this bill could bring our system for processing lawful travelers to a halt and deter legitimate trade and tourism in the United States.

As the Senator from Tennessee knows, protecting kids has been one of our top priorities in the Judiciary Committee. Last year, we held two hearings on the safety and well-being of children seeking refuge in the United States. We heard from child trafficking experts and government witnesses. Following up on these hearings, the committee is in the midst of ongoing investigation into the issue.

We all agree that no child should be abused, exploited, or trafficked, whether the President is a Republican or a Democrat.

I vigorously opposed the Trump administration's inhumane family-separation policy, and I have demanded that the Biden administration do more to protect migrant children.

It is easy to criticize the executive branch, but let's take a look at the reality of the situation. We need to look in the mirror. It has been decades—over 30 years—since Congress passed meaningful immigration legislation. In less than an hour, at 2 o'clock, every Senate Republican and Democrat will have a chance to make history, to start us on a bipartisan conversation for a better immigration system.

Instead of lobbying pro-partisan attacks, let's come together across the aisle to fix the broken immigration system. We should provide funding for enforcement against child labor violations and ensure child migrants have the services they deserve.

I have introduced legislation to improve sponsor vetting and placement,

help children navigate our legal system, and better protect minors in government custody. I welcome my colleagues from either side of the aisle to join me. I would be more than happy to sit down with any of my colleagues to discuss solutions that would prevent child trafficking. Sadly, this bill does not accomplish that goal at all.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, I think the esteemed chairman of the Judiciary Committee is misreading the bill because this would apply to people who are entering the United States. It would apply to those who are coming to the southern border.

This is a process that had been in place. The Biden administration chose to stop this process. What we understand is that they chose to stop this because the test takes 45 minutes—45 minutes to determine if that child is or is not related, 45 minutes to determine if that child should be left with those adults. Thirty percent of the children that are DNA-tested at that southern border are found to not be related to the adult who is holding them by the hand, who is bringing them into the country.

So I would ask my colleagues, is 45 minutes too much time to take to be sure that a child is secure?

We have had 10 million people come to that border. We have had 400,000 of those children. Don't we want to provide the best for these children and separate them from traffickers?

By the way, HHS has lost track of 85,000 of these children. They can't tell the Presiding Officer's committee where those children are. They can't tell the Judiciary Committee where those children are—85,000 children. We do not know if they are dead or alive. We do not know if they are being labor trafficked, sex trafficked. We do not know what is happening.

DNA testing is a way to help save some of these children. We should return to this policy.

By the way, again I will mention that H.R. 2 has been in here. The Homeland Security Committee has had 374 days to have a markup on a border security bill. They chose not to. The Judiciary Committee could have had a markup on a border security bill. They did not do it. But they are bringing a political stunt bill to the floor today to try to push it through to give cover to vulnerable Members of your party.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my unanimous consent request, the following Senators be allowed to speak prior to the scheduled rollcall vote: Senator LANKFORD for up to 5 minutes, Senator SINEMA for up to 7 minutes, and Senator MURPHY for up to 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4175

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, for over three decades, the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act—or RECA, as it is frequently described—has stood as a testament to our Nation's enduring commitment to righting the wrongs of the past. Where it has hurt someone, it wants to do something about it.

Since 1990, this vital program has distributed over \$2.4 billion to more than 38,000 individuals adversely affected by the fallout from atomic weapons testing and the uranium industry labor. These Americans suffered due to Federal activities and decisions beyond their control, enduring illnesses that spanned generations.

Yet, as we speak, RECA is on the brink of expiration. On June 10, just 18 days from now, unless we act, the Sun will set on a program that has provided essential relief to those still living with the horrific consequences of radiation exposure.

Among these are not only just the downwinders affected by nuclear tests but also the hard-working uranium miners, mill workers, and transporters contracted by the Federal Government in connection with Federal activities. Their suffering was part of the price of our national security during the Cold War, and their plight must not be forgotten.

So while we debate the merits and the potential expansions of RECA, it is unthinkable that we would interrupt access to aid for those currently suffering, those current beneficiaries, those currently eligible for RECA compensation. They consist of people whom no one disputes have been harmed. So we don't want to interrupt coverage to them simply because we are talking about who else might also need to be covered under this program.

The bill I propose is a clean extension of the existing program. It maintains the existing RECA framework, ensuring no disruption in access to compensation while we deliberate on how best to enhance and extend its reach. I don't dispute that it is appropriate to expand and extend its reach in certain respects because there are some people not currently covered by it, but, again, we don't want to harm those who are the current beneficiaries, and there is no reason why their coverage should lapse.

The proposal previously passed by the Senate to expand RECA includes regions and additional compensation claims in a variety of jurisdictions. In some of those instances, they are abundantly backed by data; in others, they are not. In some of those areas, there may be victims who are covered by other programs; in others, there may not be. Some of them are clearer than others. I think some of the clearest cases are those involving victims in the State of Missouri and in the State of New Mexico, and we will talk more about those in a little bit.

The current bill does have some challenging aspects to it—challenging from

the standpoint of moving forward toward passage. The bill as it stands risks inflating the deficit by at least \$60 billion—that is at the low end—and it may jeopardize the longevity of access to necessary resources for Americans who depend on RECA compensation for the reimbursement of costs associated with medical care or survivor benefits in the event a family member tragically passed away due to exposure.

That I will not do, and I am not alone. You see, the House of Representatives has thus far declined to take up and pass Senator HAWLEY's previous bill, with some signaling concern and raising some of the concerns that I just restated.

It is deeply troubling that amidst urgent need, we might find ourselves entangled in one form or another of brinkmanship, sitting on our hands, waiting for an unjustly expansive and unattainable bill—one that no one believes can be passed by the House. Expecting that that bill will be passed at the eleventh hour puts real lives at risk if what that means is that the existing RECA structure can't be reauthorized.

So I refuse to stand by and let the program lapse while we continue to search for a solution for legitimate victims in Missouri and New Mexico. We can't allow access to RECA's benefits to be held hostage during those negotiations.

Now, I, too, am in favor of some of the expansions, including and especially the expansion for New Mexico and for Missouri. I think those categories of would-be beneficiaries do need to be added. But we can't allow access to the benefits for the existing RECA beneficiaries to be held hostage during those.

But until we can iron out some of the details more carefully, it is no less imperative that we pass a straightforward extension that will allow support for the existing beneficiaries to continue without interruption. Those people haven't done anything wrong. There is no reason why they should be punished based on the fact that we haven't yet found a solution that can pass through both Houses of Congress and make it to the President's desk.

With the clock ticking down to just 18 days, less than 3 weeks before RECA expires, every moment that jeopardizes benefits for those suffering the consequences of our Nation's past actions is significant, and we should find that troubling. Now, these individuals do not have the luxury of time that seems at times so abundant in Washington. They need our help now, and they deserve swift and unencumbered continuation of access to the support that RECA provides while we work out the other issues.

I urge my colleagues in Congress to not allow RECA to lapse. Let's pass this clean reauthorization. Let's do it right now, and let's send a clear message that America takes care of its own.

To that end, Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 4175 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, 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 Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Reserving the right to object. Mr. President, I have literally grown hoarse coming to this floor defending the rights of Americans poisoned by their own government to be compensated by that government when, through no fault of their own, they have been exposed to nuclear radiation, nuclear waste, nuclear contamination in the soil, in the water, in the air.

I just listened to my friend from Utah describe this eleventh-hour bill after the Senate has spoken to this issue multiple times—multiple times. After that has been done, now my friend from Utah comes and says we need a clean extension—a clean extension—clean. There is nothing clean about this bill. No, it leaves Missouri filthy dirty with nuclear radiation.

Let's just remember how it happened. All the way back in the Manhattan Project, the U.S. Government used the city of St. Louis as a uranium processing site. And did the U.S. Government clean up the nuclear radiation after the fact? No, it did not. Did the U.S. Government warn the people of Missouri that they were, in fact, being poisoned by nuclear radiation? No, they did not.

What they did instead is they lied to the people of Missouri while the nuclear contamination seeped into our ground water, seeped into our soil. For 50 years and more, the people of St. Louis and St. Charles and large parts of my State have been exposed to nuclear radiation. We have the highest rates of breast cancer in the Nation in North St. Louis County. Entire schools cannot go to school because their classrooms are filled with nuclear radioactive material.

What has the Federal Government done? Not a thing. What would this bill do? Not a thing. Would it clean it up? No. Would it clean the lungs of the survivors who even now are dying from the poison they have been exposed to? No. Would it clean the areas of the Navajo Nation that have been overrun with nuclear radiation? No. Would it clean the mines that our veterans went to for decades exposed to nuclear radiation? No.

No, it would do none of these things.

This bill, I think, partakes of an entirely different philosophy, the philosophy expressed by the junior Senator from Utah, Mr. ROMNEY, who said recently it is too expensive for the Federal Government to actually make right what it has done to all these good

Americans for decades on end. No, instead what we need to do is pass this bill that the senior Senator from Utah is now advocating. It is a small fraction, he says. He is right about that. And it is reserved for those individuals who have been determined to have actually suffered.

Let's just be clear. If you live in Missouri, you are not deemed to have actually suffered under this legislation. If you live in New Mexico, you are not deemed to have actually suffered under this legislation. Heck, if you live in Utah, you are not deemed to have actually suffered. Is there any expansion for the State of Utah in the legislation proposed by the senior Senator? No, there is not.

Mr. President, we have been here before. We have been here for months. We have been here going on years now. Senator LUJÁN and I have passed through this Chamber—not once but twice—legislation that would reauthorize this critical program and finally do justice to the hundreds of thousands of Americans poisoned by their own government. And this body has passed it twice. The last time by 70 votes.

The time now is to act. It is not the time for further delay. It is not the time to look away. It is not the time to change the subject. It is the time for the House to act.

Study after study has shown the expanse of the nuclear radiation. Here is a study from 1997, from 2005, another from 2005, from 2023, all showing that the nuclear radiation is far beyond the contours of the original RECA bill passed in 1990. Yet my friend from Utah wants to keep doing the same old thing, leaving out in the cold hundreds of thousands of Americans.

I will not consent to it, Mr. President. This body will not consent to it. We have been here before. We have had this debate. We have settled it, and this is not the time to reopen it. This is the time for the House to act, no more excuses, no more delays, no more changing of the subject, no more blaming of the victims. This is the time to stand up and be counted for the House to act.

Before I object, Mr. President—and I am going to object—I want to yield to my friend, the Senator from New Mexico, who has been such a champion in the fight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act yet again.

I appreciate this opportunity because as I have learned, every opportunity we get to talk about the families, to share the stories of the families who are dying of cancer and suffering—for the Federal Government has ignored them for decades—we are able to earn one more vote, one more Member who will stand courageously in that well and say: We can do the right thing, and we can ensure that we are going to provide

support and coverage for these families.

I come to the floor today to share the same concerns as my friend Senator HAWLEY. I have proudly been working on the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act since I was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 2009. Prior to that, my predecessor in the Senate and in the House, Tom Udall, was working on this policy and these issues. I have had the honor of speaking with the late Senator Orrin Hatch—may he rest in peace—about the faults that were made when this legislation was passed in 1990 and amended in 2000, of the families that were left out.

After we hear about this approach, we get a chance to talk a little bit more about another idea, and I hope to be able to share some quotes from Senator Orrin Hatch about how we should be working together.

But today, Mr. President, for this portion, I want to share the story of Mary Dickson. Mary grew up in the fallout of nuclear testing. She lived downwind of the Nevada test site where an estimated 100 nuclear tests were detonated above ground.

She has said that all around these testing sites, Utah families were going about their daily lives, drinking milk from the local dairies, eating vegetables from the gardens that they tended to. Heck, the kids would even mix sugar with snow so they could pretend it was ice cream, she wrote.

In my home State of New Mexico, where the first bomb was tested at the Trinity Test Site just miles from the town of Ruidoso and Tularosa, kids at summer camp not only heard the terrifying sounds of the bomb but saw the white ash falling down from the sky. Those kids thought it was snow as well. They went out and played in it because there was no warning. As a matter of fact, the U.S. Government did something worse. They lied to these families and said it was just a drop of munitions. These kids were playing in radioactive waste. These kids ate radioactive waste.

Some of these kids are now adults fighting for their lives. Far too many of these adults face cancer diagnoses. Many face a diagnosis that was similar to their parents or their siblings or their grandparents or their neighbors. Mary faced her diagnosis at 30. Others gave birth to babies with birth defects. Far too many died far too young.

The Senator from Utah and I agree that the people of Utah deserve justice. I and others, like Senator HAWLEY, agree that those impacted in other States deserve justice as well. Today's exercise is not the answer.

The Senate has already acted twice—once to amend the National Defense Authorization Act with Democrats and Republicans, 61 votes strong. The same people that once said that the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act could not pass through the legislative branch—through the House or through

the Senate—they were taken aback that there was this enormous vote and success only a few months later to see another bill authored by Senator HAWLEY that I was proud to work with him on with the advocates. The advocates should be at the table as we are having these deliberations. Where are their voices?

Sixty-nine votes said yes. Now it sits in the U.S. House of Representatives, where recently even Speaker JOHNSON's office commented on taking action to make sure that this program will not die. I appreciate that.

I certainly hope that the families I have had the honor of meeting with, that I know Senator HAWLEY has met with, that all Senators share and agree that we should take further action on the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act meet with them as well.

I hope the Senators start with Mary Dickson. Learn her stories. Invite her in. Get to know her, her advocacy, her plight because by learning her story, we are going to help countless others all across America. I strongly urge my colleagues to stand with all the victims.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, for a year now, Senator LUJÁN and I have been coming to this floor and warning—warning—that the Radiation Exposure Act is going to expire. And that is why this body took action, not once but twice, in overwhelming bipartisan fashion to expand and extend RECA in a way that does justice to every American, every veteran who has been poisoned by their own government. And now it is incumbent upon the House to act.

I want to be clear. I will not consent to any short-term stopgap, any half-way measure. I will not give my consent to it.

It will not pass this floor with my consent. This body has acted. This body has spoken. And there can be no turning back now. We are not going to turn our backs on the victims, not any longer. It has been 50 years in the State of Missouri. It has been just as long in New Mexico. It has been just as long for the Navajo Nation. It has been just as long for the uranium miners, our veterans.

There can be no going back now, and so I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4403

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the insights offered today by my friends and colleagues, and that they truly are. The senior Senator from Missouri and the junior Senator from New Mexico have made an impassioned plea—an impassioned plea that I am deeply sympathetic to for a variety of reasons, including and especially the fact that they are both right as to their respective States. The folks in Mis-

souri deserve to have this coverage, and so do people in New Mexico. There are also additional people not covered by the existing program in Utah who need to be covered.

In all three instances with respect to Utah, New Mexico, and Missouri, we need to get this done. You know, taking into account all of the arguments that they have made and the evidence that I have reviewed, I am prepared to do what it takes, and I am prepared to get this done today.

As I mentioned, this isn't just an abstract concept to me; this is near and dear to my heart. Many people I know and love have had their lives altered and, in many cases, ended by exposure to downwind radiation.

One of those people was a loving husband and father who raised seven children, who was taken at the prime of his life, at the peak of his career, just days after his 61st birthday, as he was surrounded by his wife and their seven children, one of whom stands at this desk today.

My father died from this in 1996, just 28 years ago, and we didn't know at the time—didn't know until years after that he had, in fact, been a victim of and then died of a cancer linked to his exposure as a child growing up in eastern Arizona, spending his summers in Reserve, NM, a small sawmill camp where his family lived each summer. He was exposed to downwind radiation, and that led to his untimely death.

My dad would be nearly 90 if he were alive today, and I can only imagine the youth and the vitality we would still see in him. I am convinced he would still be practicing law. I am convinced he would still be a runner. His life and that of so many others in Utah, Missouri, and New Mexico have been cut tragically short by this exposure, which is why we need to get this done.

So, look, in light of these concerns and the political realities we face, again, I want to make sure that RECA doesn't lapse, and so I want to offer an updated version of the Downwinders Act.

This bill would extend the benefits of the program to those in Missouri exposed to the hazards of improperly stored nuclear waste, while also addressing the historical oversights in New Mexico and in parts of Utah.

When we look at this, we have to do this to make sure that we are following the science, and in all three of those areas, the science is backed up, and in all three of those jurisdictions, not only does the science back it up, but there aren't other government programs that may overlap with it that provide this compensation.

Remember, if this were not the U.S. Government doing it, this would ultimately be some species of tort law. But because it is the U.S. Government and the U.S. Government, as a sovereign entity—you can't just sue it unless the U.S. Government makes itself amenable to suit, and that is really where RECA came in. Because of the fact that

we are uniquely situated, both by virtue of what the science currently backs up and the absence of other programs to do it, I think it makes sense to accord that to these States.

The other States covered by the legislation now pending in the House, that is stalled out in the House—it passed here, and so that is done. It has moved on from this Chamber. One of the reasons that I understand why it stalled out in the House is because of cost.

Now, I am not aware of the full context of the quote provided by my colleague from Utah in that quote. I don't know whether there was more context there or not. But if that was the whole context, I don't share that approach. I don't share that sentiment. In other words, we don't not do this just because it is expensive. The whole thing is expensive. The loss of life is expensive, and we need to address that.

The issue is, again, one, whether and to what extent claims are backed up by the science and whether and to what extent there are other programs that already cover it in one way or another, such that the bill adequately addresses that.

There are other States in that legislation pending in the House that deal with law in the Marshall Islands, Idaho, Kentucky, Ohio, Alaska, and perhaps one or two other jurisdictions. The claims of those States are not on equal footing. They are different from these claims. The Utah and New Mexico claims are very similar. They stem from the same sequence of events related primarily to exposure to downwind radiation from the atomic weapons testing. In Missouri, they are a little bit different, but they share enough of the same elements, and they are similarly backed by science. In these other jurisdictions, it is a little bit different.

That is where a lot of the—not all but a lot of the expense is accrued and a lot of concerns expressed in the House impeding its quick passage over there that might lead to it not being able to be passed at all.

But, again, look, to ensure we do our due diligence here, where there is uncertainty as to some of the other jurisdictions covered by that bill now pending in the House, my bill that I am offering now includes a requirement that the Federal Government must study and report on other regions that should be eligible for compensation.

We need to get this done. I will continue to fight for the recognition and compensation of all those exposed to radiation through no fault of their own because it is the right thing to do regardless of cost.

With the clock ticking down to just 18 days before RECA expires, every moment that jeopardizes benefits for those suffering the consequences of our Nation's past actions is significant. We can't ignore it. These individuals do not have the luxury of time that seems so abundant here in Washington; they need our help now. They deserve swift

and unencumbered continuation of access to the support that RECA provides.

So I urge my colleagues in Congress to pass the Downwinders Act, this expanded Downwinders Act, and send a clear message: America takes care of its own.

With this legislation, we will be able to take care of our own and expand the coverage to Missouri, to New Mexico, and to the previously unaddressed regions of Utah that have nonetheless been affected.

To that end, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4403, which is at the desk. I further ask that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I think now I have heard my friend from Utah change his position. Now he is saying he is willing to acknowledge that there needs to be an expansion of coverage for the people of Missouri, for the people of his own State, for the people of New Mexico.

I am glad we have gotten to this point. I am glad we are willing to acknowledge finally that indeed there are those who have suffered, Americans who have been poisoned by their government, who have never been compensated, and it is basic justice to compensate them. I think that is now the position that we are at. It has taken us a long time to get there, but I think that is what I now hear the senior Senator from Utah saying.

I think I also heard him say that cost should not be used as an excuse. Let's just be clear about something. The cost has been paid. It has been paid by the victims. Who is it who is paying the medical bills? The victims are. Who is it who is having to choose whether to do a cancer treatment or be able to afford school supplies for their kids? The victims are. Who are the ones who are having to decide whether they can afford the burial services or not for a loved one who has passed away from nuclear radiation? The victims are. They are the ones paying the cost.

The U.S. Government has gotten off scot-free. Fifty years, the U.S. Government hasn't paid a penny in my State, in New Mexico, the Navajo Nation in Arizona, to the miners, our veterans—nothing. Nothing. They are the ones who made the mess. In Missouri, it is still not cleaned up. As I stand here on this floor, Coldwater Creek is still poisoned, the Westlake Landfill is still burning, and Weldon Spring is not cleaned up. The government hasn't done anything.

I am glad to hear an acknowledgment finally that it is time for the Federal Government to take responsibility for what it has done. We can all agree on that.

We can all agree that the time to act is now, which is why this body has acted. It has done everything Senator LEE has just talked about. We have done it. We did it months ago—months ago. The Senator talks about getting this done today; it has been done. The Senate has done it. We passed this bill with nearly 70 votes months ago.

I urge the Senator to use his good offices in the House to speak to Speaker JOHNSON, who pledged, by the way, to the Congresswoman from Missouri, ANN WAGNER, in a public statement—he said the House would take this up and make sure RECA is renewed.

I believe the Senator is right. They have 18 days—18 days. He made a commitment. Let's keep our commitments.

I urge the Senator to use his good offices, now that we all agree, to get this done in the U.S. House of Representatives. That is where the obstacle is. But I reiterate, I will not be party to any attempt at some halfway measure, some short stopgap bill, or some effort to sweep this under the rug—not anymore. The victims have waited too long. They have waited too long.

I yield to my friend from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. President, let me begin by quoting Senator Orrin Hatch, the primary author of the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act. In his final years, Senator Hatch said:

Updating this legislation is a moral imperative. RECA, as it is currently written, extends benefits only to uranium miners, millers, and transporters who worked until 1972. But an updated bill would extend benefits to those who worked after 1972, many of whom have developed cancer as a result of radiation exposure.

Let me repeat that. Senator Orrin Hatch said it was a moral imperative to provide justice to what are called Post-71 miners. And what does this bill offer to these Americans who have suffered for our country? Nothing. What does this bill offer to downwinders in Arizona, Nevada, Colorado, Idaho, Montana? Again, nothing. Instead, this exercise is an attempt to undermine the strong bipartisan coalition that passed historic RECA legislation.

I hope no one misreads what is happening today. There is a bipartisan coalition, there is a bipartisan group of advocates across the country that is growing and growing. There are more cosponsors in the House. The strongest vote that has ever taken place in the U.S. Senate has already passed this bill.

Let me be clear. Our bipartisan coalition will work with anyone who wants to meaningfully help the victims of all radiation and uranium exposure illnesses—including those that voted no when the Senate passed the RECA to the House just a few months ago. But we should help all of them, every one of these families that qualifies.

By the way, just because a community is included as a downwind county,

it doesn't mean all the people living there benefit from the program. They still have to fight and prove that they lived in this community for a number of years, that their critical illnesses and cancers are those that science shows were due to this exposure. They have to fight. It is not just given to them. There is a whole process associated with the science, and study after study continues to show how these families deserve this help.

As a matter of fact, in committee this week, we were having a hearing to help coal miners in America. And some of the experts that were in that room, I asked them about exposure with uranium and the kind of cancers that we should expect, and I asked them specifically about uranium mine workers. And it wasn't surprising when that witness told us that the same uranium mine workers who worked 1971 and before—their cancers—it turns out that the uranium mine workers that worked in 1972 had the same cancer as well.

Senator Orrin Hatch, through his wisdom and his words and in my conversations with this great leader, said: We have to fix these mistakes.

I will close with this. A few years ago, a Navajo elder—and I have shared this with our colleagues before—when she spoke before the House of Representatives, she asked an important question to a panel of Members that were not supportive of expanding RECA, and it was simple: Are you waiting for all of us to die so that the problem goes away?

With a simple vote in the House, taking up this Senate legislation that the Senate passed with 69 votes, authored by Senator HAWLEY, we can answer her question with a resounding: No, we are going to get help to families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we have got to keep our eye on the ball, our eye on the fact that the legislation, while pending in the House, is itself mired.

Now, I want to be clear in response to something, a comment made by the senior Senator from Missouri. This is not a new realization on my part. This is not a new willingness on my part to acknowledge the legitimacy of the claims and the suitability of the claims under RECA from Missouri and those from New Mexico. It is not new at all.

In fact, it is not just in this Congress that I support them. And 2 or 3 years ago, in the previous Congress, I introduced legislation because after reviewing the data, I concluded the beneficiaries—the would-be, need-to-be beneficiaries—in Missouri and those in New Mexico deserve to be added.

And so, to be clear, what I am offering here is not the whole thing that exists in the bill that is now passed by

the Senate and pending in the House but appears to be mired with no hope of passage over there. It is not the whole bill, but it is something, and it takes care of our three States. And it is not just because our three States are important and the others aren't. No, it is because the claims arising in our three respective States are materially different than those pending in other jurisdictions.

In most of those other jurisdictions, the scientific data isn't of the same caliber, drawing the same causal link between radiation exposure and liability on the part of the U.S. Government, and, ultimately, the conditions at issue, the types of cancers and related ailments that go along with it. They are materially different.

And so until such time as the science catches up, I think it is going to continue to have difficulty passing in the House. I could be wrong. That is how I see it. That is what I have heard from everyone I trust as to diagnosing the ability of that bill, or lack thereof, to pass in the House.

With respect to the Post-1971 uranium miners and millers, there is a distinction here. It is not a distinction that is necessarily impossible to overcome in every circumstance. But the Congressional Research Service looked at this for us, and we asked them to examine it. They concluded that the Post-1971 uranium millers and miners covered by the Hawley legislation now pending in the House were from the commercial sector. They were not doing this as contractors or as employees or otherwise as agents of the U.S. Government, but rather for private sector industry. And in those circumstances—in many of those circumstances, if not most or all—those can be addressed through tort law and/or through workmen's compensation law.

Now, for those that can't, there may well be an appropriate use of RECA. But if we are going to start expanding this into purely private sector activities, that changes the nature of this bill, and I suspect will continue to make it more difficult to pass in the House of Representatives.

So as to what we have got in Guam, the Marshall Islands, Idaho, Kentucky, Ohio, and Alaska, there may well be worthy beneficiaries there as to whom there exists adequate scientific research to justify the expansion of RECA and as to whom there is no other adequate recourse provided for by some other government program or through State tort law, workers' compensation law, or something else.

As to those, I would be happy to expand RECA, but we have to overcome those two issues. Those haven't been overcome. But they have been overcome as to Utah, as to New Mexico, and as to Missouri.

It is unfortunate that my friend and colleague from Missouri chose, rather than to allow the victims in his State and in New Mexico and the yet-uncov-

ered victims in the State of Utah to be taken within the protective boundaries of RECA today—we could have gotten this done today. I am confident we could have gotten it passed in the House right away. He chose to object to it.

In other words, unless you can have all of his bill passed, including the parts that are not scientifically backed—making it unpassable in the House—he is not going to let even the victims in Missouri or the victims in New Mexico get covered. That is most unfortunate.

We have got to deal with this. I will be back. We have to get this done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, three Senators started, about 8 months ago now, working to try to get some solutions on border security. It is for obvious reasons, because we have record high numbers over and over and over again at our southern border. We had a record high number in October, record high number in November, and record high number in December. In fact, December had the highest number of illegal crossings ever in the history of the country in a single day.

As of yesterday, we had about 5,200 people that illegally crossed yesterday. In fact, almost every day this year, we have had more than 5,000 illegally crossing day after day after day.

This is a very big issue that the American people want solved. It is a frustrating issue that we have not been able to get to a resolution on. It is an issue that people have been frustrated with President Biden because President Biden has not enforced the border the same way President Trump did or the same way President Obama did.

To be clear, this year we will have 2½ million people illegally cross the border. With the same law in place under President Obama, we had half a million people that illegally crossed that year.

And as I have raised over and over again with this administration, if they would just enforce the border the same way President Obama did, things would be very different. But they have chosen not to. They have chosen not to enforce it the same way President Trump did.

Instead, we have absolutely been overrun with people from literally all over the world. To put this in perspective, in the last 3 months, we have had more people illegally cross than any full year under President Obama.

They need to do what they can do. But Congress needs to do what we can do. We have got to change the definition of asylum. We have to change the appeals process. We have got to be able to speed up the process. We have got to provide more clarity so that we don't have people waiting around 8 years for a hearing. We can't just release people at the border, as what has happened day after day after day for years now. We can't have a brandnew parole pro-

gram that the Biden administration literally invented that no President has ever used to release thousands of people a day. We can't have that.

We need to solve this in the administration. We need to solve this in Congress. I wish that is what we were doing today, but we are not.

When Senator MURPHY and Senator SINEMA and I started working on this months ago, we were working to solve it. We were not able to get that done.

But today is not a bill. Today is a prop. Today is a political messaging exercise. Today is an opportunity to be able to have a vote that is sitting out there so people can send fundraising emails out later tonight and say, "Look, I tried to do something," when no work was actually done to try to get something done and completed and passed today.

In fact, I anticipate there will be fewer votes today than there were 2 months ago when this came up—on both sides of the aisle—because everyone sees this for what it is. It is not an effort to actually make law. It is an effort to do political messaging.

That doesn't help us as a country. We still have people that are illegally present here that need attention, and we are not getting it.

Now, we can say—Democrats can bring this bill up and say: Look, we tried to do something.

Well, so what. Republicans can do the same thing. We brought H.R. 2 twice. That has passed the House with a broad, sweeping piece of approval in the House to come over here to be able to change the way that actually asylum is done, the entire process. That has been voted down twice on a strictly partisan vote.

So we can have this vote today, and people can say: Well, Republicans voted against this; so it didn't pass.

Republicans can say: Democrats didn't vote for H.R. 2; so it didn't pass.

That still doesn't solve the problem. At the end of the day, the people in my State say: There is another 5,000 people that illegally crossed the border. Why aren't we sitting down and resolving this?

So, today, I am going to vote no on a bill that I think should pass, but there has been no effort to really get this to pass. Let's get us back to the table. Let's actually resolve this issue as we need to get done.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. President, I stand here today, yet again, as the border crisis continues to devastate my State.

On February 7, I stood here, angry that rank partisanship tanked the single most important piece of border security and immigration legislation produced in decades.

As we all remember, last October, I joined with Senators JAMES LANKFORD of Oklahoma and CHRIS MURPHY of Connecticut to craft this legislation. We worked every single day for over 4

months, navigating difficult policy positions, working carefully to get it right.

After months of tireless negotiations, we delivered a strong product. We produced a bill many thought impossible. We ended catch-and-release. We added more detention beds. We increased deportation flights. We quickly decided asylum claims, and we put Border Patrol back in the field where they belong—securing the border, not stuck inside processing paperwork.

Yet, less than 24 hours after we released the bill, my Republican colleagues blocked it, despite the fact that this is the most restrictive migrant legislation in decades.

My Democratic colleagues blamed Republican political theater for blocking action. So did I. They were right.

I spoke here on the Senate floor twice in defense of our legislation. It turns out that my Republican colleagues were all talk and no action.

Today, though, my Democratic colleagues have chosen more political theater instead of real efforts to solve this crisis.

All talk and no actions goes both ways. Today, the Senate will hold a show vote whose sole purpose is to point the finger back at the other party—yet another cynical political game.

These games demonstrate exactly why Americans have lost faith in their elected leaders: a Congress bickering and fighting for power instead of solving problems and making progress—any kind of progress—for regular people. Today's vote is not an attempt to solve the problem or provide relief to Arizona border communities. Today's vote is to send a message.

But Arizona doesn't need your message. Arizona needs your help. Arizona needs action.

These games of tit for tat, caving to the political messaging game, force both parties further to the fringes and further away from real solutions. Today, the Senate is proving what many Americans already think about Congress: that Senators come here for political games, not to deliver results.

Today's vote won't deliver lasting results for Americans, but the impact of today's vote is actually worse than simply being a useless message, because this vote does send an important message, but it is a message to us as lawmakers.

I have often asked my colleagues in the interest of our Nation to step out of partisan boxes and work with me to find real solutions to real problems. We have done it time and time again. This time it didn't work.

Nearly 4 months later, I am still deeply disappointed that we didn't solve the border crisis for my State and for our country. But to use this failure as a political punching bag only punishes those who were courageous enough to do the hard work of finding compromise in the first place.

So who will be courageous next time? Who will stand up and do the hard

work? Who will take the risks? Who will say: Yes, I will help solve this big challenge our country faces. Why would anyone?

We don't leave today with a political victory. No one wins. No one gets the higher grounds. Instead, we are saying to each other: Don't step out. Don't try to solve big problems. Stay in your partisan corner. Yell some more. Blame the other side.

Today, yet again, the Senate has chosen politics, but my State is still suffering. As I said on the floor back on February 7, if you want to spin the border crisis for your own political agendas, go right ahead. If you want to continue to use the southern border as a backdrop for your political campaign, that is fine; good luck to you. But I have a very clear message for anyone using the southern border for staged political events: Don't come to Arizona for your political theater. Do not bring it to my State.

In Arizona, we are serious. We don't have time for your political games. There are big challenges facing the Senate and our country, and evidently this is not a Senate interested in solving those challenges. Americans deserve better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Madam President, I am deeply grateful to Senator SINEMA, Senator LANKFORD, Senator MCCONNELL, Senator SCHUMER, and others who worked with us over the course of 4 months to craft this landmark, unprecedented, bipartisan border security bill that, if enacted, would take the biggest step that we have taken in decades to bring order to our southwest border. It would give a shot of confidence to our constituents that we can find agreement on even the toughest of issues.

I may be coming to a slightly different conclusion, though, on the reason that we are here today than my very good friend Senator SINEMA and my great friend Senator LANKFORD.

I think one of the most important, enduring values in politics is the value of persistence. If you believe something is important, you don't give up the first time.

We worked very hard to achieve this compromise. It is a good-faith compromise. You will see that it is a compromise because there will be Democratic Members who will vote against it today.

We solved some big problems in this bill—reducing the amount of time it takes to process an asylum claim from 10 years down to a handful of weeks or months, giving the President new powers to shut down the border when crossings get too high, giving new legal rights to migrants, allowing for more visas so that folks can come to the United States in a planned way to work or to be reunited with families.

I think that compromise was so important that we shouldn't give up after

failing once. I think the American people have told us that solving the problem at the border is so important that we shouldn't put away that compromise simply because the first time, politics won out.

Maybe I am naive, but I had some degree of hope, some degree of faith that maybe the second time we could come together and vote to proceed to a debate, because, remember, that is all this vote is—not a vote on final passage, a vote to bring this bill before the Senate, to litigate the outstanding issues that Republicans may have about the reforms in this bill.

So I deeply appreciate all of the work that Senator LANKFORD and Senator SINEMA did that went into this bill. I just come to a slightly different conclusion. This does not make me less eager to engage in bipartisan compromise in the future. This doesn't dissuade me from trying to reach future compromises.

Frankly, I think our decision to not give up when we have reached this really important product—I think it may, frankly, put wind behind the wings of those in the future who decide to do something really important on something big and work across the aisle to get it done.

We have a chance right now to come together, to put politics and campaigns aside, to vote to proceed on this landmark bipartisan border security reform bill, and I hope my colleagues do it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I will be very brief.

For years, we have heard that if you want to fix the border, then Congress needs to act. Today, we have a chance to act on the strongest border bill Congress has seen in generations.

To those who have said for years that Congress needs to act on the border, this bipartisan bill is the answer, and it is time to show we are serious about fixing the problem.

It is our chance to hire more Border Patrol agents and asylum officers and immigration judges. It is a chance to stop the flow of fentanyl and give law enforcement the tools they need to scan 100 percent of what is coming into the country. It is our chance to give the President emergency powers to close the border, to update asylum laws, and improve vetting. It is a chance to show the American people we are listening, we are acting, we can still reach across the aisle and work on one of the most vexing problems facing the Nation.

I implore my colleagues, do not let this moment pass.

I yield the floor.

QUORUM CALL

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair now directs the clerk to call the roll to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there an objection?
Without objection, it is so ordered.
Is there a quorum?
A quorum is present.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the 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.

The question is, is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 4261, a bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for border security and combatting fentanyl for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 43, nays 50, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 182 Ex.]

YEAS—43

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

NAYS—50

Barrasso	Booker	Braun
Blackburn	Boozman	Britt

Budd	Hawley	Romney
Butler	Hoeben	Rounds
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cassidy	Johnson	Sanders
Collins	Kennedy	Schmitt
Cornyn	Lankford	Scott (FL)
Cotton	Lee	Sinema
Cramer	Lummis	Sullivan
Crapo	Markey	Thune
Cruz	Marshall	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Tuberville
Ernst	Moran	Vance
Fischer	Padilla	Wicker
Graham	Paul	Young
Grassley	Risch	

NOT VOTING—7

Hagerty	Mullin	Warren
Manchin	Ricketts	
Menendez	Scott (SC)	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 43, the nays are 50.

Three-fifths of Senators duly chosen and sworn having not voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

The motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 647.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Christopher T. Hanson, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2029. (Reappointment).

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 647, Christopher T. Hanson, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2029. (Reappointment)

Charles E. Schumer, Thomas R. Carper, Laphonza R. Butler, Sheldon Whitehouse, Alex Padilla, Brian Schatz, Debbie Stabenow, John W. Hickenlooper, Patty Murray, Tina Smith, Tammy Baldwin, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Jack Reed, Richard J. Durbin, Angus S. King, Jr., Gary C. Peters.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 507.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Tanya Monique Jones Bosier, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 507, Tanya Monique Jones Bosier, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Charles E. Schumer, Gary C. Peters, Jeanne Shaheen, John W. Hickenlooper, Alex Padilla, Richard J. Durbin, Amy Klobuchar, Jack Reed, Tina Smith, Richard Blumenthal, Tammy Duckworth, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Catherine Cortez Masto, Margaret Wood Hassan, Peter Welch, Sheldon Whitehouse, Raphael G. Warnock.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 511.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Judith E. Pipe, of the District of Columbia, to be an

Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 511, Judith E. Pipe, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

Charles E. Schumer, Gary C. Peters, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Alex Padilla, Laphonza R. Butler, Christopher A. Coons, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Richard J. Durbin, Jeanne Shaheen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Mazie K. Hirono, Sherrod Brown, Tina Smith, Catherine Cortez Masto, Jeff Merkley.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 590.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 590, Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class

of Career Minister, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Charles E. Schumer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Ben Ray Lujan, Tammy Baldwin, John W. Hickenlooper, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Richard J. Durbin, Jeanne Shaheen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla, Mazie K. Hirono, Sherrod Brown, Tina Smith, Catherine Cortez Masto, Jeff Merkley.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, May 23, be waived.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 653 through 665 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed en bloc are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624 and 8089:

To be rear admiral

Capt. Lia M. Reynolds

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Jason T. Hinds

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Lisa A. Nemeth

The following named Air National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12212:

To be brigadier general

Col. Peter M. Boone

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be brigadier general

Col. Michael S. Shanley

The following named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203.

To be brigadier general

Col. Kathleen A. Clary
Col. Gregory C. Glasow
Col. Steven M. King
Col. Brian D. Wisniewski

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Jered P. Helwig

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Gregory K. Anderson

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Army Judge Advocate General's Corps to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 624, 7037, and 7064:

To be brigadier general

Col. Terri J. Erisman
Col. Christopher A. Kennebeck
Col. Steven M. Ranieri

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Stephen D. Sklenka

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Calvert L. Worth, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Michael J. Vernazza

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. John F. Wade

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1171 AIR FORCE nomination of Anthony K. Onitsuka, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of December 4, 2023.

PN1272 AIR FORCE nomination of Ronald J. Grimley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 8, 2024.

PN1416 AIR FORCE nomination of Debra L. Sims, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2024.

PN1417 AIR FORCE nomination of Peter S. Joo, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 6, 2024.

PN1661 AIR FORCE nominations (398) beginning GEOFFREY E. ADAMS, and ending ERICA MARIE ZENTNER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1662 AIR FORCE nominations (144) beginning NICHOLAS ALBERTO AGUILERA, and ending YONGJUN YOON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1663 AIR FORCE nominations (311) beginning JESSICA M. ABBOTT, and ending TROY BETTINGER YU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1664 AIR FORCE nominations (1071) beginning MARIAH C. ACEVES, and ending ANDREW PAUL ZIMMERMAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1668 AIR FORCE nomination of Michael W. Struthers, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1704 AIR FORCE nomination of Paula M. Chavis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1705 AIR FORCE nominations (2) beginning FRANK J. PANEBIANCO, and ending ANDREW W. WASHER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1706 AIR FORCE nomination of James L. Schneider, III, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1707 AIR FORCE nomination of Zhibin Jiang, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1708 AIR FORCE nomination of Bennet D. Krawchuk, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1709 AIR FORCE nomination of Dariusz P. Barna, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1710 AIR FORCE nominations (4) beginning SALLY L. CRAMER, and ending JONATHAN A. MONSALVE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

IN THE ARMY

PN1598 ARMY nomination of Dionne L. McMillan, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 9, 2024.

PN1599 ARMY nomination of Todd A. Hasenstein, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 9, 2024.

PN1665 ARMY nominations (405) beginning GREGORY J. ABIDE, and ending 0003682611, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1666 ARMY nominations (502) beginning JACOB P. ABSALON, and ending 0002344681, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1670 ARMY nomination of Gary R. Weltman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1671 ARMY nominations (43) beginning DANIEL A. ABALDO, and ending 0002650956, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1672 ARMY nominations (323) beginning JI Y. ADAMS, and ending 0002978777, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1712 ARMY nomination of Caroline M. Kolb, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1719 ARMY nominations (19) beginning BRADY R. CLARK, and ending ANGELINA K. MATHERLY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1721 ARMY nominations (18) beginning EMILY R. BINGHAM, and ending 0002855239, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1722 ARMY nominations (111) beginning AHMAD B. ALEXANDER, and ending 0004136628, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1723 ARMY nominations (27) beginning VANESSA E. BONNER, and ending 0002485564, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1724 ARMY nominations (87) beginning ELIZABETH A. AGUIRRE, and ending 0002517801, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN1281 MARINE CORPS nominations (38) beginning SHAWN E. ANDERSON, and ending JOSEPH J. ZWILLER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 8, 2024.

PN1307 MARINE CORPS nominations (3) beginning ROBERT W. BROOKS, III, and ending RAMON R. RAMIREZ, JR., which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 10, 2024.

PN1310 MARINE CORPS nomination of Glen R. Pond, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 10, 2024.

PN1321 MARINE CORPS nomination of Matthew T. Migliori, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 10, 2024.

IN THE NAVY

PN1282 NAVY nomination of Stephanie K. Hayes, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 8, 2024.

PN1285 NAVY nomination of Benjamin C. Waite, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 8, 2024.

PN1286 NAVY nomination of Benjamin D. Fitzharris, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 8, 2024.

PN1328 NAVY nomination of Claudia L. Battle, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 10, 2024.

PN1391 NAVY nomination of Daniel A. Hancock, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 25, 2024.

PN1392 NAVY nomination of James L. Clark, III, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of January 25, 2024.

PN1489 NAVY nomination of William Selde, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of February 29, 2024.

PN1529 NAVY nomination of Edward L. Gungon, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 14, 2024.

PN1617 NAVY nomination of Ty R. Christian, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 9, 2024.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

TRIBUTE TO SAWIN MILLETT, JR.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, before the Maine Legislature adjourned for the year on May 10, Republican, Democrat, and Independent lawmakers joined together to pass a resolution honoring retiring Representative Sawin Millett, Jr., for his "dedication, expertise, and judgment" in service to our State, followed by a long and robust standing ovation. I know people throughout Maine are grateful for the many accomplishments of this great leader and my good friend.

Sawin's nine nonconsecutive terms representing Maine House District 81 began in 1968 and only scratches the surface of his remarkable résumé. In his hometown of Waterford and throughout Oxford County, he has contributed as a teacher, coach, principal, assistant school superintendent, farmer, and town manager.

At the State level, Sawin has worked with eight Maine Governors in the legislature and as the first executive director of the Maine School Management Association. He has served in five administrations under Republican, Democrat, and Independent Governors as commissioner of education, associate commissioner of mental health and substance abuse services, legislative director, and commissioner of administrative and financial services.

I had the pleasure of serving with Sawin in the cabinet of Governor John McKernan in the 1980s and early 1990s and watched him weigh issues and decide policy questions with the wisdom and deliberation for which he is so widely respected. He is also the hardest working leader I know. For 2 years in the early 2000s, I was fortunate to have him on my team as a State office director.

In both the legislative and executive branches, Sawin is known for his absolute mastery of budgetary issues. His command of the complexities of State government finances has steered Maine through many challenging times, and his integrity and openness have earned him admirers across the political spectrum.

At 86 years of age, Sawin is retiring from the legislature, but not from public service. In addition to spending more time with his family on his beloved farm, he is running for Oxford County Commissioner in the November elections. Continuing his dedication to public service, this is the one level of government in which he has not yet served.

Regardless of the role he has taken on, Sawin has always been a problem-solver, a leader who strives to bring opposing sides together in a spirit of compromise and respect to reach common ground. He is a Maine treasure, a true gentleman, and I wish my friend all the best in the next phase of his inspiring life.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE JAMES K. BREDAR

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise to congratulate James K. Bredar upon the completion of his service as chief judge of the United States District Court for the District of Maryland and his assumption of senior status.

I was pleased to work with former Senator Barbara Mikulski to recommend Judge Bredar to President Obama for appointment as one of my first Maryland Federal judicial nominations in 2010. Notably, the Senate confirmed his nomination by unanimous consent.

Judge Bredar served with great distinction for his nearly 7-year term as chief judge. In particular, I thank Judge Bredar for his vigorous oversight of the Federal consent decree between the U.S. Justice Department and the Baltimore Police Department, which arose out of the Freddie Gray case. This consent decree, when fully implemented, will guarantee effective, fair, and constitutional policing to Baltimore City residents.

I have greatly appreciated Judge Bredar's tireless advocacy for the needs of the judges, litigants, witnesses, court personnel, and visitors to the Federal courthouses in Baltimore and Greenbelt.

The Chief Justice of the United States showed his confidence in Judge Bredar's abilities through his past appointment as a member of the Judicial Conference Committee on Federal-State Jurisdiction, as well his continuing service on the Judicial Conference Committee on the Budget.

I understand that Judge Bredar will continue to perform substantial judicial service as a judge on senior status, including taking on a new assignment to handle the complex litigation arising out of the recent *Dali* ship disaster at the Francis Scott Key Bridge in Baltimore.

I congratulate Judge Bredar again for his remarkable service on the court. Marylanders can be proud and thankful of his extraordinary service to uphold the rule of law and to provide equal justice under the law to everyone who enters his courtroom. Judge Bredar has indeed lived up to his judicial oath to "administer justice without respect to persons, and do equal right to the poor and to the rich."

I extend my best wishes to Judge Bredar as he continues his service on the Federal bench in senior status.

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL JOSHUA SCOTT KONCAR

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam President, today I wish to recognize LTC Joshua S. Koncar, U.S. Army, for his outstanding work on behalf of the people of Illinois and the Nation. Lieutenant Colonel Koncar served as a 2021 Department of Defense legislative fellow in my Washington, DC, office and later as a U.S. Army Reserve congressional liaison from 2022–2024. Lieutenant Colonel Koncar was born in Sharon, PA. The grandson of a World War II veteran, the son of a third-generation steelworker, and brother to a U.S. Marine, Joshua enlisted in the Army Reserve in August 2001. Joshua served in Operation Iraqi Freedom from March 2003 to April 2004 as an operations non-commissioned officer and attained the rank of staff sergeant before receiving a direct commission to second lieutenant in 2007. As a logistician, Joshua has served in various leadership and broadening assignments throughout his Army career. During his congressional tenure, Joshua has been integral in shaping the priorities of the U.S. Army, and as a Defense fellow, he helped me secure several provisions in the Fiscal Year 2022 National Defense Authorization Act—FY22 NDAA—that will make our country stronger and safer. During his time in my office, Joshua led my staff in orchestrating important legislative provisions for the Department of Defense. He authored sections of NDAA language, including one of my top concerns regarding modifying special and incentive pay authorities for reserve component members—Incentive Pay Parity. His contributions—both to office morale and to our collective work—are emblematic of his phenomenal character, competence, and strong work ethic.

Joshua demonstrates a level of professionalism and hard work I have come to expect—but not take for granted—from the Department of Defense and U.S. Army soldiers. Indeed, he follows a long line of accomplished Department of Defense legislative fellows who have made impactful contributions to my office and U.S. national security policy. He distinguished himself as an Army officer, setting a high bar and providing invaluable advice and insights as he advised me on wide-ranging and complex matters under consideration before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Joshua's servant leadership showed in his work as a congressional liaison for the U.S. Army Reserve. His attention to detail and ability to effectively communicate with Congress became apparent as he successfully advanced key Army Reserve legislative initiatives and priorities.

Joshua will soon transition to his new duty assignment and attend Senior Service College at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. On behalf of my colleagues and the U.S. Congress, I thank Joshua for his dedicated service to my staff, the U.S. Army, and

the Nation. Part of what makes the U.S. military the greatest in the history of the world is that servicemembers like Joshua dedicate their lives to service and sacrifice for this country. Lieutenant Colonel Koncar does not do it alone, so I also acknowledge the support of his family—his wife Melissa. I wish them all the best in what I know is a bright future.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT GENERAL A.C. ROPER

• Mrs. BRITT. Madam President, I wish to recognize and congratulate LTG A.C. Roper on his retirement as the Deputy Commander of the United States Northern Command and Vice Commander of the American element of the North American Aerospace Defense Command. I know that I speak for people across Alabama in expressing my gratitude for his countless contributions to our Nation.

General Roper, a native of Birmingham, earned a bachelor's degree at Troy State University, a master's degree in criminal justice from the University of Alabama, and a master of strategic studies from the U.S. Army War College.

He has served a total of 42 years, between Active and Reserve, including deployments to combat zones, as well as disaster response. In addition to his distinguished military service, General Roper's public service to his community includes 33 years of law enforcement service in Montgomery, Hoover, and Birmingham, where he served as the chief of police. His legacy of dedicated service to his community, State, and Nation is deserving of the highest honor and admiration.

General Roper's remarkable military career began when he was commissioned into the U.S. Army in 1983 at the University of Alabama at Birmingham. His military education includes the Chemical Officer Basic and Advance Courses, Public Affairs Officers Course, Equal Opportunity Advisors Course, Inspector General Course, Combined Arms Staff Services School, Command and General Staff College, Joint Senior Reserve Component Officer Course, Defense Support to Civil Authorities Course, National Defense University's CAPSTONE Course, the NORTHCOM Joint Task Force Commanders Course, and Harvard University's National and International Security Seminar.

He is a graduate of the FBI National Academy, the FBI National Executive Institute, where he served as an adjunct professor of criminal justice. He specialized in protecting critical infrastructure and served on the executive board of the FBI Joint Terrorism Task Force.

General Roper's other general officer level assignments included Deputy Commanding General, U.S. Army Reserve Command, Fort Bragg, NC, and

Deputy Chief, Army Reserve, Office of the Chief of Army Reserve, headquartered at the Pentagon, Washington, DC. Prior to this assignment, he commanded the 76th Operational Response Command in Salt Lake City, UT, which was the USAR's all hazard response command. He also served as Commanding General—80th Training Command (OPCON to TRADOC), Acting Deputy Commanding General—CBRN, 335th Signal Command, and Commander of the 415th CBRN Brigade, where he was dual-hatted as the Task Force Operations Commander, JTF-51, ARNORTH for the C2CRE-A homeland response mission.

During General Roper's service, he deployed to Saudi Arabia during Operation Desert Shield, to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom, and supported Joint Task Force Andrew relief operations in southern Florida.

His awards and decorations include the Distinguished Service Medal, Legion of Merit with two oakleaf clusters, Bronze Star Medal, Meritorious Service Medal with three oakleaf clusters, Joint Service Commendation Medal, Combat Action Badge, and various other accolades. He also served as a principal member of the Secretary of the Army's Army Reserve Forces Policy Committee and the Secretary of Defense's Reserve Forces Policy Board.

On behalf of the people of the great State of Alabama and our Nation, I offer Lieutenant General Roper my heartfelt thanks and wish him a long and happy retirement with his wife Edith and their two daughters. His career is defined by extraordinary devotion to the safety and security of his community and country. We truly owe him a debt of gratitude for his exemplary service to Alabama and the United States of America.●

TRIBUTE TO FLO DAPICE

● Ms. HASSAN. Madam President, I am honored to recognize Flo Dapice of Hopkinton as May's Granite Stater of the Month. At just 16 years old, Flo is working to improve environmental sustainability at her school and in her town by leading her school's Environmental Action Club efforts and by serving in local government positions.

Flo's long-time interest in sustainability made her a perfect fit for the Environmental Action Club at her high school. She led the club in applying for grants from the New Hampshire Energy Education Project and the Hopkinton Public Schools Foundation. The club was awarded more than \$11,000, which allowed it to start a compost program at their school for lunch food waste. The club has evaluated the program and already found a decrease in how much compostable waste is ending up in the trash from last year to this year. Now, Flo and her fellow club members are continuing to work to strengthen the program and, in turn, lead to less food waste at the school.

The next project that Flo and the club are planning is a transition to using metal silverware in the school's cafeteria, instead of disposable plastic utensils. They have already purchased the silverware through more grant funding and are recruiting students to help wash the extra dishes. Flo is also planning to continue her involvement with the New Hampshire Energy Education Project, which works with students and teachers to build a deeper understanding of energy and climate; she recently helped lead a middle school summit with the program.

In addition to sustainability efforts at school, Flo has sought out additional opportunities for public service so that she can make more of a difference. She became interested in local government in middle school during the Covid-19 pandemic, and she now serves as one of two student representatives on the Hopkinton School Board and as a member of Hopkinton's Energy Steering Committee. Her service on the school board strengthened her efforts to apply for grants for her school's compost program, and on both the School Board and the Energy Committee, she has pushed for more ways to reduce carbon emissions.

Flo's dedication to serving her community through combating climate change is a great example of the Granite State spirit of working to make a difference, no matter your age. Her passion for bettering her school and her town is why I am honored to recognize her as Granite Stater of the Month.●

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FORT KEOGH LIVESTOCK LAB

● Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I rise today to honor the longstanding work of the Fort Keogh Livestock and Range Research Laboratory.

Today, Montana's very own Fort Keogh Livestock Range and Research Laboratory is celebrating its 100th anniversary. Since 1924, Fort Keogh has done critically important and cutting-edge research on a wide range of agricultural areas from beef and cattle to soil and drought, truly making this facility a leader in agriculture across the West. The work being done at Fort Keogh benefits not only our State's family farmers and ranchers, but all of our Nation's rural communities.

As a third-generation Montana farmer, I have seen firsthand the importance of their agricultural research to Montana's producers, and I can say with confidence that the hard work of the folks at Fort Keogh plays a key role in keeping agriculture the No. 1 industry in Montana. Every dollar that is invested in this critical research is returned to the community, and it is research that is done at this facility that informs policy decisions like those we make here.

I am proud to have consistently fought for funding for this facility, and I appreciate all of the people at Fort

Keogh that have kept this facility alive for 100 years.

So thank you to all the folks that have played a role in the Fort Keogh Livestock Lab, and congratulations. I look forward to the next 100.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

NOTICE OF THE INTENT TO DESIGNATE KENYA AS A MAJOR NON-NATO ALLY—PM 55

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 517 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2321k), I am providing notice of my intent to designate Kenya as a Major Non-NATO Ally.

I am making this designation in recognition of Kenya's many years of contributions to the United States Africa Command area of responsibility and globally and in recognition of our own national interest in deepening bilateral defense and security cooperation with the Government of Kenya. Kenya is one of the United States Government's top counterterrorism and security partners in sub-Saharan Africa, and the designation will demonstrate that the United States sees African contributions to global peace and security as equivalent to those of our Major Non-NATO Allies in other regions. I appreciate the support of the Congress in this action.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 23, 2024.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:02 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1097. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Everett Alvarez, Jr., in recognition of his service to the Nation.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The President Pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY) announced that on today,

May 23, 2024, she had signed the following enrolled joint resolution, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.J. Res. 109. Joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Securities and Exchange Commission relating to "Staff Accounting Bulletin No. 121".

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1097. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Everett Alvarez, Jr., in recognition of his service to the Nation; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mrs. SHAHEEN, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. 3772. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require that plain writing statements regarding the solicitation of subcontractors be included in certain subcontracting plans, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3971. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require reporting on additional information with respect to small business concerns owned and controlled by women, qualified HUBZone small business concerns, and small business concerns owned and controlled by veterans, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. 4414. A bill to improve the State Trade Expansion Program of the Small Business Administration.

H.R. 7987. An act to require plain language and the inclusion of key words in covered notices that are clear, concise, and accessible to small business concerns, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. SANDERS for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Stephen H. Ravas, of Maryland, to be Inspector General, Corporation for National and Community Service.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 4395. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish a floor on

the work geographic index for physicians' services furnished in Hawaii; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 4396. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize an individual who is awarded the Purple Heart for service in the Armed Forces to transfer unused Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to a family member, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SMITH:

S. 4397. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide criteria for use of Federal funds to support trauma-informed practices in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. BUDD):

S. 4398. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a micro-employer pension plan startup credit; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 4399. A bill to amend the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act to provide for better protections for children raised in kinship families outside of the foster care system; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BRITT:

S. 4400. A bill to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to carry out a study and rulemaking on the definition of the term "small entity" for purposes of the securities laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BUDD, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4401. A bill to require the Administrator of the Small Business Administration to ensure that the small business regulatory budget for a fiscal year is not greater than zero, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 4402. A bill to establish the Benjamin Harrison National Recreation Area and Wilderness in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4403. A bill to amend the Radiation Exposure Compensation Act to revise the definition of "affected area" and extend the period in which compensation may be provided, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 4404. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 840 Front Street in Casselton, North Dakota, as the "Commander Delbert Austin Olson Post Office"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. LEE, Mr. RICKETTS, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. VANCE, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. BARASSO):

S. 4405. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to repeal the natural gas tax; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 4406. A bill to eliminate certain subsidies for fossil-fuel production; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BUTLER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 4407. A bill to effectively staff the high-need public elementary schools and secondary schools of the United States with school-based mental health services providers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HOEVEN, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 4408. A bill to ensure the timely approval of requests to export defense articles and provide defense services to the State of Israel and the fulfillment of each such agreement; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. BUTLER, and Mr. KING):

S. 4409. A bill to prohibit the disclosure of intimate digital depictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 4410. A bill to prohibit United States cooperation with the International Criminal Court, the use of the Economic Support Fund to support the Palestinian Authority, and any Federal funding for the ICC; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 4411. A bill to require Transmission Organizations to allow aggregators of retail customers to submit to organized wholesale electric markets bids that aggregate demand flexibility of customers of certain utilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 4412. A bill to require pre-merger notification to identify entities subject to a collective bargaining agreement and affected labor organizations, to require post-merger monitoring for anticompetitive effects and antitrust violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 4413. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Synthetic Biology Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN:

S. 4414. A bill to improve the State Trade Expansion Program of the Small Business Administration; from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH:

S. 4415. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to establish a medical readiness program in the Indo-Pacific region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 4416. A bill to designate the Special Guerrilla Unit National Memorial at Veterans Memorial Park in Middletown, Connecticut; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4417. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to require training on increasing contract awards to small business concerns owned and controlled by service-disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 4418. A bill to require the United States Executive Director at the International Monetary Fund to advocate for increased transparency with respect to exchange rate policies of the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. OSSOFF, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 4419. A bill to require the Science and Technology Directorate in the Department of Homeland Security to develop greater capacity to detect, identify, and disrupt illicit substances in very low concentrations; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4420. A bill to improve connections between the Department of Agriculture and national and homeland security agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4421. A bill to establish the Office of Biotechnology Policy in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 4422. A bill to require original equipment manufacturers of digital electronic equipment to make available certain documentation, diagnostic, and repair information to independent repair providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. SCHATZ):

S. 4423. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of direct housing loans and medical care from the Department of Veterans Affairs for Native Hawaiians; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 4424. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to encourage and expand the use of prescribed fire on land managed by the Department of the interior or the Forest Service, with an emphasis on units of the National Forest System in the western United States, to acknowledge and support the longstanding use of cultural burning by Tribes and Indigenous practitioners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. COONS):

S. 4425. A bill to support democracy and the rule of law in Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. VANCE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. WELCH, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 4426. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a time-limited conditional approval pathway, subject to specific obligations, for certain drugs and biological products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 4427. A bill to provide for Department of Energy and Small Business Administration joint research and development activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 4428. A bill to establish an interagency committee to coordinate activities of the Federal Government relating to biotechnology oversight, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 4429. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to provide grants to demonstrate pharmacy-based addiction care programs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4430. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a Health Engagement Hub demonstration program to increase access to treatment for opiate use disorder and other drug use treatment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 4431. A bill to reinstate the Bull Mountains Mining Plan Modification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 4432. A bill to allow certain Federal minerals to be mined consistent with the Bull Mountains Mining Plan Modification; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. RICKETTS (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 4433. A bill to enhance United States cooperation with European countries to improve the security of Taiwan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 4434. A bill to improve retrospective reviews of Federal regulations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 4435. A bill to limit and eliminate excessive, hidden, and unnecessary fees imposed on incarcerated individuals and their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. CORNYN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. BRAUN):

S.J. Res. 89. A joint resolution to direct the termination of the use of United States Armed Forces for the construction, maintenance, and operation of the Joint Logistics Over-the-Shore pier on the coast of the Gaza Strip that has not been authorized by Congress; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. LEE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mrs. BRITT):

S.J. Res. 90. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Health and Human Services relating to "Nondiscrimination in Health Programs and Activities"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 702. A resolution recognizing the contributions of Hispanic and Latino Americans to the musical heritage of the United States and designating May 2024 as "Latin Music Appreciation Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 703. A resolution designating a day in May 2024, as "Disability Reproductive Equity Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. COONS, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 704. A resolution recognizing the strategic importance of Kenya to the United States and celebrating the 60-year anniversary of United States-Kenya relations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TESTER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 705. A resolution recognizing May 28, 2024, as the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Border Patrol and commending the service of the U.S. Border Patrol to the United States people; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. Kaine, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. BRITT, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RISCH, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. Res. 706. A resolution recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policies to improve the lives of children in the foster care system; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. Kaine, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KELLY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. OSSOFF, and Mr. REED):

S. Res. 707. A resolution recognizing the significance of Jewish American Heritage Month as a time to celebrate the contributions of Jewish Americans to the society and culture of the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. Res. 708. A resolution commemorating the 100th anniversary of the designation of the Gila Wilderness; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. LUJÁN:

S. Res. 709. A resolution expressing support for the designation of May 2024 as "Mental Health Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 710. A resolution supporting the designation of May 29, 2024, as "Mental Health Awareness in Agriculture Day" to raise awareness around mental health in the agricultural industry and workforce and to continue to reduce stigma associated with mental illness; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. Res. 711. A resolution designating May 2024 as "American Stroke Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. VANCE):

S. Res. 712. A resolution designating May 2024 as "Older Americans Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. COTTON):

S. Res. 713. A resolution designating May 2024 as "ALS Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. Res. 714. A resolution recognizing and supporting individuals born with congenital disabilities or malformations due to thalidomide exposure; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 6

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 6, a bill to reduce a portion of the annual pay of Members of Congress for the failure to adopt a concurrent resolution on the budget which does not provide for a balanced budget, and for other purposes.

S. 160

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 160, a bill to require U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement to take into custody certain aliens who have been charged in the United States with a crime that resulted in the death or serious bodily injury of another person, and for other purposes.

S. 291

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 291, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs the Veterans Economic Opportunity and Transition Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 618

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 618, a bill to establish the United States Foundation for International Conservation to promote long-term management of protected and conserved areas, and for other purposes.

S. 666

At the request of Ms. HASSAN, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms.

ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 666, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to require the Chief Operating Officer of each agency to compile a list of unnecessary programs, and for other purposes.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to define currently accepted medical use with severe restrictions, and for other purposes.

S. 740

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 740, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reinstate criminal penalties for persons charging veterans unauthorized fees relating to claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1024, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to eligible entities to develop and implement a comprehensive program to promote student access to defibrillation in public elementary schools and secondary schools.

S. 1135

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, and the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to require coverage of hearing devices and systems in certain private health insurance plans, and for other purposes.

S. 1171

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1171, a bill to amend chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, to prevent Members of Congress and their spouses and dependent children from trading stocks and owning stocks, and for other purposes.

S. 1529

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1529, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide for greater protection of roosters, and for other purposes.

S. 1885

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1885, a bill to eliminate employment-based visa caps on abused, abandoned, and neglected children eligible

for humanitarian status, and for other purposes.

S. 1940

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1940, a bill to prohibit the use of M-44 devices, commonly known as "cyanide bombs", on public land, and for other purposes.

S. 2076

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2076, a bill to adjust the definition of service in the uniformed services with respect to readmission requirements for servicemembers under the Higher Education Act of 1965.

S. 2496

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2496, a bill to amend the National Housing Act to include information regarding VA home loans in the Informed Consumer Choice Disclosure required to be provided to prospective FHA borrowers.

S. 2539

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors 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. 2687

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2687, a bill to provide additional requirements for the purchase and sale of conventional mortgages by the enterprises, and for other purposes.

S. 3047

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) were added as cosponsors 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. 3102

At the request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3102, a bill to establish the American Worker Retirement Plan, improve the financial security of working Americans by facilitating the accumulation of wealth, and for other purposes.

S. 3243

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S.

3243, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude all military retirement and related benefits from Federal income tax.

S. 3356

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3356, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify the role and duties of United States Postal Service police officers, and for other purposes.

S. 3530

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3530, a bill to retain Federal employees who are spouses of a member of the Armed Forces or the Foreign Service when relocating due to an involuntary transfer, and for other purposes.

S. 3558

At the request of Mrs. BRITT, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3558, a bill to prohibit contracting with certain biotechnology providers, and for other purposes.

S. 3755

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3755, a bill to amend the CARES Act to remove a requirement on lessors to provide notice to vacate, and for other purposes.

S. 3984

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3984, a bill to amend the State Justice Institute Act of 1984 to authorize the State Justice Institute to provide awards to certain organizations to establish a State judicial threat intelligence and resource center.

S. 4128

At the request of Mr. TUBERVILLE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4128, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on abortions facilitated by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 4276

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4276, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Project ECHO Grant Program, to establish grants under such program to disseminate knowledge and build capacity to address Alzheimer's disease and other dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 4279

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4279, a bill to require the Department of State and the Department of Defense to engage with the Government of Japan regarding areas of cooperation within the Pillar Two framework of the AUKUS partnership, and for other purposes.

S. 4296

At the request of Mrs. BRITT, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) 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. 4316

At the request of Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4316, a bill to authorize urbanized area formula grants for service improvement and safety and security enhancement, and for other purposes.

S. 4317

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 4317, a bill to appropriate funds for the Federal Communications Commission's "rip and replace" program and Affordable Connectivity Program, to improve the Affordable Connectivity Program, to require a spectrum auction, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 88

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 88, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants: Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units Review of the Residual Risk and Technology Review".

S. RES. 630

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 630, a resolution supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 75 years of accomplishments.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 4411. A bill to require Transmission Organizations to allow aggregators of retail customers to submit to organized wholesale electric markets bids that aggregate demand flexibility of customers of certain utilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 4411

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Responsive Energy Demand Unlocks Clean Energy Act" or the "REDUCE Act".

SEC. 2. AGGREGATOR BIDDING INTO ORGANIZED POWER MARKETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any prohibition established by State law or a State commission (as defined in section 3 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 796)) with respect to who may bid into an organized wholesale electric market, each Transmission Organization shall, consistent with any applicable market rules that do not establish such a prohibition, allow aggregators of retail customers to submit bids that aggregate demand flexibility of customers of utilities that distributed more than 4,000,000 megawatt-hours in the previous fiscal year.

(b) RULEMAKING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission shall issue a rule to carry out the requirements of subsection (a).

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4420. A bill to improve connections between the Department of Agriculture and national and homeland security agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4421. A bill to establish the Office of Biotechnology Policy in the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. PADILLA. Madam President, I rise to introduce the Agriculture and National Security Act and the Agricultural Biotechnology Coordination Act. These bills aim to bolster the global competitiveness of the United States agricultural sector in emerging biotechnology and to address security vulnerabilities across the food and agriculture sector.

Through the work of the National Security Commission on Emerging Biotechnology, we have developed these proposals aimed at improving coordination between Agencies to accelerate agricultural biotechnology products and to include the U.S. Department of Agriculture, USDA, in important national security discussions to enhance our capabilities on disease surveillance, food security, agriculture data

security, and many other critical issues.

Agricultural biotechnology is a rapidly evolving field consisting of traditional breeding techniques and genetic engineering, among other methods, to alter living organisms into new or modified agricultural products for a variety of uses. Advances in agricultural biotechnology provide farmers with tools that can make production more efficient and manageable, which is critical for keeping pace with demands for food and our national security.

In 1986, the Coordinated Framework for the Regulation of Biotechnology was established to provide for the regulatory oversight of organisms derived through genetic engineering. The approach taken in the Coordinated Framework is grounded in the judgment of the National Academy of Sciences that the potential risks associated with these organisms fall into the same general categories as those created by traditionally bred organisms.

The Agricultural Biotechnology Coordination Act would establish an Office of Biotechnology Policy at the USDA to support internal and interagency coordination, development of biotechnology policies, activities, and regulations, and to consult with biotechnology stakeholders and leaders.

The Agriculture and National Security Act would create the position of Senior Advisor for National Security within the USDA Office of the Secretary, appoint a detailee at USDA to liaison with national security Agencies, and direct the USDA to publish a report on national security food chain vulnerabilities.

Importantly, this legislation is supported by the National Security Commission on Emerging Biotechnology, which was chartered by Congress to conduct a review of how advancement in emerging biotechnology will shape current and future activities of the Department of Defense.

Strengthening America's longstanding leadership in biotechnology through promoting interagency coordination and appointing high-level officials to promote emerging biotechnology issues in agriculture is critical for maintaining national security, trade security, food security, and assessing any vulnerabilities throughout the food and agriculture sector.

Moreover, developments in agricultural biotechnology hold immense potential to revolutionize the agricultural sector and enhance food, trade, and economic security, particularly in the face of historic heat waves and rising temperatures caused by the climate crisis.

Agricultural biotechnology has allowed scientists to, for example, identify climate-resilient plant genes and species able to withstand weather extremes. Drought, flooding, and wildfires not only pose significant threat to farmers' livelihoods but also

reliability in our food systems and consumers. In addition, genetically engineered plants have been bred to tolerate specific herbicides, protect against pests and diseases, and enhance nutritional capacity.

I would like to thank Senator TODD YOUNG for introducing these bills with me, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the Agricultural Biotechnology Coordination Act and the Agriculture and National Security Act as quickly as possible.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 702—RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF HISPANIC AND LATINO AMERICANS TO THE MUSICAL HERITAGE OF THE UNITED STATES AND DESIGNATING MAY 2024 AS "LATIN MUSIC APPRECIATION MONTH"

Mr. LUJÁN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 702

Whereas Latin music styles such as rancheras, corridos, mariachi, salsa, merengue, bachata, cumbia, reggaeton, urban, cumbia, tango, and a multitude of others, and their fusion with other genres, such as jazz, rock, hip hop, and pop, have played a pivotal role in enriching the cultural fabric of the United States, influencing everything from music and dance to fashion and entertainment;

Whereas Latin music, characterized by its vibrant rhythms, rich melodies, and diverse instrumentation, encompasses a wide array of musical styles and genres originating from Latin America and the Caribbean, as well as their respective diasporas around the world;

Whereas the rich musical traditions of Latin America and the Caribbean were deeply influenced by indigenous cultures, European colonization, particularly Spanish and Portuguese, the legacy of African slavery, and the vibrant cultural heritage of each region and country, all of which contributed to the development of diverse genres in the United States;

Whereas the roots of Mexican music in the United States can be traced back to rich musical traditions that existed in Mexico before the annexation of Mexican territories, including present-day New Mexico, Arizona, California, Nevada, Utah, and parts of Colorado and Wyoming, by the United States following the Mexican-American War;

Whereas, throughout the late 19th and early 20th centuries, various waves of Mexican immigrants came to the United States for work, particularly in agriculture, mining, and railroad construction, settling in regions such as Texas, California, Arizona, and New Mexico, and bringing their music with them;

Whereas Mexican music in the United States encompasses various regional styles, including ranchera, norteño, tejano, conjunto, mariachi, and corridos, originating from different parts of Mexico but popularized and adapted within Mexican-American communities in the United States;

Whereas the lifestyle and the social issues that Mexicans faced are reflected in corridos, a music genre that originated during the

Mexican War of Independence and the Mexican Revolution, spreading to the southwestern frontier of the United States and contributing to the development of Tejano and New Mexican music,

Whereas mariachi music stems from the traditional 'son jalisciense', and was initially played by field hands working at haciendas and humble street performers, and was subsequently promoted by the Government of Mexico in the early 1920s;

Whereas mariachi ensembles, which can include violins, accordions, trumpets, guitars, and singers, have since been prominently featured in a myriad of cultural celebrations, including birthday festivities, quinceañeras, and weddings, and in prestigious concert halls;

Whereas banda, a style of Mexican music characterized by wind instruments including primarily brass and percussion, has its roots dating back to the mid-19th century, with the introduction of piston brass instruments, as community musicians sought to emulate military bands, and encompasses a fusion of traditional dance rhythms such as polka, cumbia, son, and waltz, and notable performers in the genre include Jenny Rivera, Chalino, Banda MS, and Banda El Recodo;

Whereas Caribbean Latin music has had influences in the United States since the mid to late 1800s, with notable contributions from composers like Ignacio Piñero, Louis Moreau Gottschalk, and Ignacio Cervantes, whose works helped introduce Latin rhythms and melodies to audiences in the United States;

Whereas the Cuban version of the habanera, exposed to New Orleans in the 19th century, laid the foundation for the appreciation of Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Dominican musical styles in the United States;

Whereas Cuban immigration to the United States, spurred by communism as a result of the Cuban Revolution and the Castro dictatorship, has fostered cultural exchanges that contributed to the development of new musical genres, most prominently in Florida;

Whereas, in the aftermath of the Spanish-American War, Puerto Rico became a United States territory, granting its people citizenship and fostering a unique cultural exchange between Puerto Ricans and individuals in the mainland United States, which culminated in a significant migration wave of Puerto Ricans to cities like New York in the mid-20th century;

Whereas the establishment of Spanish-language newspapers, such as La Prensa in New York City in 1913, contributed to the dissemination of Latin music and culture among tens of thousands of Puerto Ricans and immigrants from Latin America and the Caribbean who migrated to New York City;

Whereas a convergence of Puerto Rican, Cuban, and other Caribbean immigrants, particularly in New York City, infused music in the United States with Afro-Cuban rhythms and jazz improvisation and gave rise to the vibrant musical genre of salsa in the United States, which left a lasting mark on the cultural landscape of the United States;

Whereas the introduction of Afro-Cuban music, including the rumba by Don Azpiazu's Havana Casino Orchestra in the 1930s, sparked a Latin music craze in the United States with hits like "Peanut Vendor" by Moises Simons becoming national sensations;

Whereas, by the close of the 1940s, Latin music had firmly established its presence in the United States, influencing various genres and becoming an integral part of the musical heritage of the United States;

Whereas Tito Puente, a Puerto Rican musical luminary known as both the "King of Mambo" and the "King of Latin Music", left an indelible mark on the world of Latin

music through his groundbreaking compositions, including the iconic “Oye Como Va”, famously popularized by Carlos Santana;

Whereas Puente’s innovative blend of Cuban and Caribbean sounds such as mambo, son, and cha-cha-cha resonated with mainstream audiences, solidifying his status as a cultural icon both in the United States and internationally;

Whereas, in 1959, Ritchie Valens became a trailblazer in the music industry with his iconic rendition of the song “La Bamba” becoming the first Latin song to enter the Hot 100 Billboard chart, marking a significant milestone for Chicano Rock;

Whereas Celia Cruz, the incomparable “Queen of Salsa” and a pioneer of Afro-Cuban music, infused traditional guarachas with modern flair, elevated the genre to global acclaim with timeless classics like “La Vida Es un Carnaval”, and left an enduring legacy in the realm of Latin music;

Whereas Celia Cruz served as a musical ambassador with her dynamic performances and impassioned vocals that transcended cultural boundaries, solidifying her status as a global icon;

Whereas Johnny Pacheco, revered as the “Grandfather of Salsa”, emerged as a leading figure in the vibrant New York salsa scene during the 1960s and 1970s, contributing significantly to the genre’s development, and served as the musical director of Fania Records;

Whereas Los Tigres del Norte, a Mexican band renowned for their poignant portrayal of social issues and immigrant experiences in the United States through songs like “La jaula de oro” and “América”, have been honored with multiple Grammy awards, contributing significantly to the popularization of the corridos genre within the United States starting in 1968 and continuing to the present day;

Whereas Vicente Fernandez, a singer, actor, film producer, and the “King of Ranchera Music”, made significant contributions to ranchera music, earning him Grammy and Latin Grammy awards, selling over 50,000,000 records, and receiving the title of the greatest Mexican singer of all time by Rolling Stone;

Whereas Alejandro Fernandez, “El Potrillo”, continues the legacy of ranchera music, having sold over 20,000,000 albums across the world;

Whereas Gloria Estefan, a Cuban-American singer, songwriter, actress, Grammy award winner, and Presidential Medal of Freedom recipient, emerged as a pioneering figure in Latin pop music during the 1980s and 1990s, achieving international acclaim with hits such as “Conga”, which fused Latin rhythms with contemporary pop sensibilities, and her contributions to the genre helped propel Latin music into the mainstream;

Whereas Emilio Estefan, a prominent and visionary figure in the Latin music industry, has made significant contributions to the genre as an award-winning songwriter, producer, musician, mentor, and entrepreneur, and was the first artist to receive the grand distinction of Person of the Year during the Latin Grammy Awards in 2000;

Whereas, from establishing the Miami Sound Machine to working with renowned artists such as Gloria Estefan, Marc Anthony, Alejandro Fernandez, Jon Secada, Ricky Martin, Jennifer Lopez, and Shakira, Emilio Estefan’s influence has been instrumental in defining Latin crossover and introducing Latin rhythms and culture to mainstream audiences worldwide;

Whereas Selena Quintanilla, known as the “Queen of Tejano Music”, left a profound and enduring impact on the United States through her distinctive fusion of Tejano

music with contemporary pop and R&B, captivating audiences across the United States and beyond as a Mexican-American artist, and her legacy continues beyond the 1980s and 1990s, resonating with fans to this day;

Whereas bachata, with its blend of European, indigenous Taino, and African elements, reflects the rich cultural heritage of the Dominican Republic;

Whereas the pioneering work of the band Aventura, originating in New York, played a significant role in popularizing the genre of bachata in the United States, garnering widespread popularity and acclaim;

Whereas Cuban reggaeton and tropical duo Gente de Zona, which emerged from the streets of the island and is now a world-renowned group, transcended barriers to ignite hope for the people of Cuba with their historic Spanish hip-hop song “Patria y Vida,” authored by Yotuel and Beatriz Luengo;

Whereas Maná is considered the most influential Latino rock band and is one of the best-selling Latin music artists in the world, with over 25,000,000 records sold worldwide, and was the first band ever to be recognized as Person of the Year during the Latin Grammy Awards;

Whereas Juan Luis Guerra was the first artist ever to receive a Latin Grammy Award during the first televised Latin Grammy Award ceremony for “Ni Es Lo Mismo Ni Es Igual”;

Whereas Latin music has continued to evolve and incorporate diverse styles and influences from various countries and regions, and has been popularized by artists like Shakira, Maná, Vicente Fernandez, Alejandro Fernandez, Juan Gabriel, J Balvin, Ozuna, Jennifer Lopez, Pitbull, Karol G, Peso Pluma, Pepe Aguilar, and Bad Bunny, among many others;

Whereas Daddy Yankee, a Puerto Rican artist, emerged as a pioneer of reggaeton, a genre blending Caribbean rhythms with hip-hop and reggae influences, and played a pivotal role in elevating reggaeton to a global phenomenon in the early 2000s, with his groundbreaking hits, including “Gasolina” and “Despacito”, the largest globally streamed Spanish song to date;

Whereas the Latin Grammy Award ceremony was the first bilingual primetime program to be aired on an English-language television network in the United States, and it celebrated its 25th anniversary in 2024;

Whereas the Latin Grammy Foundation is a global champion for music education and empowers communities through Latin music and culture, successfully cultivating the next generation of Latin music creators through various scholarships, educational programs and grants, and educational opportunities that advance Latin music and its heritage;

Whereas People en Español is one of the most trusted voices in Hispanic culture that, for almost 30 years, has celebrated Latin music and culture, covering in its pages and digital space the evolution of Latin music, singers, and musicians who have captivated a worldwide audience;

Whereas Leila Cobo is considered one of the world’s leading authorities in Latin music, as the first journalist based in the United States to prominently cover Latin music daily, and has been instrumental in transforming its coverage and perception in the United States;

Whereas, according to the Recording Industry Association of America, Latin music earned a record-breaking \$1,400,000,000 in 2023, following all-time high revenues in 2022;

Whereas Latin music artists have significantly contributed to cross-cultural exchanges, civic participation, political movements, and philanthropy, utilizing their in-

fluential platforms to advocate for social causes and engage with diverse communities;

Whereas the Hispanic population in the United States has grown significantly, accounting for approximately 19 percent of the total population as of the 2020 Census, and continues to contribute to the rich cultural tapestry of the United States;

Whereas continued influence and cultural exchange between the United States and the Spanish-speaking world, including Mexico, El Salvador, the Dominican Republic, Colombia, Guatemala, Venezuela, Honduras, Argentina, Peru, Brazil, and Spain, continues to elevate the cultural importance of Latin music in the United States; and

Whereas Latino culture, including its vibrant music traditions, is celebrated and honored at events such as Hispanic Heritage Month celebrations, Latin music festivals, and other cultural gatherings throughout the United States, showcasing the enduring influence and significance of Latin music and heritage in the society of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 2024 as “Latin Music Appreciation Month”; and

(2) recognizes—

(A) the importance of music produced, written, and performed by Hispanic and Latino Americans to the musical heritage of the United States;

(B) the Hispanic and Latino musical artists, composers, songwriters, and musicians whose contributions to music are underrecognized;

(C) the achievements, talent, and hard work of Hispanic and Latino pioneer artists, and the obstacles that those artists overcame to gain recognition;

(D) the importance of celebrating and uplifting music made by Hispanic and Latino artists to understand the contributions that Hispanic and Latino artists have made to the fabric of history and art in the United States; and

(E) National Hispanic Heritage Month and Latin Music Appreciation Month as an important time to—

(i) celebrate the impact of Latin music on the musical heritage of the United States; and

(ii) encourage greater awareness of the cultural importance and history of Latin music so that Latino and Hispanic history and culture can be preserved.

SENATE RESOLUTION 703—DESIGNATING A DAY IN MAY 2024, AS “DISABILITY REPRODUCTIVE EQUITY DAY”

Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WELCH, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SMITH, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 703

Whereas, in the United States, there are approximately 1 in 4 adults with disabilities, 1 in 10 people with disabilities who are able to become pregnant, and approximately 4,100,000 parents with disabilities;

Whereas this country has witnessed a long history of reproductive coercion impacting people with disabilities, including through the discriminatory Supreme Court decision *Buck v. Bell*, 274 U.S. 200 (1927), which upheld State laws authorizing involuntary sterilization of people with disabilities and which has never been overturned;

Whereas 31 States and Washington, D.C. currently have laws explicitly allowing the forced sterilization of people with disabilities;

Whereas people with intellectual and developmental disabilities living in congregate care facilities are at an increased risk of physical and sexual abuse, and the majority of these abuses go unreported;

Whereas women with disabilities are almost twice as likely as women without disabilities to experience sexual violence in their lifetime;

Whereas people with disabilities face unique barriers when accessing reproductive health care and exercising their reproductive and sexual health, autonomy, and freedom, including—

(1) harmful stereotypes about, and attitudes towards, people with disabilities;

(2) legal barriers and lack of consent due to guardianship;

(3) financial barriers;

(4) language and communication barriers;

(5) delays in receiving preventative services;

(6) a lack of accessible health care facilities, medical diagnostic equipment, and travel; and

(7) a lack of health care providers with training on, and knowledge of, the needs of people with disabilities receiving reproductive health care;

Whereas people with and without disabilities want children at the same frequency, but people with disabilities are less likely to receive contraception counseling and timely prenatal care, experience a higher rate of sterilization, and are at a greater risk for adverse pregnancy outcomes;

Whereas an ongoing legacy of reproductive oppression of people with disabilities, especially women with disabilities, people of color with disabilities, people with disabilities with low incomes, and LGBTQI+ people with disabilities, has deprived many of their reproductive autonomy;

Whereas nearly 2 years after the Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973) in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, 142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022), nearly 3,000,000 reproductive-aged women with disabilities live in States that have, or are likely to have, abortion bans;

Whereas State laws and court decisions in at least 21 States have restricted access to reproductive health care, including abortion care, disproportionately harming people who already face barriers to reproductive health care, including people with disabilities;

Whereas section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (29 U.S.C. 794), titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12131 et seq.; 42 U.S.C. 12181 et seq.), and section 1557 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (42 U.S.C. 18116) prohibit discrimination against people with disabilities and provide them with the right to equitably access and receive health care; and

Whereas all people, including people with disabilities, have the right to decide if, when, and how to start and raise a family: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates a day in May 2024, as “Disability Reproductive Equity Day” to support and bring awareness to the right of people with disabilities to reproductive and sexual health, autonomy, and freedom;

(2) pledges to advance the right of people with disabilities to reproductive and sexual health, autonomy, and freedom; and

(3) calls on the President to continue to fulfill the promise of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, and the Patient Protection and Af-

fordable Care Act to support, bolster, and protect the right of people with disabilities to reproductive and sexual health, autonomy, and freedom.

SENATE RESOLUTION 704—RECOGNIZING THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF KENYA TO THE UNITED STATES AND CELEBRATING THE 60-YEAR ANNIVERSARY OF UNITED STATES-KENYA RELATIONS

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. COONS, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 704

Whereas the United States and Kenya established diplomatic relations on May 23, 1964, after Kenya gained independence in 1963, and have since developed a strong and enduring bilateral partnership;

Whereas bilateral engagement between the United States and Kenya expanded after Kenya's historic 2002 general elections, when a coalition of opposition parties won a majority in both the presidential and parliamentary elections, ending decades of dominance by the Kenyan African National Union;

Whereas Kenya took steps to bolster its democratic institutions in 2010, in the wake of the devastating post-election violence following the presidential election held on December 27, 2007, by adopting a transformative new constitution with a bill of rights and new checks and balances, including a more deliberate separation of government powers and the devolution of certain authorities to new county governments;

Whereas Kenya has become one of Sub-Saharan Africa's largest economies, a regional hub for transportation and finance, and a cornerstone of stability and prosperity in East Africa;

Whereas, in August 2018, the United States and Kenya formally elevated their relationship to a strategic partnership and established a corresponding bilateral strategic dialogue, prioritizing 5 pillars of engagement, including—

(1) economic prosperity, trade, and investment;

(2) defense cooperation;

(3) democracy, governance, and civilian security;

(4) multilateral and regional issues; and

(5) public health cooperation;

Whereas the United States is a major trading partner with Kenya, which is a leading beneficiary of preferential trade benefits under the African Growth and Opportunities Act (19 U.S.C. 3701 et seq.) and a participant in the Prosper Africa initiative;

Whereas the United States and Kenya entered bilateral negotiations on a future free trade agreement on July 8, 2020;

Whereas, on July 14, 2022, the United States and Kenya launched Strategic Trade and Investment Partnership negotiations to increase bilateral trade and investment cooperation;

Whereas Kenya's dynamic and growing market-based economy offers increased economic opportunities for public and private partnerships that advance United States strategic and economic interests;

Whereas Kenya is at the forefront of improving environmental resilience and is a top tourism destination known for its biodiversity and conservation efforts;

Whereas, on September 25, 2023, the United States and Kenya signed a 5-year framework

for defense cooperation to guide mutual defense cooperation, enhance interoperability, and advance shared security interests;

Whereas military-to-military ties between the United States and Kenya have deepened through coordinating and participating in bilateral and multilateral military exercises and Kenya hosting United States forces at Manda Bay;

Whereas the United States and Kenya have worked together to address shared security and counterterrorism concerns in Kenya and the broader region, including in Somalia, where Kenya has contributed forces for over a decade—

(1) to counter Al-Shabaab; and

(2) to support Somalia through the African Union mission;

Whereas Kenya is a key strategic partner in responding to Iranian-backed Houthi attacks against vessels in the Red Sea through its participation in Operation Prosperity Guardian;

Whereas in 2011, Kenya re-established the Kenya National Commission on Human Rights as an autonomous institution to monitor government compliance with internationally recognized human rights and investigate alleged human rights violations;

Whereas Kenya has a flourishing civil society that is supported through constitutional guarantees and a new, more predictable regulatory environment under the Public Benefits Organization Act 2013, which came into effect on May 14, 2024;

Whereas Kenya plays a critical role in supporting regional cooperation and integration as a key member of the East African Community;

Whereas Kenya has volunteered to mediate multiple regional conflicts;

Whereas Kenya has been a leading African voice in multilateral forums, including during its 2021–2022 term on the United Nations Security Council, against Russia's illegal invasion of Ukraine, reaffirming its respect for Ukraine's territorial integrity and standing in defense of multilateralism;

Whereas the United States and Kenya have a long history of partnering to address critical public health crises, including through the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (commonly known as “PEPFAR”);

Whereas the United States and Kenya have developed strong people-to-people ties as the foundation for deeper cooperation, as evidenced by—

(1) more than 200 Kenyans participating in United States Government-sponsored exchange programs each year; and

(2) an average of more than 250,000 Americans visiting Kenya annually; and

Whereas the diverse Kenyan American community has made critical contributions to the culture and economy of the United States and forms one of the strongest bonds linking our countries together: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates 60 years of diplomatic relations between the United States and Kenya;

(2) reaffirms the strong partnership between the United States and Kenya, which is rooted in a shared commitment to upholding peace, security, and prosperity;

(3) recognizes Kenya's role in regional security, including maritime security, and its efforts to foster stability in the Horn and East Africa;

(4) calls for continued cooperation between the United States and Kenya in promoting, strengthening, and defending shared democratic values and respect for human rights;

(5) encourages the United States and Kenya to continue to expand trade and economic cooperation;

(6) encourages Kenya's efforts to improve its business environment, domestic economic

reforms, anti-corruption measures, and counter-money laundering efforts;

(7) commits to strengthening and deepening diplomatic, economic, commercial, security, and people-to-people ties between the United States and Kenya;

(8) encourages the Department of State to look at all available tools to help address Kenya's debt crisis and counter economic coercion by the People's Republic of China;

(9) appreciates the contributions of the Kenyan diaspora community to the United States; and

(10) acknowledges the potential of the bilateral relationship—

(A) to bring significant benefit to the citizens of both nations; and

(B) to address security, economic, and environmental challenges across the region and worldwide.

SENATE RESOLUTION 705—RECOGNIZING MAY 28, 2024, AS THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. BORDER PATROL AND COMMENDING THE SERVICE OF THE U.S. BORDER PATROL TO THE UNITED STATES PEOPLE

Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TESTER, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KELLY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KING, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 705

Whereas the Mounted Guard was assigned to the Immigration Service under the Department of Commerce and Labor from 1904 to 1924;

Whereas the founding members of this Mounted Guard included Texas Rangers, sheriffs, and deputized cowboys who patrolled the Texas frontier looking for smugglers, rustlers, and people illegally entering the United States;

Whereas, following the Department of Labor Appropriation Act of May 28, 1924, the Border Patrol was established within the Bureau of Immigration, with an initial force of 450 patrol inspectors, an annual budget of \$1,000,000, and \$1,300 in annual pay for each patrol inspector, with each patrolman furnishing his own horse;

Whereas changes regarding illegal immigration and increases of contraband alcohol traffic brought about the need for this young patrol force to have formal training in border enforcement;

Whereas, during the U.S. Border Patrol's 100-year history, Border Patrol agents have been deputized as United States Marshals on numerous occasions;

Whereas the U.S. Border Patrol's highly trained and motivated personnel have also assisted in controlling civil disturbances, performing national security details, aided in foreign training and assessments, and responded with security and humanitarian assistance in the aftermath of numerous natural disasters;

Whereas the present force of over 19,000 agents and 3,000 professional staff, located in 129 stations and 35 permanent checkpoints under 22 sectors, is responsible for protecting more than 8,000 miles of international land and water boundaries;

Whereas the U.S. Border Patrol has also been assigned additional interdiction duties,

and is the primary agency responsible for drug interdiction between ports of entry;

Whereas Border Patrol agents have a dual role of protecting the borders and enforcing immigration laws in a fair and humane manner; and

Whereas the U.S. Border Patrol has a historic mission of firm commitment to the enforcement of immigration laws, but also one fraught with danger, as illustrated by the fact that 155 Border Patrol agents and pilots have lost their lives in the line of duty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 100th anniversary of the U.S. Border Patrol on May 28, 2024;

(2) applauds the significant achievements of the U.S. Border Patrol;

(3) commends the tens of thousands of men and women who have served in the ranks of the U.S. Border Patrol;

(4) remembers the 155 agents and pilots who have lost their lives in the performance of their duties; and

(5) offers its support for policies to improve the working conditions, hiring processes, and retention of Border Patrol agents.

SENATE RESOLUTION 706—RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH AS AN OPPORTUNITY TO RAISE AWARENESS ABOUT THE CHALLENGES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER CARE SYSTEM, AND ENCOURAGING CONGRESS TO IMPLEMENT POLICIES TO IMPROVE THE LIVES OF CHILDREN IN THE FOSTER CARE SYSTEM

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. BRITT, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WARNER, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RISCH, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 706

Whereas National Foster Care Month was established more than 30 years ago—

(1) to bring foster care issues to the forefront;

(2) to highlight the importance of permanency for every child; and

(3) to recognize the essential role that foster parents, social workers, and advocates have in the lives of children in foster care throughout the United States;

Whereas all children deserve a safe, loving, and permanent home;

Whereas the primary goal of the foster care system is to ensure the safety and well-being of children while working to provide a safe, loving, and permanent home for each child;

Whereas there are approximately 368,530 children living in foster care in the United States;

Whereas there were approximately 186,602 youths that entered the foster care system in 2022 in the United States, while more than 108,877 youths were awaiting adoption at the end of 2022;

Whereas approximately 61,500 children entered foster care in 2022 due to parental drug abuse;

Whereas children of color are more likely to stay in the foster care system for longer periods of time and are less likely to be reunited with their biological families;

Whereas foster parents are the front-line caregivers for children who cannot safely re-

main with their biological parents, and foster parents provide physical care, emotional support, and education advocacy, and are the largest single source of families providing permanent homes for children leaving foster care to adoption;

Whereas children in foster care who are placed with relatives, compared to children placed with non-relatives—

(1) have more stability, including fewer changes in placements;

(2) have more positive perceptions of their placements;

(3) are more likely to be placed with their siblings; and

(4) demonstrate fewer behavioral problems;

Whereas some relative caregivers receive less financial assistance and support services than do foster caregivers;

Whereas an increased emphasis on prevention and reunification services is necessary to reduce the number of children that enter or re-enter the foster care system;

Whereas more than 18,500 youths aged out of foster care in 2022 without a legal permanent connection to an adult or family;

Whereas youth who age out of foster care lack the security or support of a biological or adoptive family and frequently struggle to secure affordable housing, obtain health insurance, pursue higher education, and acquire adequate employment;

Whereas foster care is intended to be a temporary placement, but children remain in the foster care system for an average of 22.5 months;

Whereas 35 percent of children in foster care experience more than 2 placements while in care, which often leads to disruption of routines and the need to change schools and move away from siblings, extended families, and familiar surroundings;

Whereas youth in foster care are much more likely to face educational instability, with a study showing that 75 percent of foster youth experienced an unscheduled school change during a school year, compared to 21 percent of youth not in foster care;

Whereas children entering foster care often confront the widespread misperception that children in foster care are disruptive, unruly, and dangerous, even though placement in foster care is based on the actions of a parent or guardian, not the child;

Whereas 30 percent of children in foster care are taking not less than 1 anti-psychotic medication, and 34 percent of those children are not receiving adequate treatment planning or medication monitoring;

Whereas, due to heavy caseloads and limited resources, the average annual turnover rate is between 14 percent and 22 percent for child welfare workers;

Whereas States, localities, and communities should be encouraged to invest resources in preventative and reunification services and post-permanency programs to ensure that more children and older youth in foster care are provided with safe, loving, and permanent placements;

Whereas, in 2018, Congress passed the Family First Prevention Services Act (Public Law 115-123; 132 Stat. 232), which provided new investments in prevention and family reunification services to help more families stay together and ensure more children are in safe, loving, and permanent homes;

Whereas Federal legislation during the past 4 decades, including the Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-272; 94 Stat. 500), the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-89; 111 Stat. 2115), the Fostering Connections to Success and Increasing Adoptions Act of 2008 (Public Law 110-351; 122 Stat. 3949), the Child and Family Services Improvement and Innovation Act (Public Law 112-34; 125 Stat. 369), and the Preventing Sex Trafficking and

Strengthening Families Act (Public Law 113–183; 128 Stat. 1919) provided new investments and services to improve the outcomes of children in the foster care system;

Whereas May 2024 is an appropriate month to designate as “National Foster Care Month” to provide an opportunity to acknowledge the child welfare workforce, foster parents, the advocacy community, and mentors for their dedication, accomplishments, and the positive impact they have on the lives of children; and

Whereas much remains to be done to ensure that all children have a safe, loving, nurturing, and permanent family, regardless of age or special needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 2024 as “National Foster Care Month”;

(2) recognizes National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges that children face in the foster care system;

(3) encourages Congress to implement policies to improve the lives of children in the foster care system;

(4) acknowledges the unique needs of children in the foster care system;

(5) recognizes foster youth throughout the United States for their ongoing tenacity, courage, and resilience while facing life challenges;

(6) acknowledges the exceptional alumni of the foster care system who serve as advocates and role models for youth who remain in care;

(7) honors the commitment and dedication of the individuals who work tirelessly to provide assistance and services to children in the foster care system;

(8) supports the designation of May 31, 2024, as “National Foster Parent Appreciation Day”;

(9) recognizes National Foster Parent Appreciation Day as an opportunity to recognize the efforts of foster parents to provide safe and loving care for children in need and to raise awareness about the increasing need for foster parents to serve in their communities; and

(10) reaffirms the need to continue working to improve the outcomes of all children in the foster care system through initiatives designed to—

(A) support vulnerable families;

(B) prevent families from entering the foster care system and reunite families in cases where reunification is in the best interest of the child;

(C) promote adoption in cases where reunification is not in the best interests of the child;

(D) adequately serve those children brought into the foster care system; and

(E) facilitate the successful transition into adulthood for youth that “age out” of the foster care system.

SENATE RESOLUTION 707—RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JEWISH AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH AS A TIME TO CELEBRATE THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF JEWISH AMERICANS TO THE SOCIETY AND CULTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. RISCH,

Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KELLY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CASEY, Mr. OSSOFF, and Mr. REED) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 707

Whereas the Senate and the House of Representatives have recognized many heritage months that celebrate the various communities that form the mosaic of the United States;

Whereas, through recognizing and celebrating heritage months, we learn about one another, honor the richness of the diversity of the United States, and strengthen the fabric of society in the United States;

Whereas Jewish American Heritage Month has its origins in 1980, when Congress enacted a joint resolution entitled “Joint Resolution to authorize and request the President to issue a proclamation designating April 21 through April 28, 1980, as ‘Jewish Heritage Week’”, approved April 24, 1980 (Public Law 96–237; 94 Stat. 338);

Whereas, on April 24, 1980, President Carter issued the proclamation for Jewish Heritage Week, and in that proclamation, President Carter spoke about the bountiful contributions made by the Jewish people to the culture and history of the United States;

Whereas Congress has played a central role in recognizing Jewish American Heritage Month since the Senate and the House of Representatives passed resolutions in 2006 and 2005, respectively, urging the President to proclaim the national observance of a month recognizing the Jewish-American community;

Whereas, since 2006, Presidents Bush, Obama, Trump, and Biden have all issued proclamations for Jewish American Heritage Month, which celebrates Jewish Americans and encourages all people of the United States to learn more about Jewish heritage and the contributions of Jewish people throughout the history of the United States;

Whereas the people of the United States celebrate the rich history of Jewish people in the United States and the more than 350-year history of Jewish contributions to society in the United States;

Whereas the United States has long served as a haven for Jewish people escaping from oppression in search of liberty, justice, and tolerance;

Whereas the Jewish-American community dates back to 1654, when a group of 23 Jewish people, fleeing persecution at the hands of the Portuguese Inquisition, fled Brazil and found refuge in what is now New York City;

Whereas Jewish Americans have established deep roots in communities across the United States and served their neighbors and the United States as loyal and patriotic citizens, always grateful for the safe harbor that the United States has provided for them;

Whereas the Jewish-American community has since grown to over 6,000,000 people, representing approximately 2 percent of the population of the United States in 2024;

Whereas Jewish Americans have served in government and the military, won Nobel prizes, led universities and corporations, advanced medicine and philanthropy, created and performed in enduring works of performing and visual art, written great novels, become emblems of justice as members of the Supreme Court of the United States, and so much more;

Whereas Jewish Americans have been subjected to a recent surge in antisemitism as the Anti-Defamation League has documented;

Whereas the rise in antisemitism is being felt by ordinary people in the United States, as the American Jewish Committee’s State of Antisemitism in America 2023 Report revealed that—

(1) almost ¾ of American Jews feel less secure in the United States than they did a year ago, which is more than a 20 percentage point increase in just 1 year; and

(2) nearly ½ of American Jews say they altered their behavior out of fear of antisemitism;

Whereas, over the course of the past decade, Holocaust distortion and denial have grown in intensity;

Whereas a 2020 survey of all 50 States on Holocaust knowledge among millennials and individuals in generation Z, conducted by the Conference on Jewish Material Claims Against Germany, found a clear lack of awareness of key historical facts, including that—

(1) 63 percent of respondents did not know that 6,000,000 Jews were murdered during the Holocaust; and

(2) 36 percent of respondents thought that “2 million or fewer Jews” were killed;

Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation has aggregated 2022 hate crime data showing that Jewish people remain the single most targeted religious minority in the United States;

Whereas the use of antisemitic language, conspiracy theories, and hatred has increased on multiple social media platforms, including—

(1) tropes about Jewish control; and

(2) messages praising Adolf Hitler and demonizing all Jewish people;

Whereas antisemitism had been increasing before October 7, 2023, and since October 7, 2023, it has dramatically escalated around the country, in particular at institutions of higher education;

Whereas the most effective ways to counter the increase in antisemitic actions are through education, awareness, and the uplifting of Jewish voices, while highlighting the contributions that Jewish Americans have made to the United States; and

Whereas, as the strength of a society can be measured by how that society protects its minority populations and celebrates their contributions, it is altogether fitting for the United States to once again mark the month of May as “Jewish American Heritage Month”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the significance of Jewish American Heritage Month as a time to celebrate the contributions of Jewish Americans to the society and culture of the United States;

(2) recognizes that Jewish-American culture and heritage strengthen and enrich the diversity of the United States; and

(3) calls on elected officials, faith leaders, and civil society leaders to condemn and combat any and all acts of antisemitism.

SENATE RESOLUTION 708—COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DESIGNATION OF THE GILA WILDERNESS

Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 708

Whereas on June 3, 1924, the Forest Service set aside 755,000 acres as the Gila Wilderness;

Whereas this was the first designated wilderness in the United States and the world;

Whereas this designation marked the beginning of a national system of wilderness

areas and helped inspire the Wilderness Act of 1964 (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.);

Whereas Aldo Leopold, a Forest Service employee in New Mexico, worked to initiate a Federal wilderness concept in the backcountry of what is now the Gila National Forest;

Whereas Arthur Carhart, a Forest Service employee, argued that wilderness recreation would help to develop individual and national character;

Whereas the Apache and Mimbres people have been stewards of this land from time immemorial; and

Whereas, 100 years later, the character of the Gila Wilderness remains without permanent human-built structures, protected and managed to preserve this condition, and the wilderness remains a place unrestrained by human development: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Congress commemorates the 100th anniversary of the designation of the Gila Wilderness.

SENATE RESOLUTION 709—EX-PRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 2024 AS “MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. LUJÁN submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 709

Whereas millions of people in the United States face mental health challenges and have unmet mental health needs;

Whereas, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, mental health disorders are chronic conditions, and, without proper diagnosis and treatment, children can face problems at home and in school, which can interfere with the future development of those children;

Whereas more resources should be dedicated in schools to the prevention, early detection, and treatment of mental health disorders in children;

Whereas childhood depression is more likely to persist into adulthood if it is left untreated;

Whereas it is important that the United States provides the necessary funding and resources to reach children and youth early on in life;

Whereas the COVID-19 pandemic accelerated the use of digital technologies, such as social media;

Whereas there has been a great concern about the impact of social media on the mental health of children and youth;

Whereas social media exposes children to bullying, depression, anxiety, and self-harm;

Whereas there is a strong need to further understand and deter any negative impact of social media on children and youth;

Whereas disparities remain in access to mental health treatment for communities of color, with Asian, Native American, Hispanic, and Black individuals less likely to receive mental health care than their counterparts;

Whereas suicide is a significant public health issue that can have an enduring impact on individuals and their communities;

Whereas additional resources should be dedicated to the prevention of suicide in the United States;

Whereas veterans are more likely to experience mental health challenges than civilians;

Whereas it is important that the United States provides additional funding and resources to support veterans with mental health needs; and

Whereas it would be appropriate to observe May 2024 as “Mental Health Awareness Month”; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of May 2024 as “Mental Health Awareness Month” to remove the stigma associated with mental illness and place emphasis on scientific findings regarding mental health recovery;

(2) declares mental health a national priority;

(3) supports increasing access to mental health services;

(4) recognizes that mental well-being is equally as important as physical well-being for the citizens, communities, schools, businesses, and economy of the United States;

(5) applauds the coalescing of national, State, local, medical, and faith-based organizations in—

(A) working to promote public awareness of mental health; and

(B) providing critical information and support to individuals and families affected by mental illness; and

(6) encourages all individuals to draw on “Mental Health Awareness Month” as an opportunity to promote mental well-being and awareness, ensure access to appropriate coverage and services, and support overall quality of life for those living with mental illness.

SENATE RESOLUTION 710—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF MAY 29, 2024, AS “MENTAL HEALTH AWARENESS IN AGRICULTURE DAY” TO RAISE AWARENESS AROUND MENTAL HEALTH IN THE AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY AND WORKFORCE AND TO CONTINUE TO REDUCE STIGMA ASSOCIATED WITH MENTAL ILLNESS

Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 710

Whereas, according to the 2022 Census of Agriculture of the Department of Agriculture, 3,370,000 producers, less than 2 percent of the population of the United States, provide high-quality food, fuel, and fiber to the United States and abroad;

Whereas, according to the Economic Policy Institute, there are approximately 1,600,000 farmworkers in the United States;

Whereas, according to the National Rural Health Association, the rate of suicide among farmers is 3.5 times greater than among the general population;

Whereas, according to the Mortality-Linked National Health Interview Survey, suicide rates among farmworkers are 1.4 times higher than rates across all other occupations;

Whereas May is “National Mental Health Awareness Month”; and

Whereas the stigma surrounding mental and behavioral health persists and acknowledging this public health crisis and creating awareness is as important as ever: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 29, 2024, as “Mental Health Awareness in Agriculture Day” to raise awareness around mental health in the agricultural industry and reduce the stigma associated with mental illness;

(2) recognizes the important role of individuals in agriculture as providers of high-quality products to the United States and the world;

(3) seeks to create awareness for the unique challenges agricultural producers and workers face, such as weather unpredictability, labor intensity and shortages, farm succession, and fluctuating commodity and market prices;

(4) highlights the resources available through the Farm and Ranch Stress Assistance Network (FRSAN) of the Department of Agriculture in connecting agricultural producers and workers to stress assistance programs; and

(5) encourages all to observe Mental Health Awareness in Agriculture Day as an opportunity to promote mental well-being and awareness for current and future agricultural producers and workers.

SENATE RESOLUTION 711—DESIGNATING MAY 2024 AS “AMERICAN STROKE MONTH”

Mr. LUJÁN (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 711

Whereas quick identification and treatment for stroke results in a higher chance of survival and reduces recovery time for individuals experiencing a stroke;

Whereas treatment depends on the type of stroke someone is having, which must be diagnosed by a healthcare professional;

Whereas, when dealing with a time-sensitive medical emergency like a stroke, the right care, at the right time, at the right facility, is of the utmost importance;

Whereas a system of care allows for scientifically proven measures to be applied to every patient, every time;

Whereas, every 40 seconds, someone in the United States has a stroke;

Whereas stroke is a leading cause of serious long-term disability and the fifth-leading cause of death in the United States, causing more than 160,000 deaths each year;

Whereas nearly ½ of adults in the United States have high blood pressure, which is a leading cause and controllable risk factor for stroke;

Whereas the “F.A.S.T.” warning signs and symptoms of stroke include face drooping, arm weakness, speech difficulty, and time to call 911;

Whereas, during American Stroke Month in May, and year-round, the “Together to End Stroke” initiative of the American Stroke Association strives to teach people everywhere that stroke is largely preventable, treatable, and beatable; and

Whereas more research and education is needed to help prevent and treat stroke: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 2024 as “American Stroke Month”;

(2) recognizes and reaffirms the commitment of the Government and people of the United States to fighting stroke—

(A) by promoting awareness about the causes, risks, and prevention of stroke;

(B) by supporting research on stroke; and

(C) by improving access to affordable, quality care to reduce long-term disability and mortality;

(3) commends the efforts of States, territories, and possessions of the United States, localities, nonprofit organizations, businesses and other entities, and the people of the United States who support American Stroke Month; and

(4) encourages all individual in the United States to familiarize themselves with the risk factors associated with stroke, recognize the warning signs and symptoms, and on

first sign of a stroke, dial 911 immediately in order to begin to reduce the devastating effects of stroke on the population of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 712—DESIGNATING MAY 2024 AS “OLDER AMERICANS MONTH”

Mr. KELLY (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. VANCE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 712

Whereas President John F. Kennedy first designated May as “Senior Citizens Month” in 1963;

Whereas, in 1963, only approximately 17,778,000 individuals living in the United States were 65 years of age or older, approximately 1/3 of those individuals lived in poverty, and few programs existed to meet the needs of older individuals in the United States;

Whereas, in 2023, there were more than 59,248,361 individuals who were 65 years of age or older living in the United States and those individuals accounted for 17.7 percent of the total population of the United States;

Whereas approximately 11,216 individuals in the United States turn 65 years of age each day;

Whereas, in 2023, more than 8,402,856 veterans of the Armed Forces were 65 years of age or older;

Whereas older individuals in the United States rely on Federal programs, such as programs under the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), including the Medicare program under title XVIII of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) and the Medicaid program under title XIX of that Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), for financial security and high-quality affordable health care;

Whereas the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) provides—

(1) supportive services to help older individuals in the United States maintain maximum independence in the homes and communities of those individuals; and

(2) funding for programs that promote social connection and improve the health and wellbeing of older individuals, including nutrition services, transportation, and care management, which assist more than 10,000,000 older individuals in the United States each year;

Whereas, as local aging network leaders, Area Agencies on Aging are critical partners in the healthy aging continuum;

Whereas, in 2023, an estimated 6,774,000 individuals in the United States who were 65 years of age or older continued to work as full-time, year-round employees;

Whereas older individuals in the United States play an important role in society by continuing to contribute their experience, knowledge, wisdom, and accomplishments;

Whereas older individuals in the United States play vital roles in their communities and remain involved in volunteer work, the arts, cultural activities, and activities relating to mentorship and civic engagement;

Whereas more than 143,000 older individuals serve as AmeriCorps Seniors volunteers in the Foster Grandparent Program, Senior Companion Program, and the Retired and Senior Volunteer Program, helping communities by mentoring and tutoring children, providing independent living support and companionship to other older adults, addressing food insecurity, and more; and

Whereas a society that recognizes the success of older individuals and continues to enhance the access of older individuals to quality and affordable health care will—

(1) encourage the ongoing participation and heightened independence of older individuals; and

(2) ensure the continued safety and wellbeing of older individuals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 2024 as “Older Americans Month”; and

(2) encourages the people of the United States to provide opportunities for older individuals to continue to flourish by—

(A) emphasizing the importance and leadership of older individuals through public recognition of the ongoing achievements of older individuals;

(B) presenting opportunities for older individuals to share their wisdom, experience, and skills with younger generations; and

(C) recognizing older individuals as valuable assets in strengthening communities across the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 713—DESIGNATING MAY 2024 AS “ALS AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 713

Whereas amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (referred to in this preamble as “ALS”) is a progressive neurodegenerative disease that affects nerve cells in the brain and the spinal cord;

Whereas the life expectancy for an individual with ALS is between 2 and 5 years after the date on which the individual receives an ALS diagnosis;

Whereas ALS occurs throughout the world with no racial, ethnic, gender, or socioeconomic boundaries;

Whereas ALS may affect any individual in any location;

Whereas the cause of ALS is unknown in up to 90 percent of cases;

Whereas approximately 10 percent of ALS cases have a strong known genetic driver;

Whereas, on average, the period between the date on which an individual first experiences symptoms of ALS and the date on which the individual is diagnosed with ALS is more than 1 year;

Whereas the onset of ALS often involves muscle weakness or stiffness, and the progression of ALS results in the further weakening, wasting, and paralysis of—

(1) the muscles of the limbs and trunk; and

(2) the muscles that control vital functions, such as speech, swallowing, and breathing;

Whereas ALS can strike individuals of any age, but it predominantly strikes adults;

Whereas it is estimated that tens of thousands of individuals in the United States have ALS at any given time;

Whereas, based on studies of the population of the United States, more than 5,000 individuals in the United States are diagnosed with ALS each year, and approximately 15 individuals in the United States are diagnosed with ALS each day;

Whereas every 90 minutes someone dies from ALS in the United States;

Whereas the majority of individuals with ALS die of respiratory failure;

Whereas, in the United States, military veterans are more likely to be diagnosed with ALS than individuals with no history of military service;

Whereas, as of the date of introduction of this resolution, there is no cure for ALS;

Whereas the spouses, children, and family members of individuals living with ALS provide support to those individuals with love, day-to-day care, and more; and

Whereas an individual with ALS, and the caregivers of such individual, can be required to bear significant costs for medical care, equipment, and home care services for the individual as the disease progresses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates May 2024 as “ALS Awareness Month”; and

(2) affirms the dedication of the Senate to—

(A) ensuring individuals with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (referred to in this resolution as “ALS”) have access to effective treatments as soon as possible;

(B) identifying risk factors and causes of ALS to prevent new cases;

(C) empowering individuals with ALS to engage with the world in the way they want;

(D) acknowledging the physical, emotional, and financial burdens of living with ALS; and

(E) ensuring all individuals with ALS and their caregivers receive high quality services and supports that benefit them; and

(3) commends the dedication of the family members, friends, organizations, volunteers, researchers, and caregivers across the United States who are working to improve the quality and length of life of ALS patients and develop treatments and cures that reach patients as soon as possible.

SENATE RESOLUTION 714—RECOGNIZING AND SUPPORTING INDIVIDUALS BORN WITH CONGENITAL DISABILITIES OR MALFORMATIONS DUE TO THALIDOMIDE EXPOSURE

Mr. KENNEDY submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 714

Whereas July 14th, 2024, is “National Thalidomide Survivor Awareness Day”;

Whereas thalidomide is a sedative drug that was widely used in the late 1950s to treat nausea in pregnant women;

Whereas thalidomide treatment resulted in irreversible side effects among babies, including stillbirths and congenital disabilities or malformations;

Whereas such congenital disabilities or malformations include the shortening or absence of limbs, the malformation of hands and feet, sensory impairment, facial disfigurement, and damage to the brain, internal organs, and skeletal structure, among other disabilities;

Whereas an estimated 8,000 to 10,000 children worldwide died at birth or were born with congenital disabilities or malformations attributable to thalidomide exposure;

Whereas it is estimated that there are at least 20 survivors of thalidomide exposure in the State of Louisiana alone;

Whereas thalidomide survivors face unique hardships requiring many to rely on adapted vehicles, electronic wheelchairs, and prosthetic limbs;

Whereas the reliance on adaptive technologies imposes great financial burden on thalidomide survivors;

Whereas thalidomide survivors are often unable to maintain full-time employment due to their impairments;

Whereas the experience of thalidomide victims has greatly influenced the passage of modern drug safety laws; and

Whereas thalidomide survivors have not received recognition or support from the Federal Government: Now, therefore, be it Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes and supports individuals born with congenital disabilities or malformations due to thalidomide exposure; and
(2) urges the recognition of such exposure in United States history and the long-term hardships affecting survivors of thalidomide exposure to this day.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2068. Mr. ROUNDS 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.

SA 2069. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4361, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2070. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4361, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2068. Mr. ROUNDS 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 240, after line 24, add the following:

SEC. 406. EXCLUDING RETURNING H-2B WORKERS FROM ANNUAL CAP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 214(g)(9)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(g)(9)(A)) is amended to read as follows:

“(A)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), and subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), an alien who has already been counted toward the numerical limitation under paragraph (1)(B) during 1 of the 3 preceding fiscal years shall not be counted again toward such limitation during the current fiscal year and shall be considered a returning worker.

“(ii) An alien who has already been counted toward the numerical limitation under paragraph (1)(B) shall be counted again toward such limitation if such alien—

“(I) departs the United States for a period longer than 1 year;

“(II) was not counted toward such limitation in any of the 3 most recent fiscal years; or

“(III) violated his or her status during the authorized period of stay.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on October 1, 2024.

SA 2069. Mr. ROUNDS 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:

Beginning on page 143, strike line 14 and all that follows through page 145, line 6, and insert the following:

SEC. 202. CLARIFICATION OF ASYLUM ELIGIBILITY.

Section 208 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1158) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “or who arrives in the United States (whether or not at a designated port of arrival and including” and inserting “and has arrived in the United States at a port of entry (including”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by amending subparagraph (A) to read as follows:

“(A) SAFE THIRD COUNTRY.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an alien if the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security determines that—

“(i) the alien may be removed to a country (other than the country of the alien’s nationality or, in the case of an alien having no nationality, the country of the alien’s last habitual residence) in which the alien’s life or freedom would not be threatened on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion, and where the alien would have access to a full and fair procedure for determining a claim to asylum or equivalent temporary protection, unless the Attorney General or the Secretary, on a case-by-case basis, finds that it is in the public interest for the alien to receive asylum in the United States; or

“(ii) the alien entered, attempted to enter, or arrived in the United States after transiting through at least one country outside the alien’s country of citizenship, nationality, or last lawful habitual residence en route to the United States, unless—

“(I) the alien demonstrates that he or she applied for protection from persecution or torture in at least one country outside the alien’s country of citizenship, nationality, or last lawful habitual residence through which the alien transited en route to the United States, and the alien received a final judgment denying the alien protection in each country;

“(II) the alien demonstrates that he or she was a victim of a severe form of trafficking in which a commercial sex act was induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act was under the age of 18 years; or in which the trafficking included the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery, and was unable to apply for protection from persecution in each country through which the alien transited en route to the United States as a result of such severe form of trafficking; or

“(III) the only countries through which the alien transited en route to the United States were, at the time of the transit, not parties to the 1951 United Nations Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, or the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(A), by inserting “(in accordance with the rules set forth in this section), and is eligible to apply for asylum under subsection (a)” before the semicolon at the end; and

(B) by amending paragraph (2) to read as follows:

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an alien if the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General determines that—

“(i) the alien ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion;

“(ii) the alien has been convicted of any felony under Federal, State, tribal, or local law;

“(iii) the alien has been convicted of any misdemeanor offense under Federal, State, tribal, or local law involving—

“(I) the unlawful possession or use of an identification document, authentication feature, or false identification document (as such terms are defined in the jurisdiction where the conviction occurred), unless the alien can establish that the conviction resulted from circumstances showing that—

“(aa) the document or feature was presented before boarding a common carrier;

“(bb) the document or feature related to the alien’s eligibility to enter the United States;

“(cc) the alien used the document or feature to depart a country wherein the alien has claimed a fear of persecution; and

“(dd) the alien claimed a fear of persecution without delay upon presenting himself or herself to an immigration officer upon arrival at a United States port of entry;

“(II) the unlawful receipt of a Federal public benefit (as defined in section 401(c) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1611(c))), from a Federal entity, or the unlawful receipt of similar public benefits from a State, tribal, or local entity; or

“(III) possession or trafficking of a controlled substance or controlled substance paraphernalia, as those phrases are defined under the law of the jurisdiction where the conviction occurred, other than a single offense involving possession for one’s own use of 30 grams or less of marijuana (as marijuana is defined under the law of the jurisdiction where the conviction occurred);

“(iv) the alien has been convicted of an offense arising under paragraph (1)(A) or (2) of section 274(a), or under section 276;

“(v) the alien has been convicted of a Federal, State, tribal, or local crime that the Attorney General or Secretary of Homeland Security knows, or has reason to believe, was committed in support, promotion, or furtherance of the activity of a criminal street gang (as defined under the law of the jurisdiction where the conviction occurred or in section 521(a) of title 18, United States Code);

“(vi) the alien has been convicted of an offense for driving while intoxicated or impaired, as those terms are defined under the law of the jurisdiction where the conviction occurred (including a conviction for driving while under the influence of or impaired by alcohol or drugs), without regard to whether the conviction is classified as a misdemeanor or felony under Federal, State, tribal, or local law, in which such intoxicated or impaired driving was a cause of serious bodily injury or death of another person;

“(vii) the alien has been convicted of more than one offense for driving while intoxicated or impaired, as those terms are defined under the law of the jurisdiction where the conviction occurred (including a conviction for driving while under the influence of or impaired by alcohol or drugs), without regard to whether the conviction is classified as a misdemeanor or felony under Federal, State, tribal, or local law;

“(viii) the alien has been convicted of a crime—

“(I) that involves conduct amounting to a crime of stalking;

“(II) of child abuse, child neglect, or child abandonment; or

“(III) that involves conduct amounting to a domestic assault or battery offense, including—

“(aa) a misdemeanor crime of domestic violence, as described in section 921(a)(33) of title 18, United States Code;

“(bb) a crime of domestic violence, as described in section 4002(a)(12) of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 (34 U.S.C. 12291(a)(12)); or

“(cc) any crime based on conduct in which the alien harassed, coerced, intimidated, voluntarily or recklessly used (or threatened to use) force or violence against, or inflicted physical injury or physical pain, however slight, upon a person—

“(AA) who is a current or former spouse of the alien;

“(BB) with whom the alien shares a child;

“(CC) who is cohabiting with, or who has cohabited with, the alien as a spouse;

“(DD) who is similarly situated to a spouse of the alien under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction where the offense occurred; or

“(EE) who is protected from that alien’s acts under the domestic or family violence laws of the United States or of any State, tribal government, or unit of local government;

“(ix) the alien has engaged in acts of battery or extreme cruelty upon a person and the person—

“(I) is a current or former spouse of the alien;

“(II) shares a child with the alien;

“(III) cohabits or has cohabited with the alien as a spouse;

“(IV) is similarly situated to a spouse of the alien under the domestic or family violence laws of the jurisdiction where the offense occurred; or

“(V) is protected from that alien’s acts under the domestic or family violence laws of the United States or of any State, tribal government, or unit of local government;

“(x) the alien, having been convicted by a final judgment of a particularly serious crime, constitutes a danger to the community of the United States;

“(xi) there are serious reasons for believing that the alien has committed a serious non-political crime outside the United States prior to the arrival of the alien in the United States;

“(xii) there are reasonable grounds for regarding the alien as a danger to the security of the United States;

“(xiii) the alien is described in subclause (I), (II), (III), (IV), or (VI) of section 212(a)(3)(B)(i) or section 237(a)(4)(B) (relating to terrorist activity), unless, in the case only of an alien inadmissible under subclause (IV) of section 212(a)(3)(B)(i), the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General determines, in the Secretary’s or the Attorney General’s discretion, that there are not reasonable grounds for regarding the alien as a danger to the security of the United States;

“(xiv) the alien was firmly resettled in another country prior to arriving in the United States; or

“(xv) there are reasonable grounds for concluding the alien could avoid persecution by relocating to another part of the alien’s country of nationality or, in the case of an alien having no nationality, another part of the alien’s country of last habitual residence.

“(B) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(i) PARTICULARLY SERIOUS CRIME; SERIOUS NONPOLITICAL CRIME OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(x), the Attorney General or Secretary of Homeland Security, in their discretion, may determine that a conviction constitutes a particularly serious crime based on—

“(aa) the nature of the conviction;

“(bb) the type of sentence imposed; or

“(cc) the circumstances and underlying facts of the conviction.

“(II) DETERMINATION.—In making a determination under subclause (I), the Attorney General or Secretary of Homeland Security may consider all reliable information and is not limited to facts found by the criminal court or provided in the underlying record of conviction.

“(III) TREATMENT OF FELONIES.—In making a determination under subclause (I), an alien who has been convicted of a felony (as defined under this section) or an aggravated felony (as defined under section 101(a)(43)), shall be considered to have been convicted of a particularly serious crime.

“(IV) INTERPOL RED NOTICE.—In making a determination under subparagraph (A)(xi), an Interpol Red Notice may constitute reliable evidence that the alien has committed a serious nonpolitical crime outside the United States.

“(ii) CRIMES AND EXCEPTIONS.—

“(I) DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED OR IMPAIRED.—A finding under subparagraph (A)(vi) does not require the Attorney General or Secretary of Homeland Security to find the first conviction for driving while intoxicated or impaired (including a conviction for driving while under the influence of or impaired by alcohol or drugs) as a predicate offense. The Attorney General or Secretary of Homeland Security need only make a factual determination that the alien previously was convicted for driving while intoxicated or impaired as those terms are defined under the jurisdiction where the conviction occurred (including a conviction for driving while under the influence of or impaired by alcohol or drugs).

“(II) STALKING AND OTHER CRIMES.—In making a determination under subparagraph (A)(viii), including determining the existence of a domestic relationship between the alien and the victim, the underlying conduct of the crime may be considered, and the Attorney General or Secretary of Homeland Security is not limited to facts found by the criminal court or provided in the underlying record of conviction.

“(III) BATTERY OR EXTREME CRUELTY.—In making a determination under subparagraph (A)(ix), the phrase ‘battery or extreme cruelty’ includes—

“(aa) any act or threatened act of violence, including any forceful detention, which results or threatens to result in physical or mental injury;

“(bb) psychological or sexual abuse or exploitation, including rape, molestation, incest, or forced prostitution, shall be considered acts of violence; and

“(cc) other abusive acts, including acts that, in and of themselves, may not initially appear violent, but that are a part of an overall pattern of violence.

“(IV) EXCEPTION FOR VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE.—An alien who was convicted of an offense described in clause (viii) or (ix) of subparagraph (A) is not ineligible for asylum on that basis if the alien satisfies the criteria under section 237(a)(7)(A).

“(C) SPECIFIC CIRCUMSTANCES.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an alien whose claim is based on—

“(i) personal animus or retribution, including personal animus in which the alleged

persecutor has not targeted, or manifested an animus against, other members of an alleged particular social group in addition to the member who has raised the claim at issue;

“(ii) the applicant’s generalized disapproval of, disagreement with, or opposition to criminal, terrorist, gang, guerilla, or other non-state organizations absent expressive behavior in furtherance of a discrete cause against such organizations related to control of a State or expressive behavior that is antithetical to the State or a legal unit of the State;

“(iii) the applicant’s resistance to recruitment or coercion by guerrilla, criminal, gang, terrorist, or other non-state organizations;

“(iv) the targeting of the applicant for criminal activity for financial gain based on wealth or affluence or perceptions of wealth or affluence;

“(v) the applicant’s criminal activity; or

“(vi) the applicant’s perceived, past or present, gang affiliation.

“(D) DEFINITIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS.—

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this paragraph:

“(I) FELONY.—The term ‘felony’ means—

“(aa) any crime defined as a felony by the relevant jurisdiction (Federal, State, tribal, or local) of conviction; or

“(bb) any crime punishable by more than one year of imprisonment.

“(II) MISDEMEANOR.—The term ‘misdemeanor’ means—

“(aa) any crime defined as a misdemeanor by the relevant jurisdiction (Federal, State, tribal, or local) of conviction; or

“(bb) any crime not punishable by more than one year of imprisonment.

“(ii) CLARIFICATIONS.—

“(I) CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of this paragraph, whether any activity or conviction also may constitute a basis for removal is immaterial to a determination of asylum eligibility.

“(II) ATTEMPT, CONSPIRACY, OR SOLICITATION.—For purposes of this paragraph, all references to a criminal offense or criminal conviction shall be deemed to include any attempt, conspiracy, or solicitation to commit the offense or any other inchoate form of the offense.

“(III) EFFECT OF CERTAIN ORDERS.—

“(aa) IN GENERAL.—No order vacating a conviction, modifying a sentence, clarifying a sentence, or otherwise altering a conviction or sentence shall have any effect under this paragraph unless the Attorney General or Secretary of Homeland Security determines that—

“(AA) the court issuing the order had jurisdiction and authority to do so; and

“(BB) the order was not entered for rehabilitative purposes or for purposes of ameliorating the immigration consequences of the conviction or sentence.

“(bb) AMELIORATING IMMIGRATION CONSEQUENCES.—For purposes of item (aa)(BB), the order shall be presumed to be for the purpose of ameliorating immigration consequences if—

“(AA) the order was entered after the initiation of any proceeding to remove the alien from the United States; or

“(BB) the alien moved for the order more than one year after the date of the original order of conviction or sentencing, whichever is later.

“(cc) AUTHORITY OF IMMIGRATION JUDGE.—An immigration judge is not limited to consideration only of material included in any order vacating a conviction, modifying a sentence, or clarifying a sentence to determine whether such order should be given any effect under this paragraph, but may consider such additional information as the immigration judge determines appropriate.

“(E) ADDITIONAL LIMITATIONS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General may by regulation establish additional limitations and conditions, consistent with this section, under which an alien shall be ineligible for asylum under paragraph (1).

“(F) NO JUDICIAL REVIEW.—There shall be no judicial review of a determination of the Secretary of Homeland Security or the Attorney General under subparagraph (A)(xiii).”

SEC. 203. CREDIBLE FEAR INTERVIEWS.

Section 235(b)(1)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1225(b)(1)(B)(v)) is amended by striking “there is a significant possibility” and all that follows, and inserting “, taking into account the credibility of the statements made by the alien in support of the alien’s claim, as determined pursuant to section 208(b)(1)(B)(iii), and such other facts as are known to the officer, the alien more likely than not could establish eligibility for asylum under section 208, and it is more likely than not that the statements made by, and on behalf of, the alien in support of the alien’s claim are true.”

SA 2070. Mr. ROUNDS 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:

Beginning on page 145, strike line 21 and all that follows through the undesignated matter following line 5 on page 165, and insert the following:

Subtitle A—Border Emergency Authority

SEC. 1301. BORDER EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 4 of title II of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.), as amended by section 1146(a), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 244B. BORDER EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.

“(a) USE OF AUTHORITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In order to respond to extraordinary migration circumstances, there shall be available to the Secretary, notwithstanding any other provision of law, a border emergency authority.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—The border emergency authority shall not be activated with respect to any of the following:

“(A) A citizen or national of the United States.

“(B) An alien who is lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

“(C) An unaccompanied alien child.

“(D) An alien who an immigration officer determines, with the approval of a supervisory immigration officer, should be excepted from the border emergency authority based on the totality of the circumstances, including consideration of significant law enforcement, officer and public safety, humanitarian, and public health interests, or an alien who an immigration officer determines, in consultation with U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, should be excepted from the border emergency authority due to operational considerations.

“(E) An alien who is determined to be a victim of a severe form of trafficking in persons (as defined in section 103 of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 (22 U.S.C. 7102)).

“(F) An alien who has a valid visa or other lawful permission to enter the United States, including—

“(i) a member of the Armed Forces of the United States and associated personnel,

United States Government employees or contractors on orders abroad, or United States Government employees or contractors, and an accompanying family member who is on orders or is a member of the alien’s household, subject to required assurances;

“(ii) an alien who holds a valid travel document upon arrival at a port of entry;

“(iii) an alien from a visa waiver program country under section 217 who is not otherwise subject to travel restrictions and who arrives at a port of entry; or

“(iv) an alien who presents at a port of entry pursuant to a process approved by the Secretary to allow for safe and orderly entry into the United States.

“(3) APPLICABILITY.—The border emergency authority shall only be activated as to aliens who are not subject to an exception under paragraph (2), and who are, after the authority is activated, within 100 miles of the United States southwest land border and within the 14-day period after entry.

“(b) BORDER EMERGENCY AUTHORITY DESCRIBED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the border emergency authority is activated, the Secretary shall have the authority, in the Secretary’s sole and unreviewable discretion, to summarily remove from and prohibit, in whole or in part, entry into the United States of any alien identified in subsection (a)(3) who is subject to such authority in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—

“(A) SUMMARY REMOVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall issue a summary removal order and summarily remove an alien to the country of which the alien is a subject, national, or citizen (or, in the case of an alien having no nationality, the country of the alien’s last habitual residence), or in accordance with the processes established under section 241, unless the summary removal of the alien to such country would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States.

“(B) WITHHOLDING AND CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE INTERVIEWS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of an alien subject to the border emergency authority who manifests a fear of persecution or torture with respect to a proposed country of summary removal, an asylum officer (as defined in section 235(b)(1)(E)) shall conduct an interview, during which the asylum officer shall determine that, if such alien demonstrates during the interview that the alien has a reasonable possibility of persecution or torture, such alien shall be referred to or placed in proceedings under section 240 or 240D, as appropriate.

“(ii) SOLE MECHANISM TO REQUEST PROTECTION.—An interview under this subparagraph conducted by an asylum officer shall be the sole mechanism by which an alien described in clause (i) may make a claim for protection under—

“(I) section 241(b)(3); and

“(II) the Convention Against Torture.

“(iii) ALIEN REFERRED FOR ADDITIONAL PROCEEDINGS.—In the case of an alien interviewed under clause (i) who demonstrates that the alien is eligible to apply for protection under section 241(b)(3) or the Convention Against Torture, the alien—

“(I) shall not be summarily removed; and

“(II) shall instead be processed under section 240 or 240D, as appropriate.

“(iv) ADDITIONAL REVIEW.—

“(I) OPPORTUNITY FOR SECONDARY REVIEW.—A supervisory asylum officer shall review any case in which the asylum officer who interviewed the alien under the procedures in clause (iii) finds that the alien is not eligible for protection under section 241(b)(3) or the Convention Against Torture.

“(II) VACATUR.—If, in conducting such a secondary review, the supervisory asylum officer determines that the alien demonstrates eligibility for such protection—

“(aa) the supervisory asylum officer shall vacate the previous negative determination; and

“(bb) the alien shall instead be processed under section 240 or 240D.

“(III) SUMMARY REMOVAL.—If an alien does not seek such a secondary review, or if the supervisory asylum officer finds that such alien is not eligible for such protection, the supervisory asylum officer shall order the alien summarily removed without further review.

“(3) ACTIVATIONS OF AUTHORITY.—

“(A) MANDATORY ACTIVATION.—The Secretary shall activate the border emergency authority if there is an average of 1,000 or more aliens encountered per day during a period of 7 consecutive days.

“(B) CALCULATION OF ACTIVATION.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the average for the applicable 7-day period shall be calculated using—

“(i) the sum of—

“(I) the number of encounters that occur between the southwest land border ports of entry of the United States;

“(II) the number of encounters that occur between the ports of entry along the southern coastal borders; and

“(III) the number of inadmissible aliens encountered at a southwest land border port of entry as described in subsection (a)(2)(F)(iv); divided by

“(ii) 7.

“(4) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary shall implement the border emergency authority not later than 24 hours after it is activated.

“(C) CONTINUED ACCESS TO SOUTHWEST LAND BORDER PORTS OF ENTRY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During any activation of the border emergency authority under subsection (b), the Secretary shall maintain the capacity to process, and continue processing, under section 235 or 235B a minimum of 1,400 inadmissible aliens each calendar day cumulatively across all southwest land border ports of entry in a safe and orderly process developed by the Secretary.

“(2) SPECIAL RULES.—

“(A) UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN EXCEPTION.—For the purpose of calculating the number under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall count all unaccompanied alien children.

“(B) TRANSITION RULES.—The provisions of section 244A(c) shall apply to this section.

“(d) BAR TO ADMISSION.—Any alien who, during a period of 365 days, has 2 or more summary removals pursuant to the border emergency authority, shall be inadmissible for a period of 1 year beginning on the date of the alien’s most recent summary removal.

“(e) SAVINGS PROVISIONS.—

“(1) UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILDREN.—Nothing in this section may be construed to interfere with the processing of unaccompanied alien children and such children are not subject to this section.

“(2) SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.—Nothing in this section may be construed to interfere with any rights or responsibilities established through a settlement agreement in effect before the date of the enactment of this section.

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—For purposes of the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, done at Geneva July 28, 1952 (as made applicable by the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, done at New York January 31, 1967 (19 USTC 6223)), the Convention Against Torture, and any other applicable treaty, as applied to this section, the interview under this section shall occur

only in the context of the border emergency authority.

“(f) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—Judicial review of any decision or action applying the border emergency authority shall be governed only by this subsection as follows:

“(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, except as provided in paragraph (2), no court or judge shall have jurisdiction to review any cause or claim by an individual alien arising from the decision to enter a summary removal order against such alien under this section, or removing such alien pursuant to such summary removal order.

“(2) The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have sole and original jurisdiction to hear challenges, whether constitutional or otherwise, to the validity of this section or any written policy directive, written policy guideline, written procedure, or the implementation thereof, issued by or under the authority of the Secretary to implement this section.

“(g) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—This section shall take effect on the day after the date of the enactment of this section.

“(2) 7-DAY PERIOD.—The initial activation of the authority under subparagraph (A) or (B)(i) of subsection (b)(3) shall take into account the average number of encounters during the preceding 7 consecutive calendar days, as described in such subparagraphs, which may include the 6 consecutive calendar days immediately preceding the date of the enactment of this section.

“(h) RULEMAKING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may promulgate such regulations as are necessary to implement this section in compliance with the requirements of section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

“(2) INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION.—Until the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary may issue any interim final rules necessary to implement this section without having to satisfy the requirements of section 553(b)(B) of title 5, United States Code, provided that any such interim final rules shall include a 30-day post promulgation notice and comment period prior to finalization in the Federal Register.

“(3) REQUIREMENT.—All regulations promulgated to implement this section beginning on the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this section shall be issued pursuant to the requirements set forth in section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

“(i) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BORDER EMERGENCY AUTHORITY.—The term ‘border emergency authority’ means all authorities and procedures under this section.

“(2) CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE.—The term ‘Convention Against Torture’ means the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, done at New York December 10, 1984, and includes the regulations implementing any law enacted pursuant to Article 3 of the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, done at New York December 10, 1984.

“(3) ENCOUNTER.—With respect to an alien, the term ‘encounter’ means an alien who—

“(A) is physically apprehended by U.S. Customs and Border Protection personnel—

“(i) within 100 miles of the southwest land border of the United States during the 14-day period immediately after entry between ports of entry; or

“(ii) at the southern coastal borders during the 14-day period immediately after entry between ports of entry; or

“(B) is seeking admission at a southwest land border port of entry and is determined to be inadmissible, including an alien who utilizes a process approved by the Secretary to allow for safe and orderly entry into the United States.

“(4) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

“(5) SOUTHERN COASTAL BORDERS.—The term ‘southern coastal borders’ means all maritime borders in California, Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida.

“(6) UNACCOMPANIED ALIEN CHILD.—The term ‘unaccompanied alien child’ has the meaning given such term in section 462(g)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 279(g)(2)).

“(j) SUNSET.—This section—

“(1) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this section; and

“(2) shall cease to be effective on the day after the first date on which the average daily southwest border encounters has been fewer than 1,000 for 7 consecutive days.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), as amended by section 1146(b), is further amended by inserting after the item relating to section 244A the following:

“Sec. 244B Border emergency authority.”

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have three 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 FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 23, 2024, at 10 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 in executive session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 23, 2024, at 10 a.m.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, May 23, 2024, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Abigail Clark, Addison Cole, Emma Blackmon, Jack Allison, Jaxon Dyer, John Gaston, Mary Douglass Evans, Owen Beaverstock, Preston McGee, and Virginia Anderson be granted floor privileges until August 2, 2024.

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

DR. EMMANUEL BILIRAKIS AND HONORABLE JENNIFER WEXTON NATIONAL PLAN TO END PARKINSON’S ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2365 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2365) to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to carry out a national project to prevent, diagnose, treat, and cure Parkinson’s, to be known as the National Parkinson’s Project, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time.

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

The bill was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the bill, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 2365) was passed.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, a few moments ago, the Senate unanimously passed the National Plan to End Parkinson’s Act, a bill that for the first time marshals Agencies across the government to tackle this disease—this awful disease—in a comprehensive way.

I thank Senators MURPHY and CAPITO and everyone who championed this bill. Parkinson’s is truly a terrible illness. It has taken an awful toll on my own family. My mom suffers from this disease. It is very hard on us. I know Parkinson’s has affected the families of others in this Chamber as well as over a million Americans in this country.

This bill, for the first time, will unite the government in an effort to find a cure for this disease once and for all by promoting better Parkinson’s research, encourage more effective treatments and other measures. With this bill, we are taking one step closer to bringing this awful disease to an end, and I thank everyone who made it possible.

I also, in particular, wish to thank Representative JENNIFER WEXTON, of Virginia, who spent months championing this bill even after being diagnosed with a particularly rare form of Parkinson’s. She is an inspiration. While many would have been discouraged and lost hope with a disease like this, she has endured. She has used her

struggle to help others. Now the bill goes to the President's desk.

PROMOTING A RESOLUTION TO THE TIBET-CHINA DISPUTE ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 367, S. 138.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 138) to amend the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 to modify certain provisions of that Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Promoting a Resolution to the Tibet-China Dispute Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) It has been the long-standing policy of the United States to encourage meaningful and direct dialogue between representatives of the People's Republic of China and the Dalai Lama, his or her representatives, or democratically elected leaders of the Tibetan community, without preconditions, to seek a settlement that resolves differences.

(2) Nine rounds of dialogue held between 2002 and 2010 between the People's Republic of China authorities and the 14th Dalai Lama's representatives failed to produce a settlement that resolved differences, and the two sides have held no formal dialogue since January 2010.

(3) An obstacle to further dialogue is that the Government of the People's Republic of China continues to impose conditions on substantive dialogue with the Dalai Lama, including a demand that he say that Tibet has been part of China since ancient times, which the Dalai Lama has refused to do because it is inaccurate.

(4) Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and Article 1 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights provide, "All peoples have the right of self-determination. By virtue of that right they freely determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development."

(5) The United States Government has never taken the position that Tibet was a part of China since ancient times.

(6) China signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on October 5, 1998, and ratified the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights on March 27, 2001.

(7) Under international law, including United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2625, the right to self-determination is the right of a people to determine its own destiny and the exercise of this right can result in a variety of outcomes ranging from independence, federation, protection, some form of autonomy, or full integration within a State.

(8) United Nations General Assembly Resolution 1723, adopted on December 20, 1961, called for the "cessation of practices which deprive the Tibetan people of their fundamental human rights and freedoms, including their right to self-determination".

(9) Secretary of State Antony Blinken, in a May 26, 2022, speech entitled "The Administration's Approach to the People's Republic of China", said that the rules-based international

order's "founding documents include the UN Charter and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which enshrined concepts like self-determination, sovereignty, the peaceful settlement of disputes. These are not Western constructs. They are reflections of the world's shared aspirations."

(10) The Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 6901 note), as amended by the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2020 (subtitle E of title III of division FF of Public Law 116-260), in directing the United States Government "to promote the human rights and distinct religious, cultural, linguistic, and historical identity of the Tibetan people" acknowledges that the Tibetan people possess a distinct religious, cultural, linguistic, and historical identity.

(11) Department of State reports on human rights and religious freedom have consistently documented systematic repression by the authorities of the People's Republic of China against Tibetans as well as acts of defiance and resistance by Tibetan people against the People's Republic of China policies.

(12) The Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) specifies that the central objective of the United States Special Coordinator for Tibetan Issues is to promote substantive dialogue between the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Dalai Lama, his or her representatives, or democratically elected leaders of the Tibetan community.

SEC. 3. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) that the Tibetan people are a people with a distinct religious, cultural, linguistic, and historical identity;

(2) that the dispute between Tibet and the People's Republic of China must be resolved in accordance with international law, including the United Nations Charter, by peaceful means, through dialogue without preconditions;

(3) that the People's Republic of China should cease its propagation of disinformation about the history of Tibet, the Tibetan people, and Tibetan institutions, including that of the Dalai Lama;

(4) to encourage the People's Republic of China to ratify the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and uphold all its commitments under the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; and

(5) in accordance with the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2020—

(A) to promote substantive dialogue without preconditions, between the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Dalai Lama, his or her representatives, or democratically elected leaders of the Tibetan community, or explore activities to improve prospects for dialogue, that leads to a negotiated agreement on Tibet;

(B) to coordinate with other governments in multilateral efforts towards the goal of a negotiated agreement on Tibet; and

(C) to encourage the Government of the People's Republic of China to address the aspirations of the Tibetan people with regard to their distinct historical, cultural, religious, and linguistic identity.

SEC. 4. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) claims made by officials of the People's Republic of China and the Chinese Communist Party that Tibet has been a part of China since ancient times are historically inaccurate;

(2) the current policies of the People's Republic of China are systematically suppressing the ability of the Tibetan people to preserve their religion, culture, language, history, way of life, and environment;

(3) the Government of the People's Republic of China is failing to meet the expectations of the United States to engage in meaningful dialogue with the Dalai Lama or his representatives or to reach a negotiated resolution that includes the aspirations of the Tibetan people; and

(4) United States public diplomacy efforts should counter disinformation about Tibet from the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Chinese Communist Party, including disinformation about the history of Tibet, the Tibetan people, and Tibetan institutions, including that of the Dalai Lama.

SEC. 5. MODIFICATIONS TO THE TIBETAN POLICY ACT OF 2002.

(a) TIBET NEGOTIATIONS.—Section 613(b) of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ";" and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ";" and;

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(4) efforts to counter disinformation about Tibet from the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Chinese Communist Party, including disinformation about the history of Tibet, the Tibetan people, and Tibetan institutions, including that of the Dalai Lama."

(b) UNITED STATES SPECIAL COORDINATOR FOR TIBETAN ISSUES.—Section 621(d) of the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (6), (7), and (8) as paragraphs (7), (8), and (9), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) work with relevant bureaus of the Department of State and the United States Agency for International Development to ensure that United States Government statements and documents counter, as appropriate, disinformation about Tibet from the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Chinese Communist Party, including disinformation about the history of Tibet, the Tibetan people, and Tibetan institutions, including that of the Dalai Lama;"

(c) DEFINITION.—The Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 (22 U.S.C. 6901 note) is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"SEC. 622. DEFINITION.

"For purposes of this Act, the term 'Tibet' refers to the following areas:

"(1) The Tibet Autonomous Region.

"(2) The areas that the Government of the People's Republic of China designated as Tibetan Autonomous, as of 2018, as follows:

"(A) Kanlho (Gannan) Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, and Pari (Tianzhu) Tibetan Autonomous County located in Gansu Province.

"(B) Golog (Guoluo) Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Malho (Huangnan) Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Tsojang (Haibei) Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Tsohlo (Hainan) Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Tsonub (Hairi) Mongolian and Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, and Yulshul (Yushu) Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, located in Qinghai Province.

"(C) Garze (Ganzi) Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Ngawa (Aba) Tibetan and Qiang Autonomous Prefecture, and Muli (Mili) Tibetan Autonomous County, located in Sichuan Province.

"(D) Dechen (Diqing) Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, located in Yunnan Province."

SEC. 6. AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS TO COUNTER DISINFORMATION ABOUT TIBET.

Amounts authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available under section 346 of the Tibetan Policy and Support Act of 2020 (subtitle E of title III of division FF of Public Law 116-260) are authorized to be made available to counter disinformation about Tibet from the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Chinese Communist Party, including disinformation about the history of Tibet, the Tibetan people, and Tibetan institutions, including that of the Dalai Lama.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to; that

the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The committee-reported amendment, in the nature of a substitute, was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FOSTER CARE MONTH

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 706, submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 706) recognizing National Foster Care Month as an opportunity to raise awareness about the challenges of children in the foster care system, and encouraging Congress to implement policies to improve the lives of children in the foster care system.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 706) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

RECOGNIZING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF JEWISH AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 707, which is at the desk.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 707) recognizing the significance of Jewish American Heritage Month as a time to celebrate the contributions of Jewish Americans to the society and culture of the United States.

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

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

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

The resolution (S. Res. 707) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

COMMEMORATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DESIGNATION OF THE GILA WILDERNESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 708, which was submitted earlier today.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 708) commemorating the 100th anniversary of the designation of the Gila Wilderness.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I know of no further debate on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

Hearing no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 708) was agreed to.

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

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

The preamble was agreed to.

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

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Majority Leader, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, as amended, appoints the following Senator as Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group Conference during the 118th Congress: the Honorable SHELDON WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

JEWISH AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today in recognition of May as Jewish American Heritage Month. Please, if we could just acknowledge that through the resolution that was passed by this body.

Since 1980, when President Jimmy Carter first celebrated Jewish Amer-

ican Heritage Week, our country has come together to recognize Jewish contributions to American culture, history, military, science, government, and more. Over the course of 250 years, since before the Revolutionary War, Jewish-American values and culture have been woven into the fabric of our Nation.

We in the Congress of the United States, despite our political differences, have historically stood united in our support for the Jewish community. This position aligns with our Nation's founding commitment to safeguard the right to worship free of persecution.

Countless Members in this body on both sides of the aisle have quoted George Washington's letter from 1790 to the Hebrew congregation in Newport, RI, in which our first President wrote:

For happily the government of the United States gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens, in giving it on all occasions their effectual support.

Jewish-American heritage commemorations have always shared a mix of celebration—with the anniversary of the founding of the State of Israel—with darker memories and commemorations, such as Holocaust Remembrance Day, Yom HaShoah.

This month, we also honor the victims of the Holocaust and lift up the lives of the survivors, nearly 40,000 of whom live in the United States. These men and women came to this country seeking refuge from unimaginable horrors. They have enriched our Nation and made us stronger.

We have an obligation to provide Holocaust survivors the community support and special services they need to live out their final days, and we must do all we can to ensure their stories are never forgotten.

The split screen between Jewish-American accomplishments and somber reflections is even more intense this year as war continues between Hamas and Israel.

As an American Jew, I can tell you that there is a level of trepidation and fear that has mushroomed throughout the American-Jewish community since the deadly attacks of October 7 by Hamas. In the wake of this horrific terrorism, anti-Semitic activities have soared, with documented verbal and physical threats against Jews in the United States and around the world.

I am pleased to say that, along with the President, majorities in Congress are taking steps and not sitting idly by. Earlier this month, the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act. This bill codifies the U.S. Department of Education's need to consider the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance working definition of "anti-Semitism" when enforcing Federal anti-discrimination laws. This legislation meets the seriousness of this moment

by providing clear guidance to address the full scope of discriminatory, anti-Semitic behavior.

As a cosponsor of the Senate companion, I urge my colleagues to stand with the Jewish-American community and vote for this legislation.

I am also pleased to join my colleagues in cosponsoring the Countering Antisemitism Act, which is bipartisan, bicameral legislation that would strengthen efforts to combat rising anti-Semitism in the United States, including the establishment of a National Coordinator to Counter Antisemitism, who would oversee the Federal efforts to counter domestic anti-Semitism and lead an interagency task force. It requires analyses and threat assessments from executive Agencies and law enforcement on anti-Semitism and violent extremism.

Of great interest to many Marylanders is that the Countering Antisemitism Act also requires the FEMA Administrator to ensure the Agency has sufficient resources and personnel needed to carry out the Nonprofit Security Grant Program, which provides critical security equipment and upgrades for many faith-based institutions and facilities across our State.

We are building on President Biden's National Strategy to Combat Antisemitism—the first ever—that identifies the problem we face today.

It states:

Loud voices are normalizing this venom, but we must never allow it to become normal. Antisemitism threatens not only the Jewish community, but all Americans.

I would like to take this moment to praise the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum and its incredible staff for its efforts to counter misinformation and disinformation. I am proud to be a member of the museum's advisory council.

The U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum has always put education and countering anti-Semitism at the forefront of its mission and activities. Since October 7, it has ramped up in an unprecedented way and further cemented its role as an indispensable resource as well as a myth-buster in this national and international fight against anti-Semitism and hate.

Anti-Semitism did not start with the Hamas attacks. From the White supremacists chanting "Jews will not replace us" in Charlottesville, forcing Jews to leave their synagogue through the back door, to the rightwing extremist, armed with an AR-15 rifle and three handguns, who attacked the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh, killing 11 Jews and leaving 7 others wounded, this has been a violent scourge that goes back centuries.

No matter what your political affiliation, we all must speak out against this hatred and correct the misinformation that breeds it. The sobering reality is that threats against Jews continue to rise—not just in the United States but also around the world.

Just since 2015, I have had the honor to serve as the Special Representative

on Combatting Anti-Semitism, Racism and Intolerance for the parliamentary assembly of the world's largest regional security organization, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, best known as the OSCE. I have used this role to urge the OSCE's 57 participating states, the United States included, to develop strategies and invest the political will and resources necessary to eradicate hate by developing and sharing best practices, building broad-based interfaith coalitions, educating young people, and countering Holocaust denial and distortions.

Just as the obligation to combat anti-Semitism is not just an American endeavor, it is also not just a Jewish endeavor. The responsibility to rid our society of the scourge of anti-Semitism is a shared responsibility.

I was proud to be part of the U.S. delegation to the Berlin conference. In Berlin, Germany, in 2004, OSCE's participating states declared that anti-Semitism is a threat not only to Jews everywhere but also to democracy, human rights, and international stability. When societies permit anti-Semitism to thrive, they also allow conspiracies and disinformation and hate in all its forms to thrive.

In extreme cases, ignoring anti-Semitism can lead not only to the erosion of public trust in democratic institutions and the media, but it can foster extremism and lead to violence.

With the dangerous rise of anti-Semitism in recent months in the United States, Jewish students and faculty have been blocked from attending classes or campus events and have been regularly harassed and attacked on campus. Many are scared to attend classes or walk around. Jewish businesses and synagogues have been vandalized. Students and nonstudents have expressed concern about wearing clothing or jewelry that might be used to identify them as Jewish.

Throughout my career in public service, I have stood for the right of individuals everywhere to free speech and peaceful protests—even if I vehemently disagree with what they are saying. But it is another thing to target, threaten, and harass Jewish students or faculty on the basis of their identity.

As President Joe Biden said at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum recently, "Violent attacks, destroying property is not peaceful protest. It's against the law. And we are not a lawless country. We're a civil society. We uphold the rule of law. No one should have to hide or be brave just to be themselves."

As a Jewish American, I was raised with the understanding that *tikkun olam*, or repairing the world, was an essential part of every community. Through acts of charity, justice, and kindness, we were encouraged to make things better for those in need. This has been my mission over the years, and it is no hyperbole to say that it is

more important today than ever before.

The Jewish people have survived the Holocaust. We have overcome terrorist attacks and anti-Semitism before. By holding fast to our values, we as a Jewish community will overcome these difficult times too.

So I want to end with a quote from Anne Frank, who was reflecting on the difficult times she was seeing when she wrote:

I see the world being slowly transformed into a wilderness, I hear the approaching thunder that, one day, will destroy us too, I feel the suffering of millions. And yet, when I look up at the sky, I somehow feel that everything will change for the better, that this cruelty too will end, that peace and tranquility will return once more.

My wish during this Jewish American Heritage Month is that we as Americans, Jews and non-Jews alike, find a way to come together. Only by rejecting anti-Semitism and all forms of hate, racism, and xenophobia will we find a path forward where all people can live together in peace and stability, with an abundance of hope and opportunity.

I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from Alabama.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, our national anthem closes with the lines "O say does that star-spangled banner yet wave, o'er the land of the free, and the home of the brave?" Usually sung as a declaration, the song's author actually intended for this to be a question, because while we often take our freedom as a guarantee, it should never be taken for granted.

President Ronald Reagan once said:

Freedom is a fragile thing and it's never more than one generation away from extinction. It is not ours by way of inheritance; it must be fought for and defended constantly by each generation, for it comes only once to a people. And those in world history who have known freedom and then lost it have never known it again.

Our freedom depends on men and women who are willing to defend it no matter what the cost.

This coming weekend, we will observe Memorial Day. It started as Decoration Day for the 1860s. Congress made Memorial Day a national holiday in 1968.

Many people would take this day as an opportunity to cook out, go to the lake, go to the pool, be around friends, but that is not the purpose of this day. It is a time to reflect on the sacrifices that have been made for all of our freedom—those who made the ultimate sacrifice and the honorable families they leave behind.

I think we can all agree our fallen heroes deserve to be remembered for more than one day a year. That is why I introduced the resolution to designate May as "Fallen Heroes Memorial Month." I appreciate my friend

Congressman DAN BISHOP of North Carolina for introducing this resolution in the House. I hope our colleagues will join us in passing this resolution because there is no cause more deserving for our time and effort.

Setting aside a month to recognize our fallen servicemembers and their families instead of one day is the least we all can do.

HONORING MESS ATTENDANT FIRST CLASS JOHNNIE LAURIE

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize some of Alabama's fallen soldiers who have paid freedom's high cost and the families who still grieve their absence. You know, it is estimated that more than 81,000 American soldiers who gave their lives for our country remain unidentified—unidentified—since World War I.

For nearly 80 years, this was the case for Alabama's own Mess Attendant First Class Johnnie Laurie of Bessemer, AL. Johnnie was very active at the Red Mountain Baptist Church teaching both Sunday school and Baptist young people's union classes.

He graduated from Dunbar High School, where he competed in basketball and high jumping in track.

In 1940, Johnnie joined the U.S. Navy and was later assigned to serve aboard the USS *Oklahoma*. He was aboard the ship on the fateful day of December 7, 1941, when our country was attacked by Japanese aircraft.

Unfortunately, Johnnie was one of the 2,403 Americans who died at Pearl Harbor that day. He was awarded several medals posthumously, including a Purple Heart for paying the ultimate sacrifice.

Out of the 429 crewmen aboard the ship, the Central Identification Laboratory was only able to identify 35 of the 429. This mystery seemed like it would never be solved. But in July 2019, Johnnie Laurie's remains were identified, and he was finally able to return to his home State of Alabama to receive a proper hero's welcome. He is now buried at the Alabama National Cemetery in Montevallo, AL.

His brother Elmer, now 94 years old, continues to participate in memorial ceremonies to ensure the sacrifices of fallen heroes like his brother are never, ever forgotten.

HONORING LANCE CORPORAL THOMAS RIVERS, JR.

Mr. TUBERVILLE. Mr. President, for many of our heroes, the desire to serve began at an early age. That is the case of LCpl Thomas Rivers, Jr., of Hoover, AL. His parents and Thomas knew as a child that he wanted to be a marine, his lifelong dream. This desire only grew throughout his life, and he was motivated in everything that he did by this thought of becoming a marine.

He struggled, at first, in high school until a military recruiter told him he would need a high school diploma to

enlist. Low grades were never a problem after that conversation. This was evidenced in an English essay he wrote entitled "Why I Want to Go Into the Marines." In the essay, he wrote in part:

I don't think I would be afraid of combat and would be proud to fight for my country.

He went on to say:

I believe that joining the Marines would be a great experience for me because it will teach me to rely on God to make it through.

Thomas joined the Marines as soon as he graduated from Briarwood Christian School in 2007. After completing training at Camp Lejeune, he deployed to Iraq and then to Afghanistan. His faith never wavered, despite the intense conditions of combat he was in almost daily.

He and one of his friends, one night, began a Bible study while deployed, leaning on passages of the Bible for comfort.

Corporal Rivers was killed by an IED explosion at the age of 22. His mother Charon spoke about how she never really got to know the fine young man she raised as he grew to be an adult.

Between deployments, he was unable to spend much time at home. Despite the devastating loss, Charon and her husband Tom find comfort in their faith and the belief that lives were changed through their son's story.

After Thomas's passing, Charon began a nonprofit that sent care packages to soldiers on the front lines of battle because she remembered how much Thomas loved receiving things from home. Through her efforts, she was able to send more than 5,000 care packages to soldiers overseas over an 8-year span.

Charon's reminder to us is that, for families like hers, Memorial Day isn't a happy holiday or just another day at the pool or cooking out. It is a day to remember heroes like her son Thomas, who answered the call to serve and courageously laid down his life for ours.

You know, President Franklin Roosevelt once said:

Those who have long enjoyed such privileges as we enjoy forget in time that men have died to win them.

May we as Americans be a Nation that remembers the sacrifices made for the many freedoms that we all enjoy—not just on Memorial Day, but every day of the year.

May we never forget those like Johnnie Laurie or Thomas Rivers who didn't allow freedom to die on their watch, and may we hold their families near to our hearts as we go into this Memorial Day weekend.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

BORDER ACT OF 2024

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, as though with the voice of God, I have been recognized. And I rise to address what just happened here. Senator

SCHUMER's failed attempt to resurrect a failed immigration bill in a bipartisan beatdown.

But, first, let me recite some numbers: In fiscal year 2021, there were 387,000 known "got-aways." In fiscal year 2022, there were 606,131 known "got-aways." In fiscal year 2023, there were 670,000 known "got-aways."

Because of Joe Biden's disastrous border policies, there are nearly 10 million people who have crossed our border illegally, dispersed throughout the United States—many of whom we have no idea who they are, where they are from; some given court dates. We hope they return sometime in the 2030s.

Thousands and thousands of Chinese nationals have illegally crossed our border since Joe Biden took office. The DEA has stated that the most ruthless Mexican cartels now operate in all 50 States. The American people are more at risk now from a terror attack than they have been since 9/11.

How did we get here? The answer is pretty simple: Joe Biden reversed nearly every successful Trump-era policy that was working to secure our border. We had a 45-year low in illegal immigration at the end of 2020.

That has all changed. His administration reversed the "Remain-in-Mexico" policy. His administration attempted to sell border wall materials that had been sitting and rusting at an extreme discount. He paused deportations. He took nearly a hundred actions in his first hundred days to weaken our border security and signal to the cartels that our border was open for their business, a deadly business.

I said from the beginning that Joe Biden has all the authority he needs to shut the border down right now. He could have shut down the border as illegal immigration numbers shattered record after record; but he didn't. And he won't. And now the American people are seeing the absolute carnage caused by Joe Biden's policies.

Democrats are attempting to give Joe Biden cover by wasting our time on this vote that we just saw that went down on a vote for a bill that had already failed. Why? I think some people actually believe in open borders. They have no real problem with this. They believe that borders are arbitrary lines on a map. But the risk for Americans are real.

And what happened on this floor—I try to draw some analogy. Seinfeld was a great show—great show—and it was famously cast as a show about nothing. This week was a show about nothing: no vehicles, no amendments on anything substantive that could help the American people—just this kabuki theater that we just witnessed.

My criticisms of that bill—that we won't hear now, thankfully—are the same as they were in February. This bill would have changed the jurisdiction from immigration law related cases from Texas to Washington, DC.

This "break glass" emergency authority is a disaster. This bill would

have only potentially shut down the border if there were 5,000 illegal crossings per day. That is over a million people per year. Somehow we would normalize the idea that a million people can come here illegally before we would take this seriously. That would be a step backwards in our law.

The law currently is—and it has been across Republican and Democratic administrations—that if you come here, you are apprehended, and you are sent back, unless there is some special reason for you to stay, like asylum. And 9 out of 10 of those claims are, typically, bogus.

But what else did this bill do? It created more asylum agents to create an express lane in a path for citizenship at the border, outside of the normal judicial process we have where it is an adversarial hearing. Those wouldn't exist anymore under this bill.

And, most importantly, this bill gave the architect of the border invasion, Joe Biden, unilateral authority to terminate the bill's meaningless trigger I just mentioned.

This bill failed for a reason. Now it has failed twice for a reason. It took us backwards. But I think it is very important for us to remember that we have an executive branch right now that isn't interested in executing the law. Joe Biden has every authority under the Sun to close this border; he just doesn't want to.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Iowa.

FARM BILL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come today to provide some real world perspective from what I call the real America. I am honored to speak on behalf of the tens of thousands of Iowa farmers who, this very day, are tending fields across my home State that feed and fuel America.

I often remind people here in Washington that farmers make up only 2 percent of our population. That means that the other 98 percent of the American people depend on the livelihoods of just 2 percent of the people for their next meal.

Here in the U.S. Senate, I am one of only two grain farmers serving among 98 other lawmakers in this body. This puts me in a unique position. As a lifelong family farmer and a U.S. Senator, I use my platform to speak up on behalf of American farmers, and I know there are lots of other colleagues that I have in this body that do the same thing for the farmers in their State, but I think I do it with some hands-on experience.

From one generation to the next, the way of life of these family farmers upholds our Nation's food security and, in recent decades, has strengthened U.S. energy independence.

The productivity of American agriculture has empowered the family farmer to supply the grain for our do-

mestic renewable fuels industry and to displace foreign oil in the U.S. transportation fleet.

America's farmers embrace best conservation practices to strengthen soil health and precision agriculture to reduce their carbon footprint in food and fuel production.

Now, it happens that my State is No. 1 producer of corn and ethanol and No. 1 in a couple of other areas that I won't go into. Clean-burning, renewable fuels are better for the environment, lower greenhouse gas emissions, and create good jobs in rural America and fuels the economic growth of that same rural America. When it comes to the hard work and ingenuity of the American farmers, the sky is the limit, quite literally.

Now, to the point of my remarks today to my colleagues: Let's consider sustainable aviation fuel and alternate fuel made from nonpetroleum feedstocks, something the environmental community in the United States is promoting to get greenhouse gas down.

Scientists say that this next-generation fuel will help lower carbon emissions in the environment. That is a pretty big shoe print, considering aviation accounts for 2 percent of all carbon dioxide emissions and 12 percent for the transportation sector alone.

Sustainable aviation fuel—that goes by the acronym SAF—has tremendous market potential. According to the U.S. Department of Energy, more than 360,000 commercial flights have used SAF at 46 airports, mostly in the United States and Europe. That is really just a spit in the ocean, considering there are more than 10 million scheduled passenger flights in the United States per year, according to our FAA.

Displacing conventional jet fuel with sustainable products, such as home-grown feedstocks, presents a tremendous market opportunity for America's farmers and at the same time reduces greenhouse gas emissions.

I am proud to say that Iowa is a leader in clean energy. Nearly 20 years ago, I worked to enact the renewable fuel standard and to this very day keep my thumbs on both Democrat and Republican administrations to faithfully implement the law as Congress intended.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I also created the biodiesel tax credit that has helped to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by around 74 percent.

Last year, my home State produced a recordbreaking 4.6 billion gallons of ethanol and 350 million gallons of biodiesel.

Iowa farmers stand ready to help scale up production of this sustainable aviation fuel—the next generation of airplane and aviation fuel. But it seems that partisan ideology might be standing in the way of that effort.

While we can find unanimous agreement that clean air is good for everyone, finding agreement on public policies to help keep our air clean is not always so clear-cut. In Washington, it is

even harder than finding a needle in a haystack.

Many people in this town would find reason to argue if the sky was blue on a cloudless, sunny day. The consensus really clouds over when Federal bureaucrats bend policy to fit ideology instead of sound science.

In December of 2022, I spoke on this very floor to urge the Treasury Department not to shortchange America's farmers when it wrote rules for the sustainable aviation fuel tax credit.

Unfortunately, when the Democrats wrote the partisan Inflation Reduction Act, they chose to ignore our very own Department of Energy and preferred modeling by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Now, that is pure poppycock. U.S. policymakers need to put America first. That is why I pressed USDA Secretary Tom Vilsack at a hearing in February this year to champion green feedstocks for the sustainable aviation fuel market because he is a big voice in this administration.

America's farmers are ready to provide low-cost and low-carbon fuel to consumers, whether that is on land, air, or sea.

For years, I have been fighting in the trenches to stop the Obama and Biden administrations from misguided regulatory schemes. I am glad that the Supreme Court recently kept check on their ridiculous plans, commonly known as the waters of the United States rule, that would have regulated dry creekbeds and mud puddles on family farms.

When the government starts meddling and telling farmers how to farm and how to raise livestock, you can bet your boots that environmental extremists are bending the ears of bureaucrats and pushing policies disconnected from reality. Writing Federal regulations not backed up by science or common sense is hogwash.

Two weeks ago, the Biden administration put lipstick on a pig when it released guidance to qualify for new Federal incentives for sustainable aviation fuel.

So as the senior Senator from Iowa and a lifelong family farmer, I am here to squeal on the Biden administration's stupid regulations. The decision-making process clearly got mired in politics and bureaucratic nonsense, not the sound science that has governed this process for about three decades.

So let's take a closer look at the guidance issued by the Treasury Department 2 weeks ago. The regulations would be used to implement section 40B sustainable aviation fuel tax credit. That is the Federal subsidy enacted in the Inflation Reduction Act to help this alternative fuel lift off and scale up to meet market demand.

Unfortunately, rather than adopt the science-based GREET—I am going to spell that because it is an acronym, G-R-E-E-T. The science-based GREET model has been used by EPA and others to measure the carbon intensity of

biofuels, and they have been using that formula for decades.

Now, the Biden administration guidelines instead played politics by adopting an untested and untried modified GREET model to determine lifecycle carbon emissions of corn and soybeans for the purpose of calculating who can qualify for this sustainable aviation fuel tax credit, and therein lies the rub.

Let me explain. First, everything in Washington goes by an acronym. GREET stands for these words that I don't know how you connect the title with the acronym, but here is what it says: G-R-E-E-T stands for "Greenhouse gases, Regulated emissions, and Energy use in Technology."

The Department of Energy's Argonne National Laboratory—a very respected laboratory—began developing the GREET analysis 30 years ago, back in 1994.

So that is why I said we have had decades of the use of this. It was a science-based agreement that they came to for this formula, and now, the politicians step in to reform it or to change it.

Scientists use the methodology to analyze the environmental impacts associated with all stages of the supply chain.

Now, in a nutshell, the Federal Government three decades ago launched a process to measure the energy output and environmental performance that could inform policies throughout government of energy efficiency, affordability, and sustainability.

Scientists develop models for particular purposes to evaluate, say, greenhouse gas emissions, water consumption, and air pollutant emissions.

Let me pause here to make an important distinction. Nonpartisan scientists develop methodologies to inform policymaking. These methodologies should not be used by political scientists to advance a political agenda. So you can understand my dismay when I reviewed the Biden administration's new formula to qualify for sustainable aviation fuel tax credit.

First, the guidelines, quite, obviously, were written by bureaucrats who don't know the first thing about family farming; and, second, the formula is flawed from another fundamental standpoint: It is going to be easy to violate and nearly impossible to verify and complicate decision-making for the family farmer.

To put it very bluntly, the Biden administration's GREET model update is a stupid approach. While the lion's share of Washington can agree that more widespread use of sustainable aviation fuel is good for the environment, the new GREET model fell victim to a political lion's den.

The Biden administration caved to extreme environmentalists who wouldn't know the difference between a corn planter or a combine, let alone what the effects of uneven emergence means on crop yields or how soil compaction impacts germination of seed.

Every spring, farmers try to hit the "Goldilocks" sweet spot: not too wet, not too dry, with just the right soil temperature when they plant to produce the best possible yields.

Every field on every farm is different. For example, no-till versus what we call conservation tillage is tailored to the requirements of that farm. And some of those requirements are based upon the soil conservancy law that I helped pass in 1986.

Farmers are stewards of the soil, passing down this heritage from one generation to the next. It is obvious that the Biden administration either doesn't care or doesn't get that its GREET formula is pigheaded.

The formula says all or nothing in order for farmers to qualify as a sustainable aviation fuel producer and help the aviation industry achieve its clear goals.

America's farmers stand ready to help clean the air, and I am here today to clear the air on how the Biden administration is standing in their way.

For those who want to argue that these regulations make sense, let me explain why they won't work in the real America. Let's consider the practical impact of the Biden administration's proposed rule. In the fall, when crops are harvested, the grain is transported from the field to the market. From the combine, it goes into a wagon or a truck that takes it to the local elevator.

On my family farm, we go to the local elevator in New Hartford. Tens of thousands of farmers are doing the same thing. In fact, in Iowa, it is 86,000 family farmers. I say "doing the same thing." That means either hauling it straight from the field or, after a period of on-farm storage, then taking it to market. Sooner or later, grains are weighed, graded, and commingled with hundreds of millions of bushels of grain from fields across the State—all coming from those 86,000 different family farmers in my State.

Do you see where I am going here? Let me summarize.

First, to qualify for the maximum SAF credit and additional carbon intensity score reductions, the Biden administration dictates that farmers must comply with the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Climate Smart Agriculture pilot program, and that requires compliance with the following mandates on the same acres: You have to practice what we call no-till farming. You have to plant cover crops in the fall, after you harvest, to protect the ground through the winter and, more importantly, not to have soil loss in the spring. Then you have to use enhanced-efficiency nitrogen fertilizer.

Now, when we first heard about this, what direction they might go, it said you would only have to apply for one of these three in order to get the tax credit. That is when the outrageous opinions of environmentalists came in and said: No. We have to have them apply to all three.

I don't think that these bureaucrats think in terms of the fall and that if you don't harvest the last of your corn crop until November and the ground freezes, you can't plant cover crops at that time. You have to plant your cover crops in the early spring so that they grow and get some root and can preserve that root through the spring and turn green the next spring. But if it is frozen, you can't do that. That is just one example that makes me wonder if these bureaucrats in Washington know what they are talking about.

Now, for the soybean farmer, it is a little less in the number of requirements. You just have to do no-till farming and plant cover crops in the same acres.

The fact is that not every—let me emphasize this—climate-smart practice that the USDA has works on every farm in the same way. In this town, one size fits all. The GREET update, then, is unworkable for the family farmer. Unrealistic burdens on farming are counterproductive to feeding and fueling the world.

Let me entertain the idea that farmers who want to participate have complied with all of these criteria. Now they must pass another dog and pony show: The sustainable aviation fuel producers or importers must get unrelated third-party verification that their feedstocks have met eligibility requirements. Of course, only accredited verifiers can grant certification to these individual farmers. This la-la land of verification will be paved with endless miles of redtape and loopholes as far as the eye can see.

The Biden administration's changes to the GREET model need a do-over. Bureaucrats who know nothing about farming shouldn't be telling farmers how to grow their corn and soybeans. This is the kind of policy that farmers resent—and rightly so—because it is out of touch with what actually goes on on the family farm. President Biden is abandoning Iowa farmers with this boneheaded update.

Now, I think there might be a little bit of good news if rumors around this town mean anything. I think there are a lot of people in this bureaucracy—and there are four bureaucracies involved in making these sustainable aviation fuel rules. It is only the Treasury that announces them, but other Departments have a hand in it. I think there are people right here in this town who know what I describe that is wrong with these rules and are ready to rewrite them. Of course, these rules were written for what we call the section 40B tax credit rules. That expires at the end of this year. Then there is going to be a new rule. Section 45Z will take over. Maybe we will have a whole bunch of new faces in town after the first of the year, when those rules are read, but I think people even today realize that what I have described here isn't workable.

So as Washington prepares to distribute tens of billions of dollars in

Federal incentives for sustainable aviation fuel, I will continue to battle on behalf of the American farmer and taxpayer.

From the IRS to the EPA and the USDA, the alphabet soup of Federal Agencies makes consequential decisions that impact the lives and livelihoods of real people, from the taxpayers to small businesses and family farmers across America.

The Biden administration's GREET model needs to stick with sound science, not political science.

Before I yield the floor, I ask unanimous consent that newspaper articles from the May 8 issue of the Iowa Farm Bureau Spokesman newspaper—a front-page story entitled "Sustainable Aviation Fuel Tax Credit Rules Announced" and, on page 11 of the same newspaper, a section entitled "Questions Surround Impact of SAF Guidance"—be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUSTAINABLE AVIATION FUEL TAX CREDIT
RULES ANNOUNCED
[May 6, 2024]

The U.S. Treasury Department issued its long-awaited rules for the sustainable aviation fuel (SAF) 40B tax credit last week, but biofuel and farm groups say the requirements have created more questions than answers.

The SAF tax credit, established by the Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) in 2022, aims to incentivize the production of SAF that achieves a lifecycle greenhouse gas (GHG) reduction of at least 50% when compared to petroleum-based jet fuels. The administration has laid out goals for producing at least 3 billion gallons of SAF annually by 2030 and up to 35 billion gallons annually by 2050.

SAF that meets the 50% GHG reduction qualifies for a tax credit of \$1.25 per gallon, with additional incentives up to \$1.75 per gallon for greater reductions.

However, biofuel advocates say the rules authored by the Treasury Department and Internal Revenue Service are overly restrictive and prescribe specific farming practices that may not be practical in all areas of the country.

"As the top producing state of lower cost and cleaner-burning biofuels, sustainable aviation fuel is an emerging market with huge potential for Iowa agriculture," said Iowa Secretary of Agriculture Mike Naig. "Unfortunately, the Biden administration is once again telling Iowa farmers that Washington, D.C., knows best. The administration's proposal mandates rigid requirements that ignore the innovation of agriculture and fails to recognize farmers' ability to incorporate the practices that work best for their individual operations."

The 40B tax credit rules incorporate an updated version of the Greenhouse Gases, Regulated Emissions, Energy Use in Technologies (GREET) model to measure the lifecycle emissions from SAF, including updated modeling of feedstocks and processes used in aviation fuel and indirect emissions.

Corn must be grown with no-till, cover crops and enhanced efficiency fertilizer to be eligible for the tax credit. For SAF produced from soybeans to qualify, farmers must use both cover crops and no-till. There also are rules for certifying that the crops were grown with climate-smart practices and extensive record-keeping requirements.

"This administration has continually pursued a one-size-fits-all approach that puts

domestic energy production, like homegrown ethanol, at a disadvantage to international competitors. Yesterday's guidance is more of the same," Naig said. "While inclusion of the GREET model is a welcome step, the details need to be right, and the administration has more work to do. I know Iowa's congressional delegation will be working to ensure that Iowa's farmers and biofuel producers will be able to realize the full potential that SAF offers."

Industry analysts note that very few farmers will be able to take advantage of the 40B credit this year since they likely haven't documented the required practices. Current SAF production levels are also very small.

In January, LanzaJet opened an SAF production facility in Georgia that will produce 10 million gallons of SAF from ethanol. The company is reportedly using Brazilian sugarcane ethanol as a feedstock due to its lower GHG lifecycle score.

The Section 40B credit expires at the end of this year and will be replaced by a new, more expansive tax credit, called 45Z. However, the rules have yet to be written for 45Z and aren't expected until mid to late winter.

QUESTIONS SURROUND IMPACT OF SAF
GUIDANCE

The Biden administration last week gave guidance on its sustainable aviation fuel (SAF) tax credits that have been long awaited by both corn growers and environmentalists. We've been told since February that an announcement was expected, and it was delayed several times between then and now. Such is the world of politics. While the announcement is a step in the right direction, it may have brought about more questions than answers. Here's what we know so far.

The bottom line for corn growers is that corn-based ethanol will be allowed to qualify for the tax credit program. This is a win for an industry that has been losing global market share to South America for the past several years.

According to the policy, there are three stipulations to qualification. These include the use of no-till practices, the use of cover crops and the use of enhanced-efficiency fertilizer that holds carbon in the soil. All three practices must be done on the same field and must be able to be certified for the corn to qualify. For soybeans (as it pertains to biodiesel), qualification is dependent on the use of just no-till and cover cropping.

The bottom line for the markets is that this has little to no effect on supply and demand for the current crop year.

There is currently one singular plant producing SAF online in the United States; therefore, demand is limited to that one plant's needs. There is also uncertainty about whether corn ethanol or soy biodiesel produced from fields using all the climate-smart ag practices will be competitive against other low-carbon feedstocks without carbon sequestration. Carbon sequestration is, more or less, the practice of storing carbon under the ground. Many of you have probably heard talk of carbon pipelines recently; those are what, in theory, would take the carbon from an ethanol plant or biodiesel plant and transport it underground to be stored.

The last piece we know is that the Section 40b tax credit, the policy's official name, is only in effect through the end of 2024. In 2025, a broader tax incentive known as 45Z will take effect. There wasn't guidance given on 45Z, likely because there is a presidential election between now and then—the results of which likely determine whether the credit is still around in 2025 and whether corn and soybeans will qualify under the new rules.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

MEMORIAL DAY

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, on the last Monday in May, our Nation sets aside the day to remember, honor, and pay respects to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice in our Nation's military. Flags are flown at cemeteries, and families visit the graves and war memorials. They are sharing and reliving memories of the ones we have lost.

This Memorial Day will be different for the family of U.S. Army SGT John O. Herrick. Nearly 80 years ago, Sergeant Herrick was killed off the coast of Normandy, and his body was never identified. The ending to his story was left unwritten until earlier this year, when his family received word that their soldier would soon be coming home 80 years later.

During World War II, Sergeant Herrick was assigned to Company B of the 149th Engineer Combat Battalion in the European theatre. He was on board Landing Craft Infantry 92, alongside 200 other servicemembers on the way to Omaha Beach, when the craft was hit by an underwater mine. Everyone on board was killed.

At the tender age of 19, on June 6, 1944, during the D-day landings, Sergeant Herrick paid the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation's freedom.

Sergeant Herrick—a young boy from a small town, Allen, with a population of about 100—is memorialized on the Normandy American Cemetery's Walls of the Missing. When I was there, I saw his name.

There are many heroes like Sergeant Herrick whose names are only remembered in the hearts of their descendants and etched in stone at places like the Vietnam Memorial wall and the white crosses at Arlington Cemetery.

Remembering and honoring the sacrifice of these heroes is not only the right thing to do, it is really important for our Nation. Hopefully, it pulls us together, not pulls us apart. We must never forget the great cost paid by our servicemembers and their loved ones as they fought fascism in Europe, tyranny in the Pacific, or terrorism in the Middle East. Their sacrifice has protected our freedoms and our Union.

One way the stories of these fallen servicemembers is being preserved is through the Veterans Legacy Program, which works to uncover the stories of fallen servicemembers and make them available to the public. The Veterans Legacy Program provides grants to educational institutions and community organizations to conduct historical research on veterans buried in national cemeteries and to share those veterans' stories through an educational program.

To help further the mission of the Veterans Legacy Program, I introduced, with Senator MAZIE HIRONO, my colleague from Hawaii, a bill entitled

Honoring Veterans' Legacies and Burial Benefits Enhancements Act. This legislation would establish a nonprofit that would be able to accept private donations that would be used to fund the Veterans Legacy Program, operated by the Department of Veterans Affairs. Furthering the mission of the VLP will help to create and preserve a collection of the stories of our Nation's heroes.

How we memorialize and how we honor our veterans when they have passed sends a message to their families and to our current and future servicemembers that we value the past, the present, and the future sacrifices made by those in military service. Doing so not only honors our fallen servicemembers but encourages another generation of Americans to model their lives after Sergeant Herrick and others who gave their lives in devotion to country.

When Sergeant Herrick is laid to rest later this year on Veterans Day, in Emporia, KS, where Veterans Day was first celebrated, hopefully his life and his story lives on in our hearts and is remembered, retold, and revered on this and every Memorial Day to come.

Mr. President, I will say what I said to my dad when I called him from the World War II Memorial shortly before it was dedicated. I called home to Plainville, KS, to say to my dad:

I am at the World War II Memorial. Dad, I want you to know this memorial—built in your honor—causes me to tell you: Dad, I respect you. I appreciate your service. And, Dad, I love you.

This Memorial Day, I no longer can say that to my dad.

Incidentally, on my way back to the Capitol from that visit, my phone rang. It was my dad.

He said:

Gerald, you left me a message. Could you repeat it? I didn't understand it.

I can't repeat it to my dad any longer—he is no longer living—but we can use this Memorial Day and every other day to say just exactly what I said to my dad then, a World War II veteran:

Dad, and to every servicemember and to every veteran, we respect you, we appreciate your service, and we love you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FETTERMAN).

The Senator from New Jersey.

OLDER AMERICANS MONTH

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent today, on the floor of the U.S. Senate, that the Senate itself proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 712, submitted earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 712) designating May 2024 as "Older Americans Month".

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

Mr. BOOKER. I ask consent from all of my colleagues—otherwise known as unanimous consent—that this resolution be agreed to, that the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid plain upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 712) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore and upon the recommendation of the Republican leader, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, as amended, appoints the following Senator as vice chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group Conference during the 118th Congress: the Honorable JOHN BOOZMAN of Arkansas.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, MAY 24, 2024, THROUGH MONDAY, JUNE 3, 2024, AT 3 P.M.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I ask again for the consent of all of my colleagues, unanimous consent, that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to then convene for pro forma sessions only, with no business being conducted, on the following days and times: Friday, May 24, at 10 a.m.; Tuesday, May 28, at 10:30 a.m.; and Friday, May 31, at 4:30 p.m.; further, that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, May 31, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 3; that on Monday, following the prayer and the Pledge of Allegiance to the United States of America, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for both leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Hanson nomination; and, further, that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, it is a privilege to say that if there is no further business to come before the U.S. Senate, I would like to ask humbly to you, sir, that the U.S. Senate stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:01 p.m., adjourned until Friday, May 24, 2024, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

WILLIAM ISAAC WHITE, OF WEST VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 18, 2028, VICE JESSIE HILL ROBERSON, TERM EXPIRED.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

REBECCA L. HEINRICH, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2024, VICE GEORGETTE MOSBACHER, TERM EXPIRED.

REBECCA L. HEINRICH, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2027. (REAPPOINTMENT)

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

STEPHANIE E. SEGAL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND FOR A TERM OF TWO YEARS, VICE SUNIL SABHARWAL, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

LAUREN MCGARITY MCFERRAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2029. (REAPPOINTMENT)

JOSHUA L. DITTELBERG, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD FOR THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING DECEMBER 16, 2027, VICE JOHN F. RING, TERM EXPIRED.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

BETHANY PICKETT SHAH, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2025, VICE JOHN B. NALBANDIAN, RESIGNED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. GORDON R. MEYER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. CARRIE L. PEREZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. ADAM K. AKE
COL. ANDREW D. CECIL
COL. JOHN M. DUNN

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

WARREN K. BLACKBURN
CLINTON S. BRYANT
JEFFREY W. CARIDEO
BRENDAN T. CASEY
JON K. CHRISTENSEN
BRITTA W. CHRISTIANSON
HYONG Y. CHU
MARCUS M. CRAIG
ROBERT R. CULLINAN
VICTOR A. CUNNINGHAM
PAUL G. DEVORSE
ADESINA EKUNDAYO
LEE H. EUBANKS
DANNY L. EWING, JR.
JASON V. ILETO
MICHAEL A. KIDD
NOEL K. KOENIG
KONRAD R. KRUPA
ANAS E. MAAZOUZI
JOSHUA R. MELCHERT
SEAN R. MOODY
CARRIE L. PABEN
ROBERT D. SALIRE
MICHAEL P. SARGENT
ERIKA M. SCHOENTHAL
JAMES L. VENCKUS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

JOHN D. AULT
ALLEN K. BROOKS

DANIEL L. CURTIS
CRISTIANO S. DESOUSA
PETER W. DIETZ
GENEVIEVE M. FISHERCLARK
DOUGLAS A. GRACE
DAVID J. JELTEMA
ROBERT D. JOHNSON
ROBERT L. JONES, JR.
DAVID D. J. KIM
SUNNY MITCHELL
THOMAS P. OFLANAGAN
ROBERT W. PETERS
TIMOTHY A. SPRINGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

AARON T. ALLISON
CHRISTOPHER W. ARCHER
TRAVIS D. BRINKMAN
PATRICK C. CHITTY
ANDREW D. CLINE
ALAN W. EICHELMAN
ANDREW B. HUNT
JAMES D. JOHNSON
NICHOLAS R. LEINWEBER
JOHN K. PERGERSON
ADAM S. PERRINS
JOSHUA M. PERRY
ROBERT S. RAMSEY
KENNETH D. SOWELL
JAMES T. STEWART
KRISTIN B. WHITEHOUSE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

COLLEEN C. BLOSSER
GEORGE J. BRAND
CRYSTAL A. BRYANT
MELISSA K. BURKE
ROBERT F. CUENTO
TERESA C. DENT
CAROLYN H. ELLISON
TATIANNNA T. ELLSWORTH
SUZANNE N. FIERROS
DANILO A. GARCIA DUENAS
DAVID R. GOODRICH
HEATHER L. KIRK
BRANDON J. LIMTIACO
MARY F. LINK
STEPHANIE M. PAONE
KENDRA L. PENNINGTON
JOSE L. PINON
RICHARD A. POZNIAK, JR.
MARGARET M. REYNOLDS
KATIE E. SCHULZ
MARC A. SILFIES
DAMIAN M. STORZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHAEL W. BLOOMROSE
SARA R. DEGROOT
GUY W. EDEN
ERIKA C. GEHLEN
WILLIAM A. HOLT
STUART T. KIRKBY
DAVID A. MELSON
JEFFREY J. PIETRZYK
IAN SANTICOLA
RYAN SANTICOLA
BARBARA A. K. SURBELLA
SEAN M. THOMPSON
RACHEL E. TREST
GRAHAM C. WINEGEART
MATTHEW J. WOOTEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

GARTH W. ALDRICH
HAK AUTH
MATTHEW J. BEHIL
ALLISON L. BENNETT
HYRUM T. BROSSARD
COLEMAN C. CHANDLER, JR.
KATHLEEN R. CAGHER
CHRISTOPHER S. DEANGELIS
JEFFREY A. DELZER
GRETCHEN S. JACKSON
SAMUEL H. JARVIS
KATHERINE L. JAUDON
BYRON L. JORDAN
PAMELA M. KLEPACTULENSRU
AUSTIN W. LATOUR
BRADLEY R. LESTER
SUSAN MALBOEUF
KINAU Y. MCCOY
DAVID M. MCCETTRICK
KIRT C. NILSSON
JODI M. PHILLIPS
BRYAN L. PYLE
YARON RABINOWITZ
ALBERT RICCARDI III
JENIFER M. SCANCELLA
JOSEPH A. SORCIC
JOSEPH G. STASTNY
JEFFREY E. SUBA

LEEDJIA A. SVEC
SHAWN A. WEBER
MAYA WILLIAMS
JESSICA N. WOODY
EMILY L. ZYWICKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

RICARDO M. ABAKAH
LALEH ABDOLAZADEH
PETER D. CERVENKA
KATHERINE L. CHENG
LORA C. CHONGRUK
CORINNE C. DEVIN
CARLA L. EPPPEL
SCOTT A. HOCKER
ROBERT G. HOLMES
DANIEL J. HONL
ERIC M. HOWARD
JAIME L. JAMES
PATRICK T. MORRELL
BROC A. MUSHET
WILFREDO PALAUHERNANDEZ
CHRISTOPHER D. PARKS
LEONEL PEREZ, JR.
MELANIE A. PERRY
SEPEHR RAJAEI
DAVID M. RASMUSSEN
JOSEPH N. REARDON
ARTHUR S. VALERI
YU ZHENG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

THOMAS B. ABLEMAN
LEE R. ALLEN
GEORGE C. BALAZS
NADINE S. BARKSDALE
ELEGANT C. BIGORNIA
KEISHA N. BLAIR
ERIN M. BLEVINS
DENISE BOGGSWILKERSON
JACK R. BRANDAU
JOHN M. BURGER
TSHAWNDA J. BURKE
BRETT M. CHAMBERLIN
DARREN CHERRY
GREGORY T. CHESNUT
EVA CHOU
MICHAEL J. CIRIVELLO
WILLIAM K. CONLEY II
TIFFANY C. COX
RAYMOND J. CUDNIK III
MICHAEL E. CUNNINGHAM
NATHAN S. CUTLER
ANGELA M. DICARLOMEACHAM
TIMOTHY J. DONAHUE
MARK S. DOUGLAS
JEREMY S. ENNIS
JOHN T. EWING
DEREK L. FOERSCHLER
AMY J. FRANKSTON
KYLE D. GADBOIS
LAURA C. GILSTRAP
ROLF E. GRANING
SUZANNE R. GUDEMAN
TRAVIS E. HARRELL
REED M. HECKERT
BENJAMIN D. HOAGLAND
MATTHEW A. HUMPHREYS
SHANE D. JENSEN
KEVIN D. JOHNSON
LUCAS A. JOHNSON
MARK S. JOHNSON
BENJAY J. KEMPNER
BRIAN M. KEUSKI
ERIN E. KOELLING
ANDREW C. KUNG
MICHAEL R. LEADER
MARTIN W. LUNCEFORD
JOHN S. MADDOX
RUSSELL J. MILLER
JEREMY P. MULLINS
LYNITA H. MULLINS
NIELS H. OLSON
MONICA D. ORMENO
YAN T. ORTIZPOALES
ANDREW M. PARSONS
MICHAEL B. PAUL
AARON J. PHARISS
BRYAN J. PLATT
KRISTINA M. POLK
BENJAMIN N. QUARTEY
VICTOR A. RIVERA
DARIN M. ROLFE
BRIANNA L. RUPP
JULIA A. SAVITZ
JOSEPH W. SCHMITZ
HEATHER L. SHIBLEY
MICHAEL D. STARSIAK
STEPHEN J. STAUB
CHRISTOPHER A. STETTLER
ALAN A. STRAWN
ADELAINE D. TRASK
JAIME VEGA
ANGELA G. VIERS
DAVID M. VOLK
DENNIS A. WHITE
KRISTI M. WOOD
BRUCE A. YEE
JERRY YUAN

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2130:

To be commander

NICHOLAS G. DERENZO
LIAM P. MCCUE
NILES C. PIERSON
WILLIAM A. STEWART
STEVEN B. VANDERLASKE
KEVIN P. WHALEN
ISAAC YATES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 2130.

To be captain

DOUGLAS D. GRAUL
BENEDICT S. GULLO

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 23, 2024:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MELISSA GRIFFIN DALTON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 8089:

To be rear admiral

CAPT. LIA M. REYNOLDS

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JASON T. HINDS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. LISA A. NEMETH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. PETER M. BOONE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL S. SHANLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. KATHLEEN A. CLARY
COL. GREGORY C. GLASOW
COL. STEVEN M. KING
COL. BRIAN D. WISNIEWSKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JERED P. HELWIG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GREGORY K. ANDERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624, 7037, AND 7064:

To be brigadier general

COL. TERRI J. ERISMAN
COL. CHRISTOPHER A. KENNEBECK
COL. STEVEN M. RANIERI

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE

INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. STEPHEN D. SKLENKA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. CALVERT L. WORTH, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. MICHAEL J. VERNAZZA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JOHN F. WADE

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ANTHONY K. ONITSUKA, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF RONALD J. GRIMLEY, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF DEBRA L. SIMS, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF PETER S. JOO, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GEOFFREY E. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH ERICA MARIE ZENTNER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NICHOLAS ALBERTO AGUILERA AND ENDING WITH YONGJUN YOON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JESSICA M. ABBOTT AND ENDING WITH TROY BETTINGER YU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARIAH C. ACEVES AND ENDING WITH ANDREW PAUL ZIMMERMAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF MICHAEL W. STRUTHERS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF PAULA M. CHAVIS, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANK J. PANEBIANCO AND ENDING WITH ANDREW W. WASHER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JAMES L. SCHNEIDER III, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF ZHIBIN JIANG, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF BENNET D. KRAWCHUK, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF DARIUSZ P. BARNA, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SALLY L. CRAMER AND ENDING WITH JONATHAN A. MONSALVE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF DIONNE L. MCMILLAN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TODD A. HASENSTEIN, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GREGORY J. ABIDE AND ENDING WITH 0003682611, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JACOB P. ABSALON AND ENDING WITH 0002344681, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATION OF GARY R. WELTMAN, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL A. ABALDO AND ENDING WITH 0002650956, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JI Y. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH 0002978777, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CAROLINE M. KOLB, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRADY R. CLARK AND ENDING WITH ANGELINA K. MATHERLY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH EMILY R. BINGHAM AND ENDING WITH 0002855239, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AHMAD B. ALEXANDER AND ENDING WITH 0004136628, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VANESSA E. BONNER AND ENDING WITH 0002485564, WHICH NOMINA-

TIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ELIZABETH A. AGUIRRE AND ENDING WITH 0002517801, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHAWN E. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH J. ZWILLER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 8, 2024.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT W. BROOKS III AND ENDING WITH RAMON R. RAMIREZ, JR., WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JANUARY 10, 2024.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF GLEN R. POND, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF MATTHEW T. MIGLIORI, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF STEPHANIE K. HAYES, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN C. WAITE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BENJAMIN D. FITZHARRIS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CLAUDIA L. BATTLE, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF DANIEL A. HANCOCK, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF JAMES L. CLARK III, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF WILLIAM SELDE, TO BE COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF EDWARD L. GUNSON, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TY R. CHRISTIAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on May 23, 2024 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nomination:

NELSON W. CUNNINGHAM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A DEPUTY UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE (WESTERN HEMISPHERE, EUROPE, THE MIDDLE EAST, LABOR, AND ENVIRONMENT), WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR, VICE JAYME RAY WHITE, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 11, 2024.