United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 2024 *No. 100*

Senate

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Our eternal God, we lift grateful hearts for the great heritage of our Nation. Thank You for those who purchased our freedom with blood, toil, and tears.

Lord, give us this day a vivid vision of what You expect our Nation to become as we accept the torches of integrity and faithfulness from those who have gone before us.

Give our lawmakers a reverence for Your Name and a determination to please You with their thoughts, words, and deeds. Enable them to bear with fortitude the fret of care, the sting of criticism, and the drudgery of unapplauded toil. Direct them to the sources of moral energy so that Your strength may be linked to their limitations.

We pray in Your magnificent 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, June 13, 2024.

To the Senate:

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

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WARNOCK thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Judy W. Chang, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2029.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

MIFEPRISTONE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, mifepristone is a safe and reliable drug that has been widely available for decades. Though I am relieved by today's decision made by the Court, no one should be celebrating this decision. This decision should have been an obvious one. And let us not forget: This decision was based not on the merits but on a lack of standing. We are not yet out of the woods.

This shouldn't be a decision women are forced to fear year after year, case after case. These healthcare decisions must be between women, families, and their doctors, not judges nor lawmakers.

RIGHT TO IVF ACT

Now, Mr. President, on IVF, for years, as the hard right had set their sights on Roe v. Wade, many of us kept hearing the same thing again and again and again: Roe can't possibly ever be overturned. We were told that worrying about Roe was sensationalism, that its repeals were so remote a prospect that worrying about it was much ado about nothing. Many on the Republican side who voted repeatedly against codifying Roe used the excuse that Roe was not in danger, and they used it as an easy way out. The same could happen to IVF.

Of course, that all came to an end 2 years ago, when a MAGA majority on the Supreme Court did precisely what the anti-abortion movement has wanted for decades—the reversal of Roe and the elimination of a constitutional right to an abortion.

Today, we live in a country where tens of millions of women are forbidden by law from making the very same personal decisions about their bodies. This is precisely what many Republicans, who are scared of their own bad views on abortion, assured us would never happen. And yet, here we are—in a modern-day dark age for women's fundamental freedoms.

Worst of all, the anti-abortion movement is not yet finished. Now that Roe is gone, they have set their sights on a new target: in vitro fertilization.

So, today, the question before the Senate is very simple: Do we agree that

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

Americans should be free to use IVF if they want to, yes or no? If yes, then the only right answer is to vote in favor of today's bill.

The Right to IVF Act is common sense and necessary. It establishes a nationwide right to IVF and eliminates barriers for the millions of families looking to use IVF to start and to grow a family.

Protecting IVF should be the easiest ''yes'' vote the Senate has taken all year. Republicans cannot say they are pro-family and then vote against protecting IVF.

It is very fitting that we take this important vote today of all days. Here in the Senate, we are voting to protect women's reproductive freedoms, but on the other side of Capitol Hill, Donald Trump and his Republican sycophants will be talking about tax breaks for the very rich, cuts to the middle class, and packing our courts with more radical judges. The contrast couldn't be clearer. Look at the contrast. Democrats are protecting IVF; Donald Trump and the Republicans are protecting wealthy tax breaks. Which side is for the American people? It is obvious.

Look, as we prepared this IVF bill, many of our Republican colleagues who hate talking about the issue have made the same panicked arguments they made about Roe: It is a nonissue; it will never happen; that we are blowing things out of proportion; that IVF, they say, is simply not under threat and today's bill is unnecessary.

Senators CRUZ and BRITT even organized a statement yesterday, signed by all Republican Senators, saying that of course they support IVF. But they certainly won't be voting on a bill that protects it. Easy to see through that one, isn't it? How strange—all 49 Republicans are willing to sign a piece of paper saying they like IVF, but none of them seem to be willing to actually vote for a bill that protects IVF. It shows you how afraid they are of the issue, how they are tied in a knot by the MAGA hard right on choice, and they can't do anything the American people want.

This is simple: If you really support access to IVF, vote to protect access to IVF.

America, watch what our Republican colleagues do, not what they say. Again, this is not a show vote; this is a ''show us who you are'' vote. Today, unfortunately, it seems our Republican colleagues are going to show us just who they are—people who will not protect a woman's right to IVF.

To all those who claim that IVF is not under any threat, facts are stubborn things. Look at what happened yesterday when one of the most powerful anti-abortion voices in America officially came out against IVF. Look at what the Alabama Supreme Court did 4 months ago. Their decision on IVF led to a temporary halt on IVF services across the State of Alabama. This is a disastrous thing to see in 21st-century America.

Senate Republicans who like to pretend that IVF is not under threat should have a word with the likes of the Heritage Foundation and Susan B. Anthony Pro-Life America. These organizations are some of the most influential authorities in conservatism and on the Republican Party, and they are making it plain as day that IVF is the hard right's next project.

Just 1 week ago, the Susan B. Anthony league wrote to Senators telling them to oppose the Right to IVF Act. They said our bill protecting IVF was ''irredeemable'' and described IVF as a ''free for all.'' Their opposition to IVF uses identical language as those who oppose abortion.

The Heritage Foundation—one of the most important conservative and most powerful conservative, most influential conservative organizations—is against our bill protecting IVF. They were even against the fig leaf messaging bill pushed by Senators CRUZ and BRITT, which didn't actually protect IVF at all. It seems the senior Senator from Texas, up for reelection, is running scared.

One senior policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation predicted a generational shift in how the right views IVF, saying:

> Many of these pro-life Republicans are going to have to think more deeply about what it means to be pro-life.

The hard right is saying it as plain as day. First they targeted abortion, and now IVF is next. Sooner or later, Republican Senators are going to fall in line.

That brings me back again to the very important vote happening today here on the Senate floor. As Donald Trump talks about protecting tax cuts for the rich, we Democrats in the Senate are talking about protecting women's reproductive freedoms. It is a fitting encapsulation of what is at stake this year.

Finally, let me finish with this: Starting a family is one of the most sacred decisions a person can ever make. For many, it is what makes life worth living. Infertility makes that impossible for tens of millions of couples. About 10 percent of couples struggle with this medical condition. That is a heavy burden to carry if your deepest wish is to become a mom or a dad. It can be a source of worry, concern, even shame.

IVF has thus been a miracle cure for generations of parents and kids. It has been part of my family's story. My beautiful grandchild was born thanks to the help of IVF, and I thank the Good Lord for it.

So it is the stuff of nightmares that today the hard right in America is beginning to set their sights on preventing people from using IVF. We have a chance today to stop this madness before it takes full flight. We have a chance to pass a bill that says something very simple: IVF is a basic right and will be protected under law.

To my Republican colleagues: The choice is yours. Americans are watching, parents back home are watching, and couples who want to become parents are watching too.

Republicans cannot say they are pro-family but vote against protecting IVF. That is what is at stake today.

I urge everyone to vote yes.

Remember, America, this is not a show vote; it is a ''show us who you are'' vote.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Now, Mr. President, on AI legislation, artificial intelligence is already reshaping our world as we know it. Every industry—healthcare, finance, manufacturing, and others—will in some way be impacted by AI and must be prepared when that moment comes. That includes the Federal Government.

As more Federal Agencies begin to incorporate AI into their operations, it is critical that they have a clear and established set of guidelines to manage this technology safely and effectively. So I was pleased that yesterday Chair PETERS and Senator TILLIS introduced a bipartisan bill to make sure the Federal Government is proactive in harnessing AI's potential while managing its very real risks.

This legislation will establish some of the first guidelines for the responsible procurement of AI by the Federal Government. The guidelines in this bill will be essential for the Federal Government to deploy AI so it protects people's civil rights, prevents bias, and ensures people's privacy.

These protections are critical not just for the application of AI in the Federal Government, they are important for the application of AI in every industry.

I commend Chair PETERS and Senator TILLIS for introducing this legislation. It is a great example of both sides working together to legislate effectively on AI.

As we have said, we first had our AI forums. We then put out our roadmap. Now our committees are beginning to work on specific legislation. I am very, very proud that we are moving forward in this regard.

We had another opportunity to work together to pass AI legislation last night when Senator DURBIN tried to pass his DEFIANCE Act, which cracks down on nonconsensual AI pornography and holds those responsible for the sharing of graphic images and videos.

Sadly, despite the bill having bipartisan support, one Member—only one Member—from the other side of the aisle stood in the way and blocked its passage. I hope this is not the norm moving forward. I hope both sides can continue working together—like Chair PETERS and Senator TILLIS did—to harness the potential of AI while protecting against its risks.

DONALD TRUMP CAPITOL HILL VISIT

Mr. President, finally, on the Trump visit, later this afternoon, Senate Republicans will welcome former President Donald Trump to Capitol Hill for a meeting about some of the top priorities of the Republican agenda moving

forward. One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle predicted the meeting would be ''an expression of unity.'' ''[A]n expression of unity''? I will be honest. It is getting harder and harder to differentiate between the Republicans' agenda and the extreme, hard-right MAGA agenda. In many ways, they seem to be one and the same nowadays.

The topics up for discussion between Senate Republicans and Donald Trump today read like Republicans' greatest hits: taxes, Social Security, Medicare, and more. But when you take a closer look under the hood, it is not difficult to see that these are issues where Republicans are way out of touch with the American people.

Cutting taxes on the very wealthy and on corporations that don't pay their fair share? That is what they want to do. Social Security and Medicare—when 180 House Members are part of the group that said we should cut them, and RICK SCOTT—running for leader—from Florida says we should cut Medicare and Social Security? Give us a break. If that is unity, the American people sure as heck don't want it.

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 Republican leader is recognized.

NOMINATION OF SARAH NETBURN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, soon, the Judiciary Committee will consider promoting a magistrate in New York, Sarah Netburn, to the district court after a less-than-judicious committee process.

Judge Netburn's hearing was a contentious affair. You should go watch it. My friends the junior Senators from Louisiana and Texas had the judge dead to rights on her judicial activism from the bench. She was clearly prepared for their line of questioning, but by the end, she wilted under the withering fire from my colleagues.

That is when the acting chairwoman of the committee got involved. After Republicans were finished questioning Judge Netburn, she invited the nominee to defend herself. Her defense, of course, flatly contradicted her written opinion as a judge.

Committee Republicans rightly objected. It is one thing to give a nominee the chance to rehabilitate herself, but giving her the last word as she lied to the committee is a different matter entirely. After the nominee gave two different explanations for why she had engaged in political activism from the bench, committee Democrats blocked further questions and closed the hearing.

It sounds an awful lot like the way another nominee, Adeel Mangi, explained his policy views to liberal interest groups only after the committee was finished questioning him. Judge Netburn got the last word here.

As the junior Senator from Louisiana said, it looks an awful lot like a cover-up. Apparently, it is not enough for Senate Democrats to rubberstamp radicals to the courts. They desperately don't want the American people to even know about it.

Well, it is not working. The Judiciary Committee has received almost 100 letters from liberals opposing Judge Netburn's activism. The cat is literally out of the bag. So I would urge my colleagues to pay attention to what happens in the Judiciary Committee as Judge Netburn's nomination moves forward.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. President, now on another matter, this week, the Armed Services Committee has been marking up the National Defense Authorization Act for the coming year. In the past, the committee has prided itself on considering hundreds of amendments and thoroughly exercising Congress's oversight responsibilities in the process. I expect this year to be no different.

But one essential question hangs over both the NDAA and the appropriations process to come: Is Congress ready—finally ready—to fulfill our most fundamental responsibility of adequately providing for the common defense? This, of course, remains an open question. For a fourth straight year, the process of funding the Federal Government began with a White House budget proposal that would impose net cuts to the national defense.

I have said it before. How can we expect to keep up with the pacing threat, the PRC, if our military budgets don't even keep pace with inflation? I know a number of our Democratic colleagues recognize that the threats we face are growing and that our defense requirements are growing along with them, but they don't seem to be ready to respond with any sense of urgency. Senate Democrats continue to indicate that they will stick to their long-standing demand for artificial parity between defense and nondefense appropriations for any increases above the President's budget.

It is time for all of us to face the actual facts. The threats we face have grown since the bipartisan budget caps were negotiated. They have grown since the President's budget was drafted. The defense of Israel and Ukraine continue to offer lessons on the glaring need for modern air and missile defenses. We have learned how insufficient our inventories of critical long-range munitions might be in the event of a direct conflict in the Pacific. And with the risk of simultaneous conflict in multiple regions actually growing, the enduring importance of the two-war force planning construct is making itself abundantly clear.

This is the reality our colleague Ranking Member WICKER was grappling with when he put together a detailed plan for an overdue generational investment in the national defense, and I am grateful to my friend for his leadership. A serious roadmap for preserving our military primacy is on the table. The question now is whether the Senate will follow it; whether we will lay the groundwork right now for urgent investments in critical munitions, long-range fires, sea power, and in the defense industrial base required to sustain all of it for long-term strategic competition.

Way back in 1940, when the scope of the Axis threat was finally so glaringly obvious that even longtime skeptics began to soften their opposition to long-overdue military investment, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Harold Stark, pointed out a harsh reality: Dollars can't buy yesterday.

We are already facing a steep uphill climb to prepare America's Armed Forces to deter aggression and outcompete our adversaries. You can't surge readiness. We can't modernize overnight. Yesterday is right now, and it is time to invest in what we need to deter and defeat looming threats.

So I will be watching our colleagues' work closely, and I will urge the Democratic leader to bring the NDAA to the floor for consideration as soon as the committee completes its work.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Mr. President, on one final matter, earlier this week, Senate Democrats took up the Biden administration's banner of prescription drug socialism.

Our colleague Chairman SANDERS announced he would ask his HELP Committee colleagues to subpoena a drug company executive to testify before the committee about the prices of innovative treatments.

Never mind that U.S. Senators shouldn't require remedial lessons in the workings of the market economy. And never mind that the company in question had already expressed willingness to testify. Our colleague has decided to take the route of maximum escalation.

I have discussed the facts behind America's world-leading medical innovation sector at length before. What innovator would sink the time, resources, and risk into the development of a new treatment if there were no prospect of recouping their investment? Apparently, Senate Democrats aren't the only ones who seem to be stumped—stumped—by this question. The Department of Commerce is taking steps to finalize a framework it announced last December known as march-in rights. Under this policy, if the Federal Government deems that the prices of certain drug treatments are too high, it could elect to ''march in'' and seize the company's intellectual property rights.

In a rather ironic twist, the Department's proposed policy relies on a law—the Bayh-Dole Act of 1980—that

was designed to do the exact opposite: to promote cooperation between government and innovators. This time around, the latest chapter of prescription drug socialism would send all the wrong signals to would-be innovators behind future lifesaving cures. It would tell them not to take risks; not to build new things; and not to invest their time, resources, and creativity to develop more of the greatest medical achievements the world has ever seen.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CELEBRATING THE 247TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, I rise today—I have done this several times since I have been here in the Senate. It is always an honor to do it. When something is that important, I think it is worth repeating. I am rising today to offer a resolution expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance as an expression of patriotism and honoring the 247th anniversary of the introduction of our U.S. flag.

Tomorrow, we celebrate Flag Day, which was established over 100 years ago by President Woodrow Wilson. As we pause to recognize all that our flag represents, let us also honor those who have sacrificed everything to defend it.

In 2002, Senator Tom Daschle raised a similar resolution with unanimous support from the Senate. It passed on the floor uneventfully. Today, I ask this body to reaffirm our support for the Pledge of Allegiance, also bringing into account somebody from Indiana—Red Skelton.

In 1969, the American entertainer, who was well known for his program ''The Red Skelton Hour,'' wrote a speech on the importance of the pledge. Reflecting on his time in Vincennes, IN, he spoke about the values instilled by one of his high school teachers.

After the performance of the speech, CBS received 200,000 requests for copies. I wonder if that would occur in this day and age. This speech would go on to be sold as a single by Columbia Records and performed at the White House for President Nixon.

I think it would honor Mr. Skelton's memory and the importance of the Pledge of Allegiance if it were recited again today on the Senate floor like I have done several times since I have been here.

Red Skelton:

When I was a small boy in Vincennes, Indiana, I heard, I think, one of the most outstanding speeches I ever heard in my life. I think it compares with the Sermon on the Mount, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, and Socrates' speech to the Students.

We had just finished reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, and Mr. Lasswell, the Principal of Vincennes High School, called us all together. He says, ''Uh, boys and girls, I have been listening to you recite the Pledge of Allegiance all semester, and it seems that it has become a little monotonous to you. Or, could it be, you do not understand the meaning of each word? If I may, I would like to recite the pledge, and give you a definition of each word:

I—Me; an individual; a committee of one.

Pledge—Dedicate all of my worldly goods to give without self-pity.

Allegiance—My love and my devotion.

To the Flag—Our standard. 'Old Glory'; a symbol of courage. And wherever she waves, there is respect, because your loyalty has given her a dignity that shouts, 'Freedom is everybody's job.'

of the United—That means we have all come together.

States—Individual communities that have united into 48 great states;——

Forty-eight because of when it was done——

48 individual communities with pride and dignity and purpose; all divided by imaginary boundaries, yet united to a common cause, and that's love of country—

Of America.

And to the Republic—A Republic: a sovereign state in which power is invested into the representatives chosen by the people to govern; and the government is of the people; and it's from the people to the leaders, not from the leaders to the people.

For which it stands

One Nation—Meaning 'so blessed by God.'

[Under God]

Indivisible—Incapable of being divided.

With Liberty—Which is freedom; the right of power for one to live his own life without fears, threats, or any sort of retaliation.

And Justice—The principle and qualities of dealing fairly with others.

For All—For All. That means, boys and girls, it's as much your country as it is mine.''

Afterwards, Mr. Lasswell asked his students to recite the Pledge of Allegiance together, with newfound appreciation for the words.

I pledge allegiance

to the Flag of the United States of America

and to the Republic for which it stands;

one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Red Skelton concluded his speech by saying:

Since I was a small boy, two states have been added to our country, and two words have been added to the Pledge of Allegiance: Under God. Wouldn't it be a pity if someone said ''That is a prayer''—and [it should] be eliminated from our schools [as well]?

Just as those students that day—Mr. Red Skelton included—recommitted to the meaning of the words of the Pledge of Allegiance, I call upon the U.S. Senate to recommit to the meaning of these words.

There are times today that the words of the Pledge of Allegiance are tossed around without care. Other times, they are altered to remove what today is deemed offensive or antiquated. But Americans should not misuse or abuse our Pledge of Allegiance. The pledge is meant to remind Americans of our guiding principles and inspire adherence to those ideas that made our country great: equality under the law; recognized rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That is why, in honor of Flag Day tomorrow, I am requesting unanimous consent from my colleagues that my resolution expressing support of the Pledge of Allegiance be passed.

Mr. President, as if in legislative session and notwithstanding rule XXII, I ask unanimous consent the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 732, which is at the desk; further, 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 clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 732) celebrating the 247th anniversary of the creation of the flag of the United States and expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, 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. 732) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, Democrats made their latest move yesterday in their yearslong campaign to undermine the legitimacy of the Supreme Court. Their failed attempt to gain unanimous consent on a so-called Supreme Court ethics bill was yet another attempt to bully the Court into ruling the way Democrats want.

With decisions in multiple controversial cases coming from the Supreme Court over the next few weeks, including today, I expect this was just the prelude to yet another dramatic Democrat temper tantrum if things don't go Democrats' way. I say ''if things don't go Democrats' way'' because it is a funny thing—when the Supreme Court decides things Democrats' way, we hear a lot less about the legitimacy of the Supreme Court.

Take the Court's decision in Consumer Financial Protection Bureau v. Community Financial Services Association of America, Ltd., in which most

of the Court's Republican appointees sided with all of the Court's Democrat appointees to deliver a decision that Democrats supported.

Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, the Democrat ranking member of the House Financial Services Committee, had this to say:

With this decision, our nation's justices have decided to put consumers first and reject the baseless attacks led by extreme MAGA Republicans and greedy payday lenders to hamstring the work of the CFPB and put consumers in harm's way.

Or take the Court's decision in Moore v. Harper, in which half of the Court's Republican appointees sided with the Court's Democrat appointees to deliver a decision that was embraced by the Democrat leader here in the U.S. Senate.

Here is what he had to say:

Today, those who support democracy, fair elections, and the rule of law can stand a bit taller. Today's ruling reaffirms the longstanding precedent that respects our constitutional system of checks and balances.

Again, that is from the Senate Democrat leader. Funny how he didn't mention anything in that statement about how the Court had been captured by, in his words, ''the fanatical MAGA right.''

I could go on, but all of this leads to one inevitable conclusion, and that is that, to Democrats, the only legitimate Court and the only legitimate Court decisions are the ones that line up with Democrats' policy preferences.

It has become clear that Democrats are willing to do whatever it takes, up to and including intimidation, delegitimization, and Court packing, to ensure that the Court rules in line with where Democrats want it.

This isn't about ethics or legitimacy or concern for our democratic institutions, as Democrats would have you believe; this is about power. Democrats are apparently perfectly willing to undermine a fundamental part of our system of government for their political ends, because, let's be very clear, it is not the Supreme Court that is undermining the legitimacy of this essential institution; it is Democrats with their unhinged campaign against a duly-constituted Court composed of nine duly-confirmed Justices nominated by a duly-elected President; a Court, it is worth pointing out, that in its last term ruled unanimously—that is right, unanimously—roughly half of the time and 90 percent of the time—let me repeat that: 90 percent of the time—had at least one Democrat-appointed Justice in the majority.

Mr. President, it would be nice if we could just dismiss Democrats' hysteria as the tantrums of a party that has discovered that sometimes in a democracy, you don't get your way, but Democrats' concerted effort to undermine the legitimacy of the Court is deeply troubling because of the widespread consequences it could have.

The last thing we should be doing at a time of deep political divisions is to be shaking Americans' faith in the legitimacy of our institutions and the impartiality of the Court. Do Democrats really want a public with less faith in the government?

Perhaps they do or perhaps they don't care, as long as their policies are ascendant and they can maintain a hold on power. But they should care.

As I said, should things not go entirely the Democrats' way in the coming weeks of Supreme Court decisions, I expect we are going to hear a lot. We will hear a lot more hysteria about the Court's supposed hijacking and illegitimacy.

But I hope the Justices and the American people will tune it out, because the Democrats' baseless and irresponsible attempts to delegitimize the Court do not deserve to be given the time of day.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to join my friend and colleague from South Dakota in decrying the relentless smear campaign that is being directed at the Supreme Court of the United States.

Of course, many of these attacks have come from expected sources—liberal activist groups and people, for example, who leaked the Justices addresses so protests could occur on their lawns, lodging threats against these judges and their families—all because they disagreed with the decisions that the Court has made in one case or another.

And, of course, there is one instance where a person who was determined to assassinate Justice Kavanaugh was thankfully stopped by law enforcement. That demonstrates the dangerousness of some of these political attacks against the Court.

Sadly, these aggressors aren't limited to a small group of outsiders though. Attacks are being waged by elected Members of Congress. Some men and women in this building have sworn an oath to support and defend the Constitution but have repeatedly targeted the Court over supposed ethics concerns.

Last year, 15 of our Democratic colleagues recommended slashing the Supreme Court's budget, which actually would be unconstitutional, but they threatened to slash the Supreme Court's budget if it failed to meet their demand to implement a code of ethics which they had proscribed.

A few years ago, five of our Democratic colleagues threatened the Court could be restructured if it failed to rule a certain way in a case involving the Second Amendment.

And, of course, we can't forget the time when the majority leader, the Senator from New York, stood on the front steps of the Supreme Court and threatened two Justices by name if they didn't reach a preferred ruling in an abortion case.

Well, these are unprecedented attacks against the Court. They are inappropriate at best, and they are unconstitutional at worst. They show a complete lack of respect for the three separate but equal branches of government that comprise our constitutional Republic.

And they know that, but they are using these attacks to undermine public confidence in the Court.

They demonstrate a willingness to do whatever it takes to secure a partisan win, even if that means shredding the U.S. Constitution and undermining the separation of powers.

The partisan political attacks on the Supreme Court have varied, but the underlying objective has always been the same. It is about control. It is about power.

Democrats want to control the institution, control the Justices, and, thus, direct the outcomes. In other words, they want to make the judicial branch not an independent branch of government—a nonpolitical branch. They want to make it another political branch of government because they don't like some of the outcomes that the courts have decided.

Forget fair and impartial courts. That is not their objective. They want judges to fall in line and obey orders. In short, they want to politicize the independent judiciary. And if there is a threat to our democracy today, it is the politicalization of some of our most basic institutions—like the FBI, the Department of Justice—and now the left is targeting the Supreme Court of the United States.

So far, they haven't been successful, but that doesn't mean they are going to stop trying any time soon.

Last month, the New York Times published a piece by Congressman JAMIE RASKIN where he advised, as a supposed constitutional scholar, self-proclaimed. He wrote an article about forcing two Supreme Court Justices to recuse themselves from a case involving President Trump. The piece is literally entitled: ''How to Force Justices Alito and Thomas To Recuse Themselves in the Jan. 6 Cases.''

Here is a prominent Member of Congress—a Democratic Member of Congress, a self-proclaimed constitutional scholar—talking about how to force an independent branch of government to commit to a certain outcome and force the recusal of two sitting Justices. He argued that the Department of Justice has the authority to compel that. He is wrong, but that is his argument.

The decision on whether or not to recuse is reserved not for Members of Congress, not for the Department of Justice, or for anyone else. The Code of Conduct for U.S. Judges provides clear

guidelines on recusal, and it is ultimately up to the individual Justices.

Unfortunately, there is a full-fledged pressure campaign to blur the lines that separate the Supreme Court from other branches of government. For years, liberal activists and dark money groups have been on a warpath to destroy public confidence in the high Court's independence.

One of these groups is called Demand Justice, an organization whose highest goal is to pack the Supreme Court and install a permanent liberal majority. A couple of years ago, one of the cofounders of Demand Justice said:

> It's time for [the Democrats] to see the Court as a political opponent, just as much as any GOP elected official, and run against it.

That is the type of people and the type of agenda we are dealing with here.

Demand Justice and other liberal groups recently sent a letter to Senator DURBIN, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, urging him to use his power to investigate these so-called ethics concerns. They want the Senate to craft a law to dictate to the Supreme Court what their code of ethics should look like.

Forget about the fact that they already have a code of ethics. Democratic Senators want to dictate what that code of ethics should look like.

And, last night, Chairman DURBIN tried to force a vote on this bill, but it was blocked. His unanimous consent request was blocked by the ranking member, Senator GRAHAM.

As my Republican colleagues and I have said for months, any decisions about the Supreme Court's practices or procedures should come from the Court itself, not from Congress. The Senate has a limited but important role where it concerns the Supreme Court, and that is through the confirmation process. And we are all familiar with that.

All nine Justices underwent a rigorous background check. They endured hours and hours of questioning from members of the Judiciary Committee, met with Senators one on one, and ultimately were confirmed by majority vote of the U.S. Senate.

That is where the Senate's role starts and ends. We don't have the authority to drag the Supreme Court Justices before Congress in pursuit of some political agenda. There are clear limits to Congress's power under the Constitution—and for good reason.

The independent judiciary has been justly described as the crown jewel of our democracy. We have our fights. We have elections. But ultimately the Supreme Court gets to decide what the law is. That has been the case since 1804 in the case of Marbury v. Madison.

Our Founders deliberately designed a Federal Government with three separate but equal branches. A system of checks and balances sought to prevent any one branch from forcing its will on another.

If Chairman DURBIN and our Senate colleagues on the Judiciary Committee respect the separation of powers, they will resist this latest attempt to hijack the Court. The Supreme Court is a separate and coequal branch, and its operations squarely fall outside of the authority of the legislative branch.

I often think back to a statement issued by Chief Justice Roberts in 2018, when he said:

> We do not have Obama judges . . . [we do not have] Trump judges, Bush judges or Clinton judges. What we have is an extraordinary group of dedicated judges [who are] doing their level best to do equal right to those appearing before them.''

It was true then, and it is true now. The men and women on the Supreme Court should not be pawns or players for either political party. The suggestion that judges are likely to apply perceived political views to cases is dangerous and disingenuous. We have been embroiled in the last few years with the hijacking of our justice system, including the FBI and the Department of Justice, for partisan political purposes, and it is very, very dangerous, because we know what goes around comes around.

Once a precedent is set around here, when the shoe is on the other foot, when the majority is in the minority, when the minority is in the majority, that same precedent will be applied in the future.

Public trust is absolutely vital to the health of our democracy, and the surest way to destroy that trust is by turning the Court into a political football. That is what our Democratic colleagues are risking.

It doesn't matter what case is before a court or what ruling is ultimately handed down, elected officials need to lead by example and support judicial independence. Members of this body must show faith in the judiciary and in our constitutional system of separation of powers, and that includes letting the judges do their job.

Look, the Court is going to hand down decisions that I don't like and that the Presiding Officer doesn't like, but that is not the point. The point is there is a fair and impartial process of applying the law and the Constitution to deciding what the outcome is.

I can't count the number of times I have been disappointed by a Court ruling, but I have certainly never advocated for restructuring the Supreme Court to ensure a preferred outcome of mine the next time. And I have never suggested cutting funds if judges failed to deliver my preferred ruling. That would be wrong.

And certainly, certainly, I have never threatened Justices with violence if they reached a decision I disliked.

And I never have and I never will use the power of Congress to try to subpoena a sitting member of the Court or force Justices to recuse themselves contrary to their decision, using the rules that exist—the code of conduct that exists for Federal judges.

So an independent judiciary is absolutely essential to our democracy, and I hope Chairman DURBIN and our Democratic colleagues will show a little self-restraint and resist the far left's latest push to destroy public confidence in the Supreme Court or in the Court's independence.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON CHANG NOMINATION

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 196 Ex.]

YEAS—63

Baldwin	Grassley	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Risch
Bennet	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Booker	Hirono	Rounds
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Cantwell	Kaine	Schumer
Cardin	Kelly	Shaheen
Carper	King	Smith
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cassidy	Luján	Tester
Collins	Manchin	Tillis
Coons	Markey	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Warner
Cramer	Merkley	Warnock
Crapo	Murkowski	Warren
Duckworth	Murphy	Welch
Durbin	Murray	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Ossoff	Wicker
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Graham	Peters	Young

NAYS—33

Blackburn	Fischer	Mullin
Boozman	Hagerty	Paul
Braun	Hawley	Ricketts
Britt	Hoeven	Rubio
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Lee	Sullivan
Cruz	Lummis	Thune
Daines	Marshall	Tuberville
Ernst	Moran	Vance

NOT VOTING—4

Butler	Sanders
Menendez	Sinema

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motions to reconsider with respect to the Rosner, See, and Chang nominations be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

RIGHT TO IVF ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 413, S. 4445.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 413, S. 4445, a bill to protect and expand nationwide access to fertility treatment, including in vitro fertilization.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

RIGHT TO IVF ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, last week, every Senator was put on the record as to whether they will defend the right to contraception, and despite Republicans' words about supporting birth control, their actions—voting against the Right to Contraception Act—spoke louder.

Today we are putting Republicans on the record on another issue families across the country are deeply concerned about: the right to IVF.

As we saw in Alabama, the threat to IVF is not hypothetical. It is not overblown, and it is not fearmongering. After the Alabama Supreme Court ruled that a frozen embryo is the same—has the exact same rights—as a living, breathing human person, women who waited for months and spent tens of thousands of dollars and were days away from an IVF appointment were left to wonder if it was all for nothing when their treatment was abruptly canceled.

And families that had already gone through IVF were left to wonder if they could have their providers now dispose of unused embryos without facing legal threats.

This happened. It was national news. It was complete chaos. So Republican efforts to dismiss this vote as fearmongering are simply not going to fly—especially when, right now, there are Republican bills, right now, that would enshrine as a matter of law that life begins at conception and that discarding unused embryos is, essentially, murder. That would essentially end IVF in our country.

And this is not a fringe bill, either. It is supported by the majority of House Republicans, including the Speaker.

Mr. President, I don't know how to make this any clearer to my Republican colleagues: You cannot support IVF and support fetal personhood laws. They are fundamentally incompatible.

Democrats are not going to let Republicans off the hook for their support for fetal personhood. This is a dangerous and extreme ideology that the public must understand Republicans support wholeheartedly.

We are also not going to let Republicans paper over their extremism with their so-called solution: a bill that is not only silent on ensuring embryos can be discarded but that explicitly allows States to put burdensome restrictions on IVF and create the kind of legal uncertainty that forced clinics in Alabama to close their doors.

Mr. President, I do have good news for any of my Republican colleagues who do genuinely want to support IVF in a serious, meaningful way. We have a bill before us today that will do just that, and we are going to vote on it very shortly: the Right to IVF Act.

I really want to thank Senator DUCKWORTH and Senator BOOKER for working with me to put together a bill that would protect Americans from attempts to restrict IVF and help people get those vital services at a lower cost. The Right to IVF Act would establish a Federal right for patients to get IVF care and for doctors to provide it. It would ensure more health insurance plans cover IVF services, making care finally accessible to middle-class and lower income families who desperately need it.

And this package includes my bill to help more veterans and servicemembers who have difficulty conceiving get the critical fertility services they need to start their families, including IVF. This is something I have long been pushing for, for years now, and it is long overdue. After all, these men and women fought to protect our families. We owe it to them to make sure they have the support when they come home to grow theirs.

None of this should be controversial, especially if Republicans are serious about supporting IVF and preventing more chaos like we saw in Alabama.

I will have more to say before the final vote, but the bottom line is: Americans saw earlier this year, with painful clarity, just how real the threat to IVF is, and they are going to see right now just who is serious about addressing that threat and protecting IVF access.

With that, I will turn it over to my colleague from Michigan, who has been a champion on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, first, I want to thank the senior Senator from Washington State, who is also the President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate, for her incredible leadership on all of the issues related to reproductive freedom.

And I just want to start by saying that I cannot believe that we are in 2024—we are not in 1824; we are in 2024—and we have to stand on the floor of the U.S. Senate and say that we need to protect a woman's right to choose IVF as the process to start or grow her family or that we have to protect her ability to make decisions on birth control or on abortion services or any other reproductive issue—any other reproductive issue.

This is not for people here to decide what every single woman—every person—involved in this should decide. It is not for politicians. It is not for judges. This is an individual freedom in America and needs to be protected, and that is what today is about as well.

For those who want to have children but struggle with infertility, IVF is a path. It is a wonderful path—expensive path. It may take a lot of time, but it is an important path to grow a family.

I have two senior members of my staff who have chosen IVF for different reasons. One of my staff has a beautiful little boy, Carter, who celebrated his first birthday not long ago. Amazing. And my other staff person is excitedly waiting with her wife for their new son to be born in September.

Different paths, different choices. Their choice. Their choice. Not the choice of politicians. Not the choice of judges or anybody else. Their choice.

And IVF has helped thousands of Americans have children, including Brittany from Holly, MI, who I know is with us today. After being diagnosed with PCOS at 16, she experienced fertility issues when she was ready to start a family. After 3 years, six rounds of fertility treatments, countless tests, and two rounds of IVF, she gave birth to her beautiful baby girl, Eloisa, who is now 8 months old—8 months old.

Despite the strain this journey put on her relationships, Brittany told me that ''Every penny was worth it for our daughter.'' She said:

Every penny was worth it for our daughter. IVF has made our family complete.

And she is not the only Michigander who has been able to start a family because of IVF. When her husband was serving our country in the U.S. Navy, Sue from Brighton, MI, used IVF to bring her son into the world. At the time, she was an elementary schoolteacher and her husband was deployed for months at a time. Her entire salary went toward the seven rounds of IVF that were needed to have a successful pregnancy—a wanted, present pregnancy.

With insurance only paying for some of the medication, Sue spent over $100,000 out of her own pocket on treatment. This journey put an emotional and financial strain on Sue and her husband, as we would expect.

And this situation is not unique. Our veterans and our servicemembers sacrifice so much for our country. They shouldn't have to sacrifice their ability to start or grow their family because these treatments aren't covered. And families shouldn't have to choose between going into debt to cover the enormous cost of treatment and having a baby just because it is not covered by insurance.

That is why passing the Right to IVF Act is a no-brainer for me. I hope it is a no-brainer for everybody on the floor of the Senate. This should be 100 Members of the Senate supporting this bill.

We need to protect the freedom for millions to use IVF. We need to expand

and protect fertility treatments for our servicemembers and our veterans and cover adoption assistance, which is in this bill. We need to lower the cost of IVF for everyone, and we need to make sure women have the freedom to make our own reproductive decisions—not rightwing politicians, not judges.

That is why we must pass the Right to IVF Act, and it needs to be done today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. I rise to join my colleagues here. I want to thank my colleague from Washington, Senator MURRAY, for her leadership and so many others who are here on the floor today.

I come to speak also about the Right to IVF Act and want to say how important it is that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle support this.

I want to take one minute, though, to talk about the important decision the Supreme Court just made on mifepristone. It is so important because 60 percent of abortions in the State of Washington are done with this drug. It is a highly safe and effective medication used by millions of Americans. And the Court ruled on standing alone. It didn't reach any conclusion about the ludicrous arguments that the plaintiffs were making.

So America should not rest on this decision because anti-choice activists are going to keep using the courts to target abortion. It is just another reminder of why we have to fight for reproductive freedom and why we can't rest.

I also, though, want to talk about how important it is to support the legislation in front of us. Every American should have a chance to use fertility treatments to bring new life into this world and to become a parent. This opportunity wasn't always available. The first child conceived through IVF was born in 1978. That was an era of major advances and new freedoms for women: the right to have your own credit cards, the right to choose to have your access to an abortion and when you start your family, the right not to be discriminated against in so many ways.

Today, nearly half a century after IVF, it is safe, it is well-established, and many, many, many American families rely on it. In fact, more than 2 percent of all children born in the United States are born as a result of IVF. We have IVF to thank for over 2,000 new lives created in the State of Washington just in 2022.

IVF brings new life into the world and helps families start their families, and it shouldn't be controversial. That is why I can't believe that we have to take this action today because there are those who are trying to take this hard-won right away from families, to take away their reproductive rights and their freedoms.

Since the Dobbs decision revoked the constitutional right to abortion, we have seen waves and waves of different things that affect our healthcare. In February, in Alabama, the State supreme court shockingly ruled that frozen embryos legally have the same rights as living children. That forced IVF clinics in the State to temporarily halt their services. One can only guess why they halted those services.

At a Pacific Northwest facility in Seattle, a reproductive endocrinologist said her office got a wave of phone calls from fertility patients wanting to move embryos there, to the Northwest, after the Alabama ruling. They were terrified that the ruling could cause complications for the embryos and the future of their IVF process. The doctors said there is an increase in cost, in complexity, and the risk of damage to embryos associated with moving them because of the possibility of threats to IVF access.

I have heard so many stories from my own constituents and that of Senator MURRAY's. A mother from Kirkland told me she gave birth to a baby boy after 4 years of fertility treatments, but she is afraid that the future in States might force people like her to remain without that option.

A Spanaway mom of a 19-month-old conceived through IVF asked me to protect IVF so that everyone can choose—everyone gets to choose—when they start their family.

Grandparents from Bremerton of an IVF baby wanted me to know that, during the IVF process, everything—everything, everything—is time-sensitive.

But rulings like Alabama's throw the process into chaos, potentially, permanently ripping away the prospects for these couples of having children.

A Vancouver woman struggling with infertility due to scarring in her abdomen pointed out that IVF is science, and courts and legislators shouldn't be interfering with it.

A woman in Everett, currently going through the IVF process for her second child, urged me to ensure everyone has access to those treatments.

My constituents are right. Congress needs to act today to expand and protect the access to IVF.

While it is safe and common, the IVF process still is stressful. It is still expensive. And that is why the possibility of activists going to court in an overzealous, anti-choice State and getting involved in these choices is not what we should support. We should support making sure that this right is protected. We can't have this continued attack on reproductive healthcare in the United States of America.

The bill we are voting on today would establish the right to access IVF. It also would expand insurance coverage, which is incredibly expensive. Just one cycle can cost between $15,000 and $30,000, and many women require more than one cycle. So that cost can be as high as $60,000.

It would also allow our veterans to help preserve their opportunities.

In February, this Chamber tried to pass a narrow bill codifying the right to access IVF, and it was blocked.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim reproductive freedom isn't under attack. Trust me. Come to the State of Washington, where we have codified these rights. We are seeing this happen. Physicians are moving to our State because they are not sure, if they go home across the Idaho border, that they are not going to get arrested. Women are coming over to get treatment, not sure if they can get back to their State.

The system is more clogged because more people are coming there because we provide the care. All of this is making the system harder to deliver the important things.

I should just say that people aren't even thinking of the two collision courses here, where the vertical integration of healthcare is making it harder and harder for people like gynecologists to even stay in business. And now we are making it harder and harder on States that are the ones who are carrying the burden of upholding reproductive rights.

I ask my colleagues to support this important measure. Let's make sure Americans have the freedom to decide for themselves when and how to have children, and let's put this to rest. Let's give Americans the certainty that fertility treatments in America are part of your healthcare delivery system.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, this is my son Jack, who I think you know. Every time I look at him, I remember the doctor telling my wife Robin and me that we had literally a one-in-a-million chance of naturally conceiving a child—a one-in-a-million chance.

Like so many other couples in America, we had experienced a family health issue that would make having a child very difficult and exceedingly unlikely—all but impossible. You don't know how hard it is to hear something so definitive, so final until you are in that situation. It was the end of a dream we had to create a child together, to grow our little family—our family that, like so many others, didn't have the usual path to this point, the usual path that makes having children without medical help all but certain.

But regardless of what the doctor was telling us, we knew that we would welcome a child with more love and care than I could ever put into words, if we only had the chance.

If red States like Alabama had their way, Robin's and my story would have ended there, in inconsolable heartbreak and what might have been, what should have been. Thankfully for us, we don't live in an America as envisioned by MAGA Republican extremists in Alabama.

The one-in-a-million odds weren't the end of our dream. It was just the start of a new part. That part was called in

vitro fertilization. It is not an easy process. It comes with its ups and downs, its uncertainties, and tremendous cost, both economic and emotional. But it meant our dream could still come true.

And in December 2022, my wife and I welcomed this amazing little man, Jack Hickenlooper, into our family. In vitro gave us what we hoped for. It gave us our one in a million. And we are not the only ones. In 2022 alone, more than 2,300 babies were born in Colorado through fertility services. Across the country, it was nearly 100,000 families. Now, so many families like ours are cherishing the sacred experience of staring into your own child's eyes—when they take off the sunglasses—and of that child staring back.

Every family should have that same opportunity. And to restrict that opportunity in some States but not in others, or for some people but not for others, is nothing more than anti-American. Aren't we the country that stands for equality and freedom?

We are standing here voting on this today because the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, seizing the rights of millions of women, same-sex couples, and families like our own in the process.

Don't take my word for it. Look at Alabama. We have already seen in vitro services stopped cold in the State of Alabama.

That is not all. In the aftermath of the Roe decision, we have seen red States and MAGA Republicans trying to roll back the rights to abortion, to in vitro, and even contraception—banning contraception in America in 2024.

The door is open right now for all of us to show our constituents that American families are more important than playing politics. I certainly hope we all do.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. I want to thank Senator MURRAY for her leadership on this issue. I thank my colleague Senator TAMMY DUCKWORTH.

I first met TAMMY DUCKWORTH about 12 years ago. She was my guest at a State of the Union Address. She was a patient at Walter Reed Hospital. She was recovering from the wounds which she incurred in a combat helicopter, fighting for the United States of America.

What happened to her is unimaginable. A terrorist shot a rocket-propelled grenade into the cockpit of her helicopter, and it landed in her lap. She lost her left leg as a result of it and went through at least a year, maybe more, at Walter Reed Hospital, patching her up, saving her arm, thank goodness, and giving her the kind of guidance she needed to lead a life.

When I met her, I knew she was an extraordinary person, an extraordinary American. I didn't know how extraordinary until I called her one day and said: Would you consider running for office? In a moment of weakness, she says, with medication, she answered yes.

I watched her elected to the U.S. House of Representatives and to the U.S. Senate. She has become more than just a colleague. She is a friend I dearly love. I believe we are lucky to have her in the Nation and in the U.S. Senate.

She made a phone call to me about 8 years ago. I remember it so well. I was driving on Interstate 55 up to Bloomington for a meeting, and it was TAMMY that gave me some news.

I said: What is up, TAMMY?

She said: I am going to have a baby.

You could have knocked me over with a feather. I couldn't believe it. After all she had been through—losing a leg, going through a year or more at Walter Reed Hospital—she and her husband Brian finally had a dream come true. Through in vitro fertilization, she was going to have a baby girl. It was a miracle. I couldn't believe it. Yet it did happen.

We had to change the rules of the Senate so TAMMY DUCKWORTH, the first woman Senator to have a child while serving in the Senate, could bring her baby on the floor of the Senate. We have a special rule for that. But it meant so much for her to let her little girl have that experience that we changed the rules.

The reason I tell you that story is it could be repeated over and over thousands and thousands of times. In vitro fertilization is the ticket for military servicemembers and veterans like TAMMY DUCKWORTH to have the joy of a child. In fact, she has had a second child through IVF. And with that joy, she showed that she cannot only be a great Senator and a great wife, but a terrific mother too.

What is at stake here is privacy and freedom—privacy and freedom—as to whether we as Americans are going to respect one another in making these fundamental human decisions. There are politicians in this Chamber as well as in legislatures across the country who want to make that decision for your family. Don't let them take that away from you.

That is why this vote is so critically important. What we are guaranteeing is the privacy and freedom of individuals and families who want to choose IVF to start or expand their families. That is just common sense.

If you are pro-choice, protect the choice to use IVF to expand your family. If you are pro-life, protect the life that comes out of that process. It becomes such a critical part of your own life.

I listened to Senator HICKENLOOPER. I met Jack. He is worth all the effort and pain they went through. People like Senator HICKENLOOPER and his wife Robin should have that opportunity, and we should protect it. Let's make sure we do.

Vote yes on this proposal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, when I introduced the Women's Health Protection Act a little more than 10 years ago, the idea that Roe v. Wade might be reversed was unthinkable—in fact, unimaginable. We are living now in the post-Dobbs era, which is one of horror and heartbreak for women across the country.

Let's be very clear that the ramifications in our law, in our families, in bedrooms of Americans are widespread and real. The Alabama Supreme Court's ruling is absolutely horrifying to women and families who want IVF to give them the miracle of childbirth, the wondrous magic of a new life as part of their family.

Now, a lot of people are going to look to today's Supreme Court decision and say: Isn't it comforting? No, it is not. This decision on mifepristone was made on a legal technicality. It does nothing to restore the reproductive rights and access to abortion that the Supreme Court dismantled in Dobbs, and it does nothing to reassure families that IVF will be accessible and affordable to them. That is why we need the Right to IVF Act—to reassure Lisa, who lives in Norwalk, CT, who has a healthy and happy baby girl as a result of IVF and cannot imagine life without it. Families like Lisa's wouldn't exist if it weren't for IVF, and many will not exist if we do not pass this measure.

Those who vote against this measure are not in favor of life; they are anti-women, anti-choice, anti-science. This miracle is the result of scientific advance.

I am going to close by just recalling a trip that I recently took to Normandy on the 80th anniversary of D-Day. Walking through the American cemetery, row upon row of gravestones, white, silently eloquent testimony to the importance of freedom and the American determination to expand freedom and liberty across our country and the world, and then to walk on Omaha Beach and see the absolutely insurmountable, three-football-field-long terrain that those soldiers had to confront and overcome on D-Day. I would guess that few, if any, of those young men knew of Roe v. Wade—they were kids, 17 and 18 years old, had never been away from home before, farm boys, mechanics—but they knew they were fighting for freedom. That is why they jumped into that 8 feet of water, under a hail of bullets and mortar fire, fighting for the ideal that America respects and expands the frontiers of freedom.

If we have one-tenth, one-hundredth of their courage and determination, today this body will vote for the Right to IVF Act because it is about freedom.

One Justice of the Supreme Court called the right of privacy ''the right to be let alone,'' and that is what American families want—the right to

be let alone from politicians or government bureaucrats telling them what to do with their families.

We owe it to Americans. We owe it to the great tradition of our veterans of military service, to all who have given their lives to preserve America, the ideal and the beacon of freedom around the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Right to IVF Act, and I want to thank Senator MURRAY, who is here, and Senators DUCKWORTH, BOOKER, and SCHUMER for their leadership on this bill. I am proud to be a cosponsor.

We all know why we are here. We are all here in part because the Supreme Court made a wildly unprecedented decision in the Dobbs case. They threw out decades of precedence, making it the case that my daughter has less rights today than her mom or her grandma did. The ruling goes against the wishes of between 70 and 80 percent of Americans.

In the wake of the disastrous ruling, extremist judges have attempted to undermine IVF and even criminalize doctors for simply doing their jobs. Twenty-one States have fully or partially banned abortion. The number of U.S. patients traveling to other States for care has skyrocketed to one in five. I know because they are coming to Minnesota from North Dakota and South Dakota.

But it wasn't enough for them to just mess with a women's right to decide her own healthcare, no. Now they are trying to control when you choose to start a family. We saw this happen earlier this year in Alabama, where the State supreme court brought IVF procedures in the State to a screeching halt. This is merely the latest instance of the chaos and cruelty that have been unleashed since the Dobbs decision.

We know what a miracle IVF is. You just saw Senator HICKENLOOPER's adorable little boy. IVF is a miracle for millions of families who can't otherwise have children, and no politician and no court should interfere.

Since 1978, over 8 million children have been born due to fertility treatments like IVF. In 2022 alone, more than 1,800 babies were born in Minnesota, in my home State, thanks to IVF. That is why we are fighting to protect these rights.

I am thinking of Miraya and Meta, whom I met this morning, two Minnesota moms. They are with us. They both became parents through the miracle of IVF.

Meta said: I am the proud mother of twin girls, but without IVF and my ability to access treatment, they would not be here today. Our twins are now almost 8 years old, and I cannot imagine my life without them. They are incredible humans who are already bringing so much love, joy, and hope into the world.

That is why, along with Senators DUCKWORTH, MURRAY, BOOKER, and SCHUMER, I am calling on our colleagues to pass the Right to IVF Act. This legislation is hardly a radical proposal. It simply ensures that families can be in the driver's seat when it comes to family planning, not people who want to strip away the rights of those who have them.

This bill safeguards a patient's ability to seek IVF and a healthcare provider's ability to provide these critical services. It ensures that our veterans can choose if, when, and how to start their families. Because the kind of healthcare insurance you have shouldn't determine whether your family can access the miracle of IVF, the bill requires health insurance carriers to cover fertility treatments.

For these last years, we have seen complete chaos, a patchwork of laws across the country. What this bill does is protect freedom, protect the right to start a family.

We all have an opportunity today to make clear where we stand, and I call on our colleagues to join us. The American people overwhelmingly support this bill. Let's get it done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, nearly one in five American couples has trouble conceiving, and many of them turn to IVF for help. In the year 2021, more than 85,000 babies were created using this miraculous procedure—truly a miracle. Yet they will also tell you, these parents, that undergoing treatment is hard and long and painful and challenging and expensive and emotionally and physically draining. It is often a last resort. After a long journey of failed attempts, they talk to their doctor, and their doctor says: Would you like to try this? And even that is going to be super expensive and maybe not work. One in five families experiences this trouble, and there is this miraculous treatment that can help you to start a family.

So let's be really clear about what the so-called pro-life movement is about here. It is not about life at all. In this instance, it is specifically about assigning the rights of a fully formed human being to a fertilized embryo in a petri dish so that they can control females—so that they can control females. That is exactly what this is about.

Look, there is a fair amount of spin going around Washington—more than usual—because Republicans understand how angry families are, how angry people who are not yet able to conceive are, and so they are trying to get people to believe something other than their own eyes and their own experience.

But here is the beauty of this place: We talk and talk and talk and talk and talk, and then we vote. There is one opportunity and one opportunity only to enshrine the right to IVF in Federal statutory law.

I don't care what you tweeted. I don't care what you said on cable news. I don't care what the memo from the campaign arm of the Republican National Committee says. In a few minutes, we will know the official position of the Republican conference on IVF, and the Susan B. Anthony list and the MAGA Court and these extreme forces in our society are going to show that the Republican Party is not for IVF.

I wish it were different. I wish we could pass this law. But the beauty of the Senate floor is that everybody will be on the record by the end of the afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I rise in support of this legislation. I thank my colleagues, Senator MURRAY, Senator BOOKER, and Senator DUCKWORTH.

You know, there are two things. One is good news, and one is bad news. I will start with the bad news.

We have a terrible U.S. Supreme Court. It will live in infamy for many reasons but none more than an ignominious decision that took away constitutional rights that American citizens enjoyed. They stripped women of their right to choose. Enormously bad consequences. It has created an incentive for folks who have their views to try to impose them on others, and we saw that in Alabama with their effort to prohibit people from having access to in vitro fertilization.

But there is good news. The good news: our American families, couples who want to have a child, who are so excited about taking on that challenge of loving this new person and caring for them through their infancy, through their adolescence, looking forward to when they themselves will be grandparents. That is the good news.

In 2022, 91,000 infants, through IVF, came into these families, so those couples have that opportunity to have this place to give the love that is within them that they can now express, having this child. That is really the good news here. So, yeah, I am upset about the Supreme Court, but I am so excited about American families that want to make this decision and have IVF as an option for them to be able to realize their dreams of giving love to this new person in the world.

Now, our Republican colleagues are saying that this is a show vote so why pay attention to it. Well, you know what, they are right. They are right. It is a vote to show that we want to make certain, with the power of the U.S. Congress, that the decision a family wants to make about trying to conceive through IVF is protected; that they have the capacity to take advantage of the best medicine that is out there to realize that dream that is a dream about life. And what is wrong with showing the people of the United States that each and every one of us in the U.S. Senate wants to not only show that we respect and honor the decision

those citizens are making, but with the power invested in us as U.S. Senators, we are going to use the authority of our vote to guarantee they have that right?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, thank you to Senator DUCKWORTH for her leadership today on the floor.

In February, the Alabama Supreme Court placed the medical procedure that has helped millions of Americans realize their dream of having children, in vitro fertilization, or IVF, at risk. The Alabama judges used the Supreme Court's decision in the Dobbs case to justify their argument.

These extremist judges showed the American people that the Dobbs case was never just about abortion. Dobbs was a preview of coming atrocities, and the Supreme Court majority declared open season on American reproductive freedom.

And Republicans got to work. States passed immediate and overbroad abortion bans; peeled back protections for access to birth control, IUDs, and Plan B; and put access to IVF at risk. They created confusing, restrictive, and punitive schemes across States and threatened to jail patients and providers.

And they aren't finished. Republicans don't have to pass a national ban on abortion, birth control, or IVF to effectively achieve that goal. Confusion, misinformation, and fear are the point. In some States, they make it so difficult and so terrifying to get reproductive care that it is like it is already banned.

But in creating this chaos, Republicans have made clear their intentions and their position: Republicans will not protect the right to an abortion; Republicans will not protect the right to birth control; and Republicans will not protect the right to start a family.

Republicans will try to hide their extremism and say they support contraception and IVF, but we are calling their bluff.

Given the chance to protect access to contraception, they voted no. And today, given the chance to vote to protect IVF, they will vote no.

Republicans will continue to pursue their anti-choice, anti-freedom, and show the American people what ''GOP'' really stands for: Gutting Our Protections. The GOP are so offended by bodily autonomy that they would rather follow the extremism of the few than the will of the majority of American people who want their reproductive rights protected.

We must meet the clarity of their extremism with the clarity of justice. We will fight for reproductive freedom. We will fight for national protections for abortion, birth control, and IVF. We will keep putting them on the record, and we will guarantee that they are held accountable to the American people who will not forget who tossed away their freedom in pursuit of radical rightwing extremism.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the Right to IVF Act is simple. It says that all Americans should have access to the tools that they need to start a family, no matter where they live or how much they earn or whether they serve in the military.

That all sounds obvious. We shouldn't even need this bill, but we do need this bill. We need this bill because a judge in Alabama ruled that an embryo that is created by basic assistive reproductive technologies like IVF can be considered children. And that even if embryos aren't viable, an IVF provider could be held liable for manslaughter or murder if anything happens to those embryos.

We need this bill because the cost for a single round of IVF is enough to bankrupt a family, let alone two or three or four rounds, and many parents are forced to bear all of those costs out-of-pocket. A constituent in Oregon said:

> Most fertility treatments are considered ''elective'' by insurance companies. I never elected to have a deformed uterus and fallopian tubes.

Another parent in Oregon who was a public servant for 22 years added up the out-of-pocket costs:

> $9,000 to see the Reproductive Endocrinologist, $2,000 for consultation and diagnostic testing . . . $7,000 for medications . . . $3,000 for cryo-preservation and storage fees . . . $5- to 7,000 for genetic testing . . . $2- to 3,000 for embryo transfer.
>
> Then, we hope and pray it works. If not, then we do a second round. Again, all cash. Our insurance benefits do not cover ANY infertility treatments. We have nothing left.

This is unacceptable. Fertility treatments are medical care that should be covered by insurance, full stop. We need this bill because many of our military servicemembers and veterans have been wounded and lost the ability to conceive, and many more are deployed to dangerous combat zones right now. Infertility rates for our members of the military can be up to three times higher than the rest of the population. They protect our families. Let us protect their ability to have a family and guarantee they have access to IVF and the other fertility care they need.

And we need this bill because, as we celebrate the month of June as Pride Month, we know that many of our LGBTQ+ friends and family members rely on IVF to conceive.

We shouldn't need this bill, but we do, to protect IVF providers, to cover IVF costs, protect the ability of members of our military, LGBTQ community to start a family.

Anyone who has been through IVF knows that someone who is willing to endure the long and heart-wrenching process that involves truly wants to become a parent, to have children, to raise a family. And we should do all we can to support that.

So I urge my Republican colleagues to reconsider. Instead of being so anti-family, instead of denying the ability of our community members to have children, join us in this protection.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise and want to thank my colleague from Washington State who has been leading on these issues for years and years and my friend from Illinois. And what I am going to do just briefly, my colleagues have been so eloquent, is talk about why Senator DUCKWORTH's legislation is so important at this crucial time. It is absolutely essential that we pass the Duckworth bill.

And as far as I am concerned, I am prepared to stay on this floor—I mentioned this to my colleague—for as long as it takes. We are just going to stay at it until we get this done. And the reason I feel so strongly about this is, several decades ago, as a young Member of the Congress—the other body, the House, with a full head of hair and rugged good looks—I wrote a law called the Fertility Clinic Success Rate and Certification Act. It was supported by the profession. It was supported by patient groups.

And I never imagined, after we passed that law, that people would be out here on the floor of the U.S. Senate trying to unravel the progress that has been made. And when we passed it, it was all about some simple ideas, particularly clarity for the families trying to navigate the system. It was largely information.

It was a new technology then, decades ago. It is not now. Now it is proven. Families rejoice being able to use it.

And never did I imagine that we would have an effort on the floor of the U.S. Senate trying to turn back the clock, trying to unravel the progress that has been made. That is what Senator MURRAY and Senator DUCKWORTH are taking on: a rearguard action to turn back the clock and unravel the progress that has been made for so many families.

And, unfortunately, this is kind of where we have been for a while, trying to unravel the progress with respect to contraceptives, trying to unravel the progress with mifepristone. We will have more to talk about all of this.

But the court ruling out of Alabama earlier this year would have effectively turned back the progress, made IVF impossible. And since then, we have seen the far right, as my colleagues have said, trying to build on the effort to take away our freedom.

And none of this seemed to me, Senator DUCKWORTH, imaginable several decades ago when people were rejoicing because they knew how to navigate the system and get information, figure out what providers were right for them, and it worked so well, as it does today.

And your bill is absolutely essential business for the Senate. I would just

say to my colleagues here: Do not vote to unravel all of this progress that families rejoice in. Support the Duckworth legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I am the Senator from Delaware, and I am joined by my colleague from Delaware. And one of the things that has long distinguished Delaware—it was one of the first States in the whole country where, because of her personal experience with IVF, a former Republican, Delaware insurance commissioner, helped drive through mandatory insurance coverage for IVF in the State of Delaware years ago. The idea that today we would be on the floor of the Senate advocating on behalf of Senator DUCKWORTH's bill to put in law protections, the right to access IVF, would have been unthinkable.

I still remember, as someone hoping to become a parent, struggling with the challenge of working through difficulties that we as a couple faced in becoming pregnant and talking all the time to friends and neighbors and others who were going through similar challenges. There is nothing more important in life than being a parent. And sometimes all of these activities and debates here on the floor don't connect. People have a hard time understanding why this matters. One of the reasons I am so thrilled that Senator DUCKWORTH is leading this effort here on the floor today is it is easy to understand. Because of her service to our Nation, because of her grievous wounds in combat is why, perhaps, this is so important to her and her family.

But I wanted to share the story of a Delawarean, and I am so grateful she has allowed me to share her story today.

Lindsay Griffin was diagnosed with Stage IV endometriosis, which prevented her from ever conceiving naturally. Lindsay and her husband were determined to become parents. And like so many of us, knew that it would be expensive and difficult and take a long time. They even took out a $25,000 loan to pay for IVF.

Lindsay endured procedure after procedure, surgeries, embryo transfers, even the loss of a pregnancy. Now, today, years later, they are parents to two healthy boys, 7 and 2.

Why would we in this country put this blessing of parenthood for so many in Delaware and Illinois and throughout our Nation at risk? It is already hard enough.

Today, Lindsay and her husband are blessed with two children. But in States like Alabama, far-right lawmakers and judges have already tried to deny families this precious gift.

The vast majority of Americans want us to pass this bill today, want us to protect the right to IVF. Eighty-six percent of Americans in a recent poll want us to do this. So why is this even controversial? In the best of circumstances, the journey to the blessing of parenthood is difficult. The journey to the blessing of parenthood through IVF is incredibly hard: emotionally, financially, physically.

Let's stand up for families for the common and shared principle that the blessing of parenting should not in any way be barred by threats to the procedure of in vitro fertilization. I stand before you today as someone committed to protecting IVF in Delaware, in this Congress, in this Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The junior Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, as we approach the 2-year anniversary of the disastrous Dobbs decision, I am struck by the chaos it has sown across our country.

Last week, on this floor, I was joined by a number of my Democratic colleagues in speaking out against the Republicans' attacks on contraception. Despite the relentless attacks from my colleagues across the aisle that they actually support the right to contraception, when it came down to it, nearly every single Republican voted against a bill protecting the right to contraception.

Today, I rise in defense of another tool that has helped millions of people across our country start or grow their families. This tool is called in vitro fertilization. For decades, IVF and other assisted reproductive technologies—or ART—have helped people who otherwise couldn't start families of their own.

While some on the right like to paint IVF as some sort of new or untested technology, that is not so. The first baby delivered via IVF was more than 45 years ago, and since then, IVF has helped bring more than 10 million babies—10 million babies—into this world. In fact, as a State representative in the Hawaii Legislature in the 1980s, I led the passage of a bill making Hawaii one of the first States in the Nation to require health insurers to cover IVF treatment. That was in 1987, years before the iPhone, before email, before some of my colleagues in Congress were even born. And earlier this year, I met Dr. Lori Kamemoto, an OBGYN who helped deliver the first baby born in Hawaii via IVF.

And yet, thanks to the chaos created by Dobbs, a whole range of reproductive rights are on the chopping block. Look at Alabama, where the State supreme court invoked a fetal personhood law to call into question the legality of IVF, effectively halting IVF treatments in the State. In this Chamber, earlier this year, Republicans blocked our attempts in passing a bill protecting IVF.

The impacts of these concerted attacks are being felt far beyond the red States. In Hawaii, a doctor who practices in the OB–GYN field on Oahu reported that he ''[O]bserved an increasing level of anxiety among both [his] fertility patients and staff.'' So Hawaii being one of the first States to protect IVF and promote IVF, this doctor is saying that even his patients are seeing the impact of all of these attacks on our reproductive rights.

IVF is a complicated process as it is, even under the best of circumstances. The last thing people trying to conceive need to worry about is being criminalized by some of the States I mentioned—Alabama—because of the whims of far-right jurists and politicians.

That is why this bill is so important. It would establish a nationwide right for patients to access IVF and other ART services and a right for doctors to provide IVF treatment. And, crucially, it would require and expand health insurance coverage of IVF because we know access without affordability is not true access. But my Republican colleagues appear blinded by their obsession with power and control over women's bodies that they are unable to support even this commonsense bill—again, indicating how out of touch Republicans are about the needs of particularly women in our country. It is disappointing, but not surprising. They continue to show us just how out of step they are with the American people.

So today, the Democrats will vote to protect the right to IVF as we continue working to ensure people can make decisions about their bodies, their lives, and their futures—free from government interference.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, as many of our colleagues know, I am the proud father of two sons and a stepson. It has been the joy of my life to be their father. My wife and I love them all unconditionally.

But the journey to parenthood is not the same for every family, nor always an easy one. Being the last Vietnam veteran serving in the U.S. Senate, I know the importance of helping our servicemembers when they return home from deployment abroad.

During my three deployments to Southeast Asia many years ago, many of my brothers in combat shared dreams of coming home to marry and start families of their own. But those who made it home from Southeast Asia, as well as other war zones past and present, have often struggled with health issues for years to come, including infertility.

While IVF was not an option for returning Vietnam veterans, had it been available, I know it would have helped countless young couples start their families in the country they fought so hard to protect. We have an obligation to serve those who serve our country, and this bill does just that.

The Right to IVF Act is a commonsense piece of legislation, and bringing more life into this world should be an issue that all of us can agree on.

I urge all of our colleagues to join us today in passing this legislation before us.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the Right to IVF Act. So here is something that is close to a miracle. People who have struggled and struggled to have children are able today, through the very best science and medicine, to conceive and to bring a child into the world. It is incredible; it is a blessing.

In 2021, more than 86,000 babies born in America were conceived through IVF. And in my home State of Minnesota, I have heard from so many of my constituents who have struggled with infertility and who wouldn't have children but for IVF. So today, we have the opportunity to vote on a bill that protects us. Our bill is straightforward in its purpose. It would establish a clear and enforceable nationwide right for people to receive IVF, for doctors to provide IVF, and for health insurance to cover IVF.

So if you live in a State where a Republican State legislature passes a law infringing on IVF, that would be stopped by our bill. If you get your health insurance through your employer, your health insurance would cover your care. If you are a servicemember or a veteran, as my colleague Senator CARPER said, you are covered—same for Federal employees. And if you get your health insurance through Medicaid, which covers 40 percent of the births in this country, you are covered.

So you may be asking: Who could disagree with this? It is a good question. And here is the reality. Since the extremist Supreme Court Justices—appointed by Donald Trump and confirmed by Senate Republicans—since they overturned Roe, Trump abortion bans across the country have sown chaos and confusion. And they have emboldened States that have created this chilling effect on reproductive healthcare and emboldened States like Alabama to restrict IVF.

Now, if my colleagues on the other side want to protect IVF, if they believe that doctors and providers should be able to provide IVF without fear of criminal prosecution, then they would vote for our bill.

Colleagues, I hope that Republicans will vote with us to proceed on our bill so that we can make real progress to protect access to IVF and to say very clearly that government has no business interfering in your families' decision about the healthcare that you need to treat infertility.

If my Republican colleagues want to make it clear where you stand on IVF, please join us in voting for this bill today. If you vote no, your actions speak louder than any words.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Madam President, I rise today to speak in support of my bill to protect IVF. Elissa Smith was living in Alabama when she heard the news this past February. She had been pregnant a few years earlier, but it had left her with scars, both emotionally and physically.

She had been in her third trimester with her first child when she had learned that she had cancer. She gave birth early to a beautiful baby girl. Then soon after, she underwent surgery, chemotherapy, multiple medical procedures—you name it—a care plan that helped to get rid of the disease but that also left her unable to conceive again. Thankfully, she had than undergone one round of IVF before her treatment for cancer.

Fast forward to early 2024, things were finally getting brighter. She and her husband had just begun to research surrogates to carry her viable embryos. Then, a gavel sounded out of her State courthouse, marking the ruling that changed theirs and so many other families' lives.

On February 16, the Alabama Supreme Court declared that frozen extrauterine embryos created through IVF should be considered children under State law—a ruling that painted would-be moms and their doctors as criminals and one that uprooted the dreams and began the nightmares of aspiring parents, as IVF clinics statewide soon paused treatments out of fear that their doctors and patients would be punished for trying to start families.

Elissa was one of these women. Now, it seemed like her desperately hoped for wish of growing her family was snatched away by an extremist court that either had no idea or simply didn't care about everything that had gone into trying to turn her dreams of a family into reality.

Elissa's story is exceptional. But it is not the exception. For so many women, that lifelong hope of having children is now stuck in a hellish limbo, as they remain uncertain whether more States will follow Alabama's lead; as they are forced to live in fear that Republican success come November would even further imperil their right to try to create a family; as they remain unsure whether living in a red State under a Trump Presidency could mean getting jail time for committing this supposed sin of needing modern medicine to bring into the world a baby to nuzzle and swaddle and love.

Look, I was actually stationed in Alabama many times throughout my 23 years of military service. And I didn't know it at the time back then, but infertility would become one of the most heartbreaking struggles of my life, my miscarriage more painful than any wound I ever earned on the battlefield.

It is only thanks to IVF that I get to be embarrassingly proud when I hang my 6-year-old's drawings on my Senate office walls or that I get to be tackled in bed every Mother's Day by my 9-year-old who runs into my room bearing the biggest of hugs and sweetest of cards.

So excuse me if I find it a bit offensive when a bunch of politicians who have never spent a day in med school hint that those of us who have needed the help of IVF to become moms should be sitting behind bars rather than lulling our babies to sleep in rocking chairs.

My apologies if I take it personally when the same folks who rely on NRA blood money to get elected suggest that women like me are committing acts akin to murder when all we are trying to do is create life and not have to suffer through more miscarriages.

You know, right after the Alabama ruling came out, I came to this very spot and begged my GOP colleagues to help me pass my bill that would set the simple standard that no doctor or hopeful parent could be criminalized for IVF. And Republicans blocked it. This was after days and days of the GOP claiming to support IVF. This was after they claimed to support reproductive health. This was after days of them claiming that they actually gave a damn about the women in this country. Naturally, that was all untrue, all a ruse to mislead voters.

And at this point, it is obvious: The only thing they care about is kissing up to trial room Trump and bowing down to the most extreme wing of their party. Things like common decency or common sense doesn't even register anymore.

It comes down to this: Every woman deserves to be able to be called ''mama'' without being called a criminal. That is why, today, I am trying once again to pass legislation that would enshrine into law every American's right to IVF, now called the Right to IVF Act.

If Republicans actually care more about protecting women's health more than they do about getting invitations to Mar-a-Lago, then all they have to do to show it is help me move my bill forward—because, look, struggling with infertility is hard. Using all your savings to go through round after round of IVF is hard. This vote? Well, that is one thing that is actually really simple: Vote for it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 5 minutes, followed by Leader SCHUMER for up to 3.

Mr. BOOKER. Reserving the right to object, if the Senator would allow me just to not give my remarks on the floor but enter them into the RECORD, I am happy to give consent to that.

Mr. CASSIDY. Absolutely. And I did not mean to cut you off, and I apologize. I did not know you were in the queue. I apologize.

Mr. BOOKER. I am the junior Senator from New Jersey; I am used to being cut off.

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

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I rise today in support of the Right to

IVF Act, a package of bills that I was proud to introduce alongside my colleagues, Senator DUCKWORTH and Senator MURRAY. This legislation does two key things: it establishes an enforceable nationwide right to fertility treatments, including in vitro fertilization or IVF and it allows more people to access these critical, family building treatments at a lower cost by expanding insurance coverage.

I am especially proud that my bill, the Access to Fertility Treatment and Care Act, is included in this package. This bill makes fertility care, including IVF, more affordable by requiring employer-sponsored insurance plans and other public insurance plans to cover those treatments.

Millions of Americans who rely on fertility treatments and IVF to build their families face excessive out-of-pocket costs.

This would help Americans like Lindsay Gordon, a constituent of mine from Glassboro, NJ, realize her dream of starting a family. When Lindsay and her husband Daniel were diagnosed with male-factor infertility, IVF became the only option to have children. But even though they both worked for private corporations, neither Lindsay nor Daniel had insurance coverage for fertility treatment. So they drained their life savings and Lindsay actually took on a second job at night to afford IVF treatments, working over 18 hours a day for over a year. Heartbreakingly, Lindsay and Daniel suffered multiple miscarriages while going through the process to achieve a pregnancy. In all, their fertility journey cost them close to $100,000 in out-of-pocket healthcare costs. This is a staggering burden that can keep people from accessing these medical services.

There is a happy ending to their family building journey: Lindsay and Daniel were ultimately blessed with a baby boy. But no family should have to struggle so much to build the family of their dreams.

There is overwhelming support for the Right to IVF Act: it has 46 cosponsors in the Senate. By supporting this legislation, we make clear to Lindsay and Daniel Gordon and to the American people that being rich or poor should not dictate whether you get to start or grow a family.

Supporting this bill also sends the message that radical courts and legislators should not dictate whether someone has access to reproductive health care.

Since the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, we have seen a full-scale assault on the rights of women to make their own reproductive health care decisions. We have seen increased attempts by State governments to exercise control over women's bodies, including by criminalizing expectant mothers. And we have seen confusion and uncertainty amongst medical providers, who are trying to uphold the oath they swore to care for their patients.

The Court's radical decision to overturn Roe opened the floodgates on attacks beyond abortion to other types of reproductive health. The Alabama Supreme Court made a medically and scientifically unfounded decision that a frozen embryo should be treated as the legal equivalent of an existent child or a fetus gestating in a uterus. IVF treatment immediately halted across Alabama following this ruling, illustrating how fragile access to these services are without a federal enforceable right to IVF.

I firmly believe that everyone everywhere deserves to have access to high quality, comprehensive healthcare. Healthcare includes reproductive services, fertility care, and abortion. I am not alone in this belief. Most American adults agree with me that these rights must be protected.

I know there are people across this country, in red States and blues States alike, making deeply personal reproductive healthcare decisions. These decisions should not be more difficult because of the assault on reproductive freedom. I look forward to continuing to fight to protect your fundamental freedoms and to increase access to reproductive healthcare for every American.

I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I have been sitting here listening to this, and I can't help but notice that my Democratic fellow Senators have chosen to disrespect and deceive the American people as they politicize a deeply personal issue for short-term political gain—distorting facts, capitalizing on the pain and the longing of women desperate to conceive, families desperate to hold a child. Democrats are trivializing, for political purposes, the substantial emotional, financial, and personal investment required of a woman and of a family to become pregnant through IVF.

Let's set the record straight. I support IVF. Republicans in the Senate support IVF.

Now, the tragic situation in Alabama has been used to fearmonger and scare that IVF is somehow in jeopardy, as though for someone who has a hope for a future family, that hope is threatened. And that is not true. Let's just say there is no State in the United States of America that prohibits a woman from growing her family through IVF, and Democrats know that.

Let me say that again. There is not a single State which bans IVF; and Alabama, which has been mentioned several times, specifically passed a law after the Mobile incident in which they make sure—affirm—that IVF is available.

So this bill before us today would have done nothing to prevent that which happened in Mobile, where embryos were dropped and destroyed. In the recent case at Mobile's Center for Reproductive Medicine, a hospital patient wandered into the embryology lab—how did that happen?—removed five human embryos from cryostorage, and dropped them, destroying the embryos.

Tragically, cases like this are not isolated. There was a storage tank failure in San Francisco that resulted in the death of 3,500 eggs and human embryos and another in Ohio in which 4,000 eggs and human embryos died.

A recent investigation into a fertility clinic with 33 locations across the country uncovered multiple instances of accidental embryo destruction, mislabeled embryos, and labs with faulty heating, ventilation, and air conditioning.

Just this year, a fertility clinic in California used hydrogen peroxide instead of distilled water during the incubation period—used hydrogen peroxide instead of distilled water—rendering all of the embryos nonviable. Then, if you can believe it, the clinic allegedly transferred more than two dozen embryos into would-be mothers despite knowing that this would not end in a pregnancy.

It is expected, at a minimum, that fertility clinics protect and respect human life, keeping these treasured embryos safe. Women, mothers, parents—they deserve better.

But what we have today is a haphazardly copied and pasted bill that sets up a messy hierarchy of unfunded mandates and inconsistent policies. For example, under this legislation, private insurance companies are required to provide unlimited fertility treatments and related storage, but the bill limits how many treatments a veteran can get through the VA clinic.

So why are women who receive care at the VA treated differently than those with commercial insurance? If access to IVF is really a problem and this legislation is really needed, we could have addressed that if we had taken this bill through the committee process, but I note that Leader SCHUMER plucked it out of the committee before we had a chance to address the shortcomings, and he brought it to the floor for, I presume, political purposes.

By the way, we don't even have a CBO score. That is usually like, you can't bring anything to the floor unless you have a Congressional Budget Office score. How much is it going to cost? It is because this is not serious legislation. The CBO, by the way, acknowledges that it has not evaluated and cannot evaluate this mash-up of bills.

The committee process would have allowed us to explore the effect of a mandate on Federal programs like Medicare, the DOD, the VA, small businesses, and State Medicaid programs. So how will this legislation impact that woman business owner with 20 employees, 10 of whom are women in their childbearing years? We don't know. We don't know because this is not serious legislation. It was not taken through the committee process. It is a political process. Now, we can guess. Premiums will skyrocket.

I ask unanimous consent for 2 more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASSIDY. That woman I described with a small business who has 10 employees must now make the challenging decision to absorb the new cost or consider not offering health insurance to employees or laying employees off.

Interestingly, labor unions got more time to comply with the insurance mandate than others. If this is a political bill, you would expect a carve-out for political supporters.

The bill requires coverage of genetic testing of human embryos, which may help inform decisions about which embryos to transfer first, but to what end? And will these tests be used to screen for life-ending conditions?

I only see two limits in this bill: one, on the ability of healthcare providers to exercise their conscience rights when practicing medicine and, two, on States that wish to regulate the practice of medicine in a way that treats human embryos with the value and dignity they deserve.

Republicans are so open to working with Democrats on a sincere bipartisan effort, but this is a show vote. Unfortunately, Democrats do not care about working with Republicans to protect IVF access. They wish to manufacture an issue they can campaign on.

Today's vote is disingenuous. Pushing a bill that is haphazardly drafted and destined to fail does a disservice to all women who may pursue IVF treatments.

I will end as I started. This seems a deceiving, disrespectful bill to misinform and scare the public and to gin up Democratic votes for November. And that is shame. Americans deserve better.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, today, Senators face a very simple question: Do you agree Americans should have access to IVF; yes or no? If ''yes,'' the only correct answer is to vote yes on the Right to IVF Act.

Protecting IVF should be the easiest ''yes'' vote Senators have taken all year. All this bill does is establish a nationwide right to IVF and eliminate barriers for millions of Americans who seek IVF to have kids.

It is personal to me. I have a beautiful 1-year-old grandson because of the miracle of IVF. And so, in a perfect world, a bill like this would not be necessary, but after the fiasco of the Alabama Supreme Court decision and the generally MAGA views of some on the Supreme Court, Americans are genuinely worried that IVF is the next target of anti-choice extremists.

To my Republican colleagues who say they are pro-family, today's bill protecting IVF is as pro-family as it gets, and we should vote yes today.

It is a contradiction to claim you are pro-family but then turn around and vote to block protections for IVF. The contrast today is glaring. Here in the Senate, Democrats are talking about protecting women and IVF, and a couple of blocks away, Trump and our Republican colleagues are talking about protecting tax cuts for the very wealthy.

So the American people are watching how we vote today on basic freedom. Parents back home are watching how we vote. Couples who want to become parents are watching how we vote. It is very simple: If you support access to IVF then vote to protect access to IVF today.

Thank you to Senators Duckworth, Murray, Booker, and so many others leading on this legislation.

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

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. 413, S. 4445, a bill to protect and expand nationwide access to fertility treatment, including in vitro fertilization.

Charles E. Schumer, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Alex Padilla, Tammy Baldwin, Tim Kaine, Richard J. Durbin, Jeanne Shaheen, Benjamin L. Cardin, Debbie Stabenow, Patty Murray, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tina Smith, Elizabeth Warren, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 413, S. 4445, a bill to protect and expand nationwide access to fertility treatment, including in vitro fertilization, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) would have voted ''nay.''

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 47, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 197 Leg.]

YEAS—48

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

NAYS—47

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

NOT VOTING—5

Butler	Sanders	Sinema
Menendez	Schmitt	

(Mr. MERKLEY assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. WHITEHOUSE assumed the Chair.)

(Mr. CARPER assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). On this vote, the yeas are 48, the nays are 47.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion was rejected.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, for everyone's awareness, I am changing my vote on this bill, from yes to no, in order to have the option of returning to this legislation later. We hope some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will see the light and change their minds.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote with respect to the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 413, S. 4445.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 510.

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 Katherine E. Oler, 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. 510, Katherine E. Oler, 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. 464.

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 Mustafa Taher Kasubhai, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

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. 464, Mustafa Taher Kasubhai, of Oregon, to be United States District Judge for the District of Oregon.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls for the cloture motions filed today, June 13, be waived.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

REMEMBERING MICHAEL LOVELL

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, on a picturesque college campus in Milwaukee, WI, the excited whispers of students would make you think a celebrity had just walked by. And, in a way, a celebrity had just walked by—because in the eyes of the Marquette University community, beloved University President Michael Lovell was a figure to admire, learn from, and emulate. He embodied cura personalis—Marquette's guiding principle—meaning ''care for the whole person.''

There is something especially painful about the death of those taken from us too soon. And so it is with a heavy heart that I grieve the loss of Dr. Michael Lovell—celebrated president of Marquette University, distinguished engineer, educator, and scholar. President Lovell passed away last week after a 3-year long battle with sarcoma, a rare form of cancer. His time with us was cut short, but during his 57 years of life, he had a tremendous impact on students, the Milwaukee community, and all those lucky enough to call him a loved one.

For the past decade, Dr. Lovell served as the president of Marquette University. Though a man of faith, he was the first president who was a layman, rather than a member of the Catholic clergy. In this role, President Lovell became a fixture of the Marquette community, showing a fierce devotion to the university and the city he called home.

Prior to serving as Marquette's president, Dr. Lovell served as the chancellor of the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and, before that, as the dean of its engineering college. An engineer by trade, President Lovell held not one, not two, but three mechanical engineering degrees, including a doctorate from the University of Pittsburgh. And he was recognized nationally and globally for his exceptional talents. Throughout the course of his career, he received awards from the National Science Foundation, was a fellow of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers and National Academy of Inventors, and earned U.S. and global patents.

During his tenure as Marquette's president, Dr. Lovell helped create the Near West Side Partners, a nonprofit dedicated to the economic development, safety, and community identity of Milwaukee's seven near west side neighborhoods. Under his leadership, Marquette grew to new heights. Dr. Lovell was instrumental in the construction of a new athletics center, new residence hall, new green spaces, new academic buildings, and countless other projects across Marquette's campus. His stewardship shaped the university, and every student that passes through those new halls will benefit from his dedication to making Marquette a world-class institution.

But more impressive than what he accomplished was the relationships he built. Marquette was dear to him. In an interview with the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel in 2022, he reflected on why he continued to work as he battled cancer. His response was simple: ''When you don't know how much time you have left, you want your days to be impactful and you want to do things that you love.'' And, boy, did President Lovell love that community. He lived by that guiding principle of cura personalis. He showed up for his students—fostering not only their academic potential, but their growth as future leaders who engaged with their communities. Students fondly recall running alongside him for the annual Briggs and Al's Run or him handing out hot cookies and ice cream in the dining halls. And of course, he made regular appearances on the jumbotron at Marquette basketball games.

Dr. Lovell made a habit of meeting with and listening to students. He often sat down with small groups of them for lunch to hear about their classes or to discuss the probability of the basketball team making it through March Madness and into the Final Four. And as Milwaukee reckoned with its own history of racial injustice in 2020, Dr. Lovell held townhalls and met directly with students of color to better understand their experiences on campus. Because of those listening sessions and student advocacy, President Lovell partnered with the Black student council to establish new scholarships for students of color, improve the diversity of counselors on campus, and strengthen the core curriculum to require additional education on racial injustice.

And this commitment to the well-being of students reached beyond campus. In the wake of the horrific January 6 insurrection, Dr. Lovell heard that a 2018 Marquette alumnus was among the U.S. Capitol Police officers protecting lawmakers that day. He personally reached out to that former student, offering gratitude for his service and the full support of the university. It was a small gesture, but one that demonstrated just how much Dr.

Lovell cared for Marquette's students, past and present.

Marquette University may not be in Illinois, but it is significant to me. My son is a proud Marquette graduate, as are many of my incredible staff members in Washington, DC, and across Illinois. And it was President Lovell's innovative and empathetic leadership that helped make Marquette so special for so many. In the words of Milwaukee Bucks Head Coach Doc Rivers, who played for Marquette in the 1980s, President Lovell was a ''gentle giant.'' I join my staff, my son, and the whole Marquette community in mourning the loss of President Lovell.

While Dr. Lovell's legacy will live on in all the lives he touched, it does not make this loss any easier. He was deeply kind, an exceptional listener, and unyieldingly optimistic in the face of a formidable diagnosis. President Lovell lived the last years of his life to the fullest. And, in part, it was his deep religious convictions that allowed him to remain strong during such trying health challenges. I admire his faith and resilience.

Loretta and I join his wife Amy and his four children—Marissa, Matt, Anna, and Kevin—in grieving this tremendous loss. We send our love to all of you. Though he has passed, Dr. Lovell's embodiment of cura personalis carries on—and we are all better for it.

TRIBUTE TO THE KENTUCKY BOURBON TRAIL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, it was roughly two centuries ago that Kentucky's early settlers first began converting corn and grain into the rich, amber liquor we now know as bourbon. Originating from the heart of the Bluegrass State, America's only native spirit has since achieved worldwide recognition and secured Kentucky's foremost place as the world capital of bourbon whiskey.

Today, visitors from all 50 States and 26 countries have traveled to the Commonwealth to enjoy this corn-based, barrel-aged spirit along the famous Kentucky Bourbon Trail. Founded in 1999, the Kentucky Bourbon Trail connects distilleries all over the Commonwealth for natives and visitors alike to responsibly enjoy our State's signature spirit. What started as only seven distilleries has grown into an international destination. Today, the Kentucky Bourbon Trail encompasses 46 distilleries offering everything from behind-the-scenes tours to unique experiences that celebrate Kentucky's rich history in bourbon production.

The Kentucky Bourbon Trail originated as a gathering place for bourbon enthusiasts to celebrate the tradition and time-honored craft behind this liquor in its birthplace. However, today the trail continues to enrich and give back to Kentucky as a vital part of our State's tourism economy. Since its inception in 1999, bourbon production in Kentucky has surged by 493 percent and, within that time, became the largest export among all distilled spirits in the United States. Other areas within our economy have also experienced unprecedented growth—new hotels, tourism companies, and other local attractions have all cropped up along the trail's many destinations.

This year, the Kentucky Bourbon Trail celebrates 25 years since its founding. I want to thank all those involved for their stewardship of Kentucky's heritage and their work to build our State's vibrant bourbon industry. As this Kentucky landmark celebrates its silver jubilee, I would like to extend my best wishes to its dedicated team and all the hard-working Kentuckians who have contributed to the enduring popularity and legacy of bourbon whiskey.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, section 36(b) of the Arms Export Control Act requires that Congress receive prior notification of certain proposed arms sales as defined by that statute. Upon such notification, the Congress has 30 calendar days during which the sale may be reviewed. The provision stipulates that, in the Senate, the notification of proposed sales shall be sent to the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In keeping with the committee's intention to see that relevant information is still available to the full Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the notifications that have been received. If the cover letter references a classified annex, then such an annex is available to all Senators in the office of the Foreign Relations Committee, room SD–423.

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

DEFENSE SECURITY COOPERATION AGENCY,
Washington, DC.

Hon. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, we are forwarding herewith Transmittal No. 24–49, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of Norway for defense articles and services estimated to cost $1.94 billion. We will issue a news release to notify the public of this proposed sale upon delivery of this letter to your office.

Sincerely,

MIKE MILLER
(For James A. Hursch, Director).

Enclosures.

TRANSMITTAL NO. 24–49

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended

(i) Prospective Purchaser: Government of Norway.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:

Major Defense Equipment * $0.92 billion.

Other $1.02 billion.

Total $1.94 billion.

(iii) Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

Three hundred (300) AIM–120C–8 Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM).

Twenty (20) AIM–120C–8 AMRAAM guidance sections.

Non-MDE: Also included are AMRAAM containers and support equipment; spare parts, consumables, accessories, and repair and return support; weapons software, support equipment, and classified software delivery and support; transportation support; classified publications and technical documentation; training; studies and surveys; U.S. Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support.

(iv) Military Department: Air Force (NO–D–YAH).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: NO–D–YAE.

(vi) Sales Commission, Fee, etc., Paid, Offered, or Agreed to be Paid: None known at this time.

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology Contained in the Defense Article or Defense Services Proposed to be Sold: See Attached Annex.

(viii) Date Report Delivered to Congress: June 11, 2024.

*As defined in Section 47(6) of the Arms Export Control Act.

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Norway—AIM–120C–8 Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles

The Government of Norway has requested to buy three hundred (300) AIM–120C–8 Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAM) and twenty (20) AIM–120C–8 AMRAAM guidance sections. Also included are AMRAAM containers and support equipment; spare parts, consumables, accessories, and repair and return support; weapons software, support equipment, and classified software delivery and support, transportation support; classified publications and technical documentation; training; studies and surveys; U.S. Government and contractor engineering; technical and logistics support services; and other related elements of logistics and program support. The estimated total cost is $1.94 billion.

This proposed sale will support the foreign policy goals and national security objectives of the United States by improving the security of a North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) Ally that is a force for political stability and economic progress in Europe.

The proposed sale will improve Norway's capability to meet current and future threats by supplementing and replacing its AIM–120B AMRAAMs with the latest version of the AIM–120C. Norway already has AMRAAMs and F–35As in its inventory and will have no difficulty absorbing these articles into its armed forces The newly acquired missiles will be used for ground-based air defense in the National Advanced Surface-to-Air Missile System (NASAMS) but may be subject to dual use with the F–35A.

The proposed sale of this equipment and support will not alter the basic military balance in the region.

The principal contractor will be RTX Corporation, located in Tucson, AZ. The purchaser typically requests offsets. Any offset agreement will be defined in negotiations between the purchaser and the contractor.

Implementation of this proposed sale will not require the assignment of any additional U.S. Government or contractor representatives to Norway.

There will be no adverse impact on U.S. defense readiness as a result of this proposed sale.

TRANSMITTAL NO 24–49

Notice of Proposed Issuance of Letter of Offer Pursuant to Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act

Annex Item No. vii

(vii) Sensitivity of Technology:

1. The AIM–120C–8 Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile (AMRAAM) is a supersonic, air or surface-launched aerial intercept guided missile featuring digital technology and microminiature solid-state electronics. AMRAAM capabilities include look-down and shoot-down, multiple launches against multiple targets, resistance to electronic countermeasures, and interception of high and low-flying and maneuvering targets. This potential sale will include AMRAAM guidance sections, control sections, warhead spares, and containers.

2. The highest level of classification of defense articles, components, and services included in this potential sale is SECRET.

3. If a technologically advanced adversary were to obtain knowledge of the specific hardware and software elements, the information could be used to develop countermeasures that might reduce weapon system effectiveness or be used in the development of a system with similar or advanced capabilities.

4. A determination has been made that Norway can provide substantially the same degree of protection for the sensitive technology being released as the U.S. Government. This proposed sale is necessary in furtherance of the U.S. foreign policy and national security objectives outlined in the Policy Justification.

5. All defense articles and services listed in this transmittal have been authorized for release and export to the Government of Norway.

NATIONAL ORAL HEALTH MONTH

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to recognize June as National Oral Health Month. This month provides us an opportunity to reflect on the significant role oral health plays in overall health and to recommit our efforts to ensure that Americans have access to quality oral health care.

While oral diseases alone contribute to negative outcomes, there are proven relationships between poor oral health and other medical conditions like cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, cancers, pneumonia, premature birth, and infectious diseases. The World Health Organization estimates economic productivity losses from oral diseases at $323 billion in 2022.

Oral disease affects Americans of all ages. For children, dental cavities remain one of the most common chronic diseases. About one in four preschool children experienced caries in primary teeth and at least one in six children aged 6 to 11 years experienced dental cavities in permanent teeth. According to the CDC, 34 million school hours are lost each year—on average—because of emergency dental care.

In Maryland, like many other States, we have witnessed firsthand the consequences of neglecting the oral health of young people. Deamonte Driver, a 12-year-old Prince George's County resident, tragically died in 2007 due to a lack of comprehensive dental services. Deamonte's death was particularly heartbreaking because it was entirely preventable. What started out as a toothache turned into a severe brain infection that could have been prevented by an $80 extraction. After multiple surgeries and a lengthy hospital stay, sadly, Deamonte passed away.

We must ensure everyone has timely, affordable access to oral health care.

In recent years, dentists nationwide have seen a significant decrease in operating room access for dental procedures. This problem has primarily impacted children and adults with disabilities who are in need of urgent dental care and cannot access it in an office-based setting, necessitating care in an operating room. Earlier this Congress, Senator BLACKBURN and I sent a letter to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services urging them to include the recently established code for dental surgical services in the 2024 Medicare Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment System. I am glad to say that the code was included in CMS's final rule to expand access to these critical procedures and shorten the waitlists to receive care under general anesthesia in operating rooms.

I am proud to say that we have since made significant progress in improving access to pediatric dental care in our country and in Maryland. In 2009, Congress reauthorized the Children's Health Insurance Program—CHIP—with an important addition: a guaranteed pediatric dental benefit. Research shows that CHIP generally offers more comprehensive benefits at a much lower cost to families than private coverage. Additionally, the Affordable Care Act—ACA—has significantly improved access to affordable dental care for millions of Americans by requiring most insurers to cover essential health benefits.

Providing dental coverage for adults also improves outcomes for their children. A 2021 study found that Medicaid adult dental coverage was associated with a reduction in the prevalence of untreated tooth decay among children after parents had access to coverage for at least 1 year. The study found that all children saw improvements in oral health, and non-Hispanic Black children experienced larger and more persistent improvements than non-Hispanic White children. A Medicaid dental benefit for adults would enhance the progress for children and provide much needed dental care and improve oral health outcomes for adults, showing the interconnectedness in outcomes for all ages.

Earlier this Congress, I introduced the Medicare Dental Benefit Act. This legislation would require Medicare coverage to include dental and oral health services, such as routine diagnostic and preventive services, basic and major dental services, and emergency care. By including these services in Medicare, more than 65 million seniors and people with disabilities would have access to affordable dental care.

I have also worked with Senator STABENOW to introduce the Medicaid Dental Benefit Act. This bill would extend comprehensive dental health benefits to tens of millions of low-income Americans on Medicaid. The legislation would provide States with a 100 percent Federal match for the dental benefit for 3 years. This investment of Federal funds would support States to set up or improve their dental benefit and assist in provider education and outreach efforts to better connect enrollees to oral health care.

Last year, I held a hearing in the Senate Finance Health Care Subcommittee to focus on these issues. The hearing highlighted disparities in access to oral health care, which have persisted and have serious consequences for children, adults, families, and communities. I was proud to have Dr. Warren Brill, a distinguished pediatric dentist from Maryland who has long provided care to low-income children serve as a witness. Dr. Brill was able to provide valuable insights for our conversation and gave Senators an on-the-ground perspective of someone doing this important work.

It is also important that we support research focused on empowering dentists and advancing oral health for all. I am proud to have the National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, one of the National Institutes of Health, in Maryland and I was glad to pass a resolution this Congress to recognize their 75th anniversary and highlight the important work they do.

While we will continue to work on combating oral disease in Maryland and the United States, we must also realize that it is a global challenge that requires cooperation from partners around the world to address effectively.

Oral diseases, such as tooth decay and gum disease, are globally the most common health conditions, impacting over 3.5 billion people as of 2019. Despite the widespread nature of oral diseases, many go untreated as health systems around the world are often not properly equipped to deliver appropriate oral health care.

In light of these concerning figures, I am glad to see that the World Health Organization, FDI World Dental Federation, and National Institutes of Health have all issued landmark oral health reports in 2021 and 2022 as well as the World Health Assembly having adopted a global strategy on oral health in 2022. Our coordinated efforts with global partners are essential to overcoming this widespread issue.

It is important that we reiterate that oral health is a crucial part of overall health and accessing care should not be a luxury reserved for the most privileged. Ensuring affordable, quality care not only helps to combat widespread issues like dental caries and gum disease, but also can work to the significant health disparities that exist in America. As we recognize the progress we have made on this issue, we must recommit to expanding access to oral health services, reducing disparities and emphasizing a preventative approach. I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort.

250TH ANNIVERSARY OF UNION, MAINE

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, on July 19, 1774, a small band of rugged and courageous pioneers established a settlement in the Maine wilderness between the Medomak and Saint George rivers. They cleared the land, built cabins, endured hunger and cold, and, with backbreaking work, created a community. Today, it is a pleasure to join the people of Union, ME, in celebrating the 250th anniversary of a community that is a wonderful place to live, work, and raise families. Although part of a land grant made by the Plymouth Council in 1629, the territory remained unsettled for more than a century due to conflicting claims of jurisdiction by the English and French. When the hostilities ended, Dr. John Taylor of Massachusetts bought the land and led the settlement party. Originally called Taylor Town, it was renamed Sterlingtown in honor of a Revolutionary War hero and finally incorporated as Union to commemorate our new Nation.

Among the many illustrious natives of Union is John Langdon Sibley, scholar, author, and librarian of Harvard University. His history of his beloved hometown from its origin to 1850 is remarkable for its thoroughness, insight, and wit.

''By competent judges,'' he wrote, ''the soil of Union is considered as good as that of . . . the best farming towns in the State.'' The scenery provided by lush vegetation, hills, valleys, rivers, and streams ''affords a rich enjoyment to people of taste and admirers of nature.'' Although Mr. Sibley allows that the assertion from a neighboring town that ''people never die in Union'' is an exaggeration, he posits that the uncommonly pure water, brisk air circulation over the varied terrain, the vigorous agricultural work, and generally good habits are why inhabitants ''wear the hue of health'' and why visitors often remark ''that there was more female beauty in Union than in any other town in the county or State.''

The work ethic of the townspeople and water power from the fast-moving rivers soon made Union a center of industry, with foundries, sawmills, grain mills, and factories manufacturing products ranging from carriages and farm equipment to footwear and musical instruments. Thousands of artifacts from those early days are preserved at the Matthews Museum of Maine Heritage, with a special section devoted to Dr. Augustin Thompson, the Union-born Civil War hero, physician, and inventor of Moxie, the patent nerve medicine that is now the official soft drink of the State of Maine.

Union cherishes its history. Next to the museum stands the Hodge School, the thoroughly restored one-room schoolhouse that served the town from 1864 to 1954. Established more than 150 years ago, the Union Fair celebrates the town's agricultural traditions. Laid out in 1790, the picturesque Union Common is the oldest public town common in Maine, with memorials to patriots and a bandstand listed on the National Register of Historic Places.

The people of Union are rightfully proud of their town and have worked together to plan an exciting and funfilled 3-day sestercentennial celebration beginning July 19. Among events will be the opening of a time capsule from the bicentennial celebration in 1974.

In addition to John Langdon Sibley's book, the story of Union was told in the popular 1940 historical novel ''Come Spring'' by Ben Ames Williams. Republished in 2000 by the Union Historical Society, the novel imagines the struggles and triumphs of the real-life Robbins family during the first years of the settlement's—and our Nation's—existence.

In the preface to his novel, the author writes that Union ''is a small Maine town founded by ordinary people in the ordinary way, by carving a community out of the forest and putting the land to work. The people in this book were not individually as important as George Washington, the town was not as important as New York, but people like them made this country, and towns like this were and are the soil in which our country's roots are grounded.''

Union's 250th anniversary is not merely about the passing of time. It is about human accomplishment. We celebrate the people who, for longer than America has been a nation, have pulled together, cared for one another, and built a great community. Thanks to those who came before, Union, ME, has a wonderful history. Thanks to those there today, it has a bright future.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTER FOR BLACK EXCELLENCE AND CULTURE OF MADISON

Ms. BALDWIN. Madam President, I rise to recognize the Center for Black Excellence and Culture, which will break ground in Madison this year on Juneteenth National Independence Day. I wish also to acknowledge the many community leaders who have worked tirelessly to make the Center a reality.

The Center for Black Excellence and Culture was founded by Reverend Doctor Alex Gee who has been a fierce advocate for Madison's African-American community for more than 30 years. The Center will unite and uplift Madison's African-American community by providing a space for entrepreneurial exploration, cultural engagement, and celebration.

Rev. Dr. Gee and his board of directors have joined with other community leaders to raise over $28 million for the project. Now that they have reached their goal, they will begin construction on June 19, 2024. The decision to break ground on Juneteenth was an intentional and powerful one.

The new Black inspired and designed building will sit on 3.5 acres of land and will include many commercial spaces, including an art gallery and theatre space. Rev. Dr. Gee has convened a powerhouse team of Black leaders and hundreds of diverse Black voices to shape the Center. These leaders will support thousands of students through mentorship and professional development and teach students about African-American history and culture to inspire and advance the Black community in Madison and beyond.

The Center will also include a space dedicated to Rev. Dr. Gee's mother, Ms. Verline Gee, who served the Madison community for decades as a mentor, poet, social worker, and faith leader. Ms. Gee's story is one of strength and perseverance. She was born in Mississippi and worked alongside her parents as a migrant farmer in her youth. As a child she moved to the Midwest eventually making her way to Madison. Throughout her life, Ms. Gee was always passionate about education. She was one of the inaugural students to attend the University of Wisconsin-Madison's Black Studies Program. The Center for Black Excellence and Culture will honor the memory of Ms. Gee and all other African-American community members who have contributed so much to Madison.

Juneteenth celebrates the end of slavery in the United States, but it also serves as a reminder of the work that still needs to be done to dismantle deep-rooted systems of racial injustice. While strides have been made, the African-American community continues to face significant systemic injustices. Across Wisconsin, African-American families are five times more likely than White families to experience poverty and 61 percent of all African-American households in Dane County live near or below the poverty line. The presence of these injustices makes the Center for Black Excellence all the more critical.

True freedom requires liberty and equity for all. The Center for Black Excellence and Culture will contribute to this mission and serve as a model for other cities to follow.

As the Center for Black Excellence breaks ground this Juneteenth, I honor the accomplishments of Rev. Dr. Gee, the Center's board of directors, the memory of Ms. Verline Gee and all the community leaders, past and present, who made the Center a reality.

CONGRESSIONAL AWARD GOLD MEDALISTS

Ms. LUMMIS. Madam President, today I wish to congratulate this year's winners of the Congressional Award. The Congressional Award was established by Congress in 1979 and, for many years, has recognized the spectacular achievements of young people in the areas of volunteerism, personal development, fitness, and expedition.

The brilliant design of this program allows individuals to set their own

goals based on personal interest and work toward either a bronze, silver, or gold certificate or medal. It is incredible to see what young people can achieve when they are personally invested in setting and achieving their goals. I am impressed to hear of the combined impact and can only imagine the overwhelming benefits to communities across the country.

It is a privilege to recognize the great work of this year's recipients. I urge these young people to continue aiming high and setting a positive example for their peers.

I include in the RECORD a list of this year's Congressional Award Gold Medalists from around the country:

Alaska: Madeline Anderson

Alabama: Amanda Browning, Lily Hoyle

Arkansas: Abigail Catron

Arizona: Billal Abulfotuh, Adelina Grotenhuis, Thomasina (Tamsin) Hurlbut, Zaid Jamal, Timothy Jiang, Payton Kelly, Ronald (Ronnie) Keyes, Shea Lee, Colin Lifshitz, Mustafa Nalbantoglu, Zack Okun, Borislava Panayotova, Cutter Papritz, Sofia Reyes, Alyson Small, Elyzabeth Small, Mason Takeuchi, Ivanna Viloria Enciso

California: Annika Agarwal, Nathaniel Arrogante, Emin Aslan, Shijoon Bae, Adrian Baek, Zoey Bahng, Brianna Bailey, Pravin Balasingam, Daniel Bang, Naim Bayraktar, Wolfram Bikel, Lachlan Black, Reenie Cao, Tenzing Carvalho, Hyunwoo Cha, Olivia Cha, Ethan Chang, David Chang, Shruti Chari, Mina Chen, Steven Cheng, Hemkesh Chenupati, Emilie Chi, Alexander Chiao, Jamie Cho, Jessica Cho, Nathan Cho, Nagyung (Anna) Cho, Rosa Cho, Michelle Cho, Mason Choey, Ellie Choi, Minjoon Choi, Samuel Choi, Sophia Chou, Taylor Chu, Chloe Chung, Brandon Chung, Hatice Sevde Deniz, Diya Dipak, Claire Dokko, Elliot Dokko, Jason Dong, Feodora Douplitzky-Lunati, Renee Duan, Azra Erdogan, Madeleine Freeland, Aarushi Ghildyal, Xinyue (Cindy) Gong, Sophie Gopen, Amita Gowda, Radhika Goyal, Athena Guan, Aaron Han, Paul Han, Junhyeok Han, Yahya Hasan, Xihao He, Qingchun He, Dia Hemanth, Katherine Hion, Evan Ho, Jeongmin Hong, Eric Hong, Ian Hong, Daniel Hong, Yixian Huang, Celine Huh, Cat-Tam Huynh, Jung Jin Hwang, Priscilla Ibarra, Nolan Ironhill, Carter Jackson, Ria Jain, Hanlee Jang, Shriya Janolkar, Jaeyoung (Ryan) Jeon, Ella Jeon, Minhyeok Jeong, Noah Jeong, Eliana Jeong, Benjamin Jiang, Claire Jin, Jaehee Jung, Jessica Jung, Heidi Jung, Hailey Jiwon Kang, Shreyas Kapavarapu, Garrett Kath, Sudhakhar Katta, Ava Khossravi, Julian Kim, Ryan Kim, Chloe Kim, Rachel Kim, Stanley Kim, Daeyong Kim, Theodore Kim, Baron Kim, Sean Kim, Eric Kim, Jonathan Kim, Hennah Kim, Skyler Kim, Lauren Kim, Clair Kim, Christine Kim, Kayleen Kim, Ivy Kim, Isaac Kim, Choyoung (Kaylee) Kim, Yoonho Kim, Niklas Kinne, Amit Krishna, Shivam Kumar, Chris Kwon, Hannah Lee, Eunchan Lee, Nicole Lee, ChunPo Lee, Jayden Lee, Ashley Lee, Kunwoo Lee, Kayla Lee, Alexis Lee, Seongjae (Alex) Lee, Claire Lee, Aiden Lee, Yennie Lee, Hyunmin (Paul) Lee, Brandon Lee, Logan Lee, Nathan Lee, Angelina Lee, Hyunwoo Lee, Nahyun Lee, Eunice Lee, Nayun Lee, Jeongwoo Lee, Ian Lee, Tabitha Lee Chon, Michelle Li, Jessica Li, Qiuxian (Lily) Li, Darell Lien, Ryan Lim, Zoe Lin, Vito Lin, Sebastian Liong, Danny Willow Liu, Ziyi (Eva) Liu, Bryan Louie, Audrey Lowell, Alex Lu, Mallika Maddukuri, Simon March-Cunningham, Addison Marrs, Tejas Mathai, Mihir Mathai, Robert McPhie, Xuefeng Mei, Ryan Min, Avery Mizrahi, Maya Mohan, Antoinette Morales, Kea Morshed, Jane Moyer, Heeju Nam, Sriya Neti, Yishan Ni, Alex Nicholson, Hyunmin Noh, Ethan Noh, Abigail Norman, Justin Oh, Azra Oten, Matthew Paek, Iris Paek, Ethan Paik, Noah Pak, Andrew Park, Michelle Park, Michelle Park, Keilah Park, Joanne Park, Sydney Park, Lena Park, Aiden Park, Gunwoo Park, Ryan Park, Arin Parsa, Safia Peer, Shay Pema, Abhinav Penagalapati, Devyn (Divya) Ponnuvelu, Arya Prince, Sanam Punjabi, Tengjie (Jay) Qiu, Kate Quach, Tanush Rachamalla, Zachery Ramos, Maanasa Ramprasad, Neel Rangan, Nevin Rao, Mahika Redla, Aidan Reyes, David Rivera, Jonathan Ryu, Hoon Ryu, Simran Saluja, Katherine Scannell, Jeremy Schabilion, Samyuktha Senthilnathan, Sienna Shah, Sidharth Sharma, Anthony Shen, HaJoon Shim, Chloe Shim, Yeonsu Shim, Christine Shin, Yuna Shin, Hojun Son, Ryan Song, Jocelyn Soo, Jacob St. George, Raymond Suh, Erin Ji Sun, Bridget Swineford, Emily Tae, Alex Tak, Shiyan (Judy) Tao, Alyssa Taylor, Maia Tumbokon, Sashan Umashankar, Sriram Vaidhyanathan, Ved Vedere, Tanya Vidhun, Nathan Wan, Kylie Wang, Terry Wang, Tiffany Wang, Dylan West, Aaron Won, Chelsea Won, Avery Wong, Andrew Woo, Jiyun Woo, Kari Wu, Wenkai Wu, Jiaze (Leo) Xu, Adora Yan, Lindsay Yao, Noah Yi, Jaewon (Justin) Yi, Boaz Earl Yoo, Calista Yoo, Jaden Yoo, Jeremy Yoo, Hayley Yoon, Faith Yoon, Juneho Yoon, Ethan Yoon, Allison Yu, Zihang Yu, Jackson Zagone, Zhongwen Zhang, Wenyao (William) Zhao, Cindy Zhao, Ruiyu (Rayer) Zhou, Jackson Zinn

Colorado: Seif Abouyoussef, Henry Bae, Elizabeth Batenburg, Ria Ghosh, Gracie Woo

Connecticut: Reid Barry, Martin Jara, Ava Leshem, Alisha Patel, Madeline Phelan, Emily Roy, Natalia Schaffer, Liam Tomaszewski, Neha Tungaturthy, Zach Yung

Delaware: Nitya Singh, Anirudh Singh

Florida: Keziah Anderson, Jessie Baxter, Flavio Canello, Caleigh Carter, Coen Chilver, Colton Chilver, Luke Cooper, Landon Dabney, Clayton Didier, Zakaria El-Helw, Emily Feichthaler, Keira Rose Finelli, Tarang Gaddam, Anjali Gusani, Chase Hartman, Maddox Hoffman, John Humphreys, Jake Julien, Jessa-Chloe Katzeff, Neeharika Kota, Aditya Krishnan, Fisher Ledbetter, Calder Ledbetter, Robert Linton, Ramsey McClure, Isabella Mendelson, Aaditya Nair, Arjun Nanduri, Adam Oakes, Sophia Olsinski, Dhruv Pandya, Grace Pleinis, Emma Rawlson, Aubrey Rosenhaus, Julian Sant, Ava Shelly, Charles Stacy, Jonathan Steffen, Christopher (Thor) Warnken

Georgia: Katherine Elizabeth Aide, David Blanco, Ashley Choi, Raine Cox, Jayden Daniel, Christian Flournoy, Lauren Foglesong, Joseph Ivey, Rishi Jeyamurthy, Akhil Kalva, Achintya Murugaraj, Sanjana Pawar, Danica Resha, Ella Shaffer, Ananya Tadepalli, Pranavi Vedula

Guam: Julie Ann Laxamana

Hawaii: Barbara Goldyn, Jay Rhymer

Iowa: Alexander Hennig, Tiff Lieberman, Nadia Patel

Idaho: Ireland Clark, Elliott Lochard

Illinois: Grace Catherine Bourbon, Christian Goodall, Cora Koch, Anne Reidenbach, Bela Sanghavi

Indiana: Liam Blank, Audrey Booher, Zoe Carpenter, Aditi Dey, Brandon Kruger, Theodore Lach, Thomas S. Pemberton

Kansas: Samiksha Aitha, Liane Bdair, Afraah Hawa, Ella Heitmann, Daniel John

Kentucky: Jackson Robbins, Isaac Stricker

Louisiana: Elliott Gomes

Massachusetts: Madison Cable, Matthew Church, Aden Geonhee Lee, Tain Leonard-Peck, Chen-An Lin, Prisha Shrivastava, Jason Zhou

Maryland: Ellis Chung, Elijah Cockey, Isabel Cockey, Mason Denny, Emily Dong, David Hamman, Zander Hine, Adam Jackson, Jessica Li, Aidan McCrohan, Amari Mhoon, Rithwik Reddy, Andrew Sha, Joseph Simak, Guy Taylor, Boyan-Jise Tiwang

Michigan: Elizabeth Cook, Benjamin Hayes, Miles Hopkins, Grace Pantea, Jeff Roseman

Minnesota: Alluri Akshay, Jonathan Erickson, Abigail Hudson, Gabriella Hudson, Mark Swanson

Missouri: Brandon Barrett, Lydia Brodbeck, Alex Chen, Cole Dannull, Gianna Francis, Lindsey Gordon, John Hayes, Savannah King, Melissa Matlalcuatzi Pluma, Liam Smith, Alina Stribling, Helton W. Walker, Ethan Wood

Mississippi: Hayden Barnett, Ashley Grace Bassett, Colt Bergman, Lauren Hobson, Hannah Sanders

North Carolina: Nachammai Annamalai, Hannah Bauer, Ava Beninati, Lula Bovino, Sabrina Bradford, Mina Cayli, Ayse Civelek, Ava Copeland, Ciela Crane, Philip Dai, Jonah Dickerson, Anna Goldsmith, Rayna Hamilton, Karis Hunt, Ameya Kandula, Avery King, Ally Kryzalka, Sloane Lewis, Sofia Liotino, Robert Lyda, Caroline Mautner, Graham Mills, Niharika Parui, Dawson Raynes, Shravan Selvavel, Hemharsith Sivakumar Gayathri, Asmithaa Vinukonda, Katya Withrow, Allison Witte, Truett Wolf

Nebraska: Meruni Are, Alejandro González Ba os, Francisco González Ba os, Landry Lehan

New Hampshire: Adele Mamedova

New Jersey: Suheyla Akman, Riya Atluri, Burak Cebe, Canon Chiu, Autumn Chiu, James Crowley, Jack DeVirgilio, Kaitlin Dowling, Sriram Elango, Ryan Gilmartin, Alyssia Gomez, Nathaniel Han, Riya Jain, Rohan Jay, Ahmet Kaval, Muhammed Keskin, Elif Kilinc, Jonah Klein, Naishada Kotagiri, Emily Kukal, Sonal Lakhani, Chase Mazur, Benjamin Miller, Tyler Minn, Senthilkumar Nithyanandam, Udgita Pamidigantam, Rishi Parikh, Rahil Patel, Dev Patel, Samhita Pokkunuri, Mili Raghavan, Pallavi Routray, Shaunak Sabbani, Gavin Tripido, Jonathan Yoo

Nevada: Jenna Becker, Lorelani Riley Ladislao, Taha Lahlou, Diesel Leano, Jia Mahesh, Emily Mattox, Ignatius Miller, Gianna Nakhle, Randy Pahang, Momoka Utsumi, Tamara Young

New York: David Barlow, Jonathan Barlow, Luke Bonifacio, Ethan Chiu, Lillianna Cognato, Yana Dhingra, Victoria D'Ovidio, Thomas Fernandez, Cassandra Fitzpatrick, Akshar Gopa, Miyana Holden, Ava Johnson, Riha Kyatham, Ryan Leonard, Jasmine-Sixian Li, Nitin Malepati, Ciara McGroary, Phillip Muller, Viraj Pahuja, Ana Lee Palmer, Saharsh Peddireddy, Sahil Polepalle, Alexander Ren, Hailey Richman, Ziyue Wang, Haluk Yavas, Eugene Yoo, Elle Yormak, Youwei Zhen

Ohio: Laasya Acharya, Pragalya Arumugam, Micah Burkhard, Shashank Chanamolu, Zachary DeVor, Adam Howe, Gabrielle Kirwin, Madeline Morrison, Megha Nadagouda, Maya Nayar, Carter Norvell, Naisha Patel, Keeran Patel, Meera Rajeev, Vaidika Ravi, Maggie Skelly, John Snethkamp, Keshav Sriram, Shreemayi Trichy

Oklahoma: Andrew Ebert, Timothy Martin, Anna Parry, Alanya Abou-Elmajd

Oregon: Sophia D'Antonio, McKenna Erickson

Pennsylvania: Maura Campbell, Eleanor Day, S bastien Guillotin, Lucas Hayes, Ryan Kraychik, Delia Maldonado, Sabrina Maldonado, Alex Porambo, Shivika Varshney, Vanessa Wehinger, Max Zhang

Puerto Rico: Gerardo Juan Jos Mena-Fernández, Meghna (Chili) Pramoda

South Carolina: Alex Bohnen, Grant Bohnen, Harmonie Frederick, Nina Gallo,

Tyler Hanson, Caitlyn Horton, James Reaves, Alexander Ring

South Dakota: Grace Belcher, Ronan Maher

Tennessee: Jaishva Bhatt, Daniel Clark, Joshua Clark, Zeynep Dibi, Ethan Elder, Blake Freeman, Rachel Oppmann, Hannah Skaar

Texas: Heather Adams, Alyssa Anderson, Nikita Basappa, Praneel Bhagavatula, Brooke Carol Billedo, Mehmet Bisen, Andrew Boisson, Nicholas Boling, Ethan Bosita, Carson Bosita, Oliver Burke, Ananya Chandak, Josh Chandra, Sanjith Chandran, Riya Chauhan, Elijah Chen, Isaiah Clark, Shloak Dalal, Charli Davis, Dominique de Waal, Anagha Deepak, Thomas Dorsey, Andon Epp, Nursel Eski, Mahek Goel, Kyler Hester, Abdullah Hussein, Jonah Ismael, Sally Ismael, Trisha Jha, Abraar Khan, Shiza Khan, Ivy Koh, Kaden Mabey, Tanya Mahesh, William Martin, Margot Martin, Justin Mathew, Ayaan Moledina, Abi Newell, Nayonika Pande, Aryan Patel, Aliya Patel, Duane Pfeiffer, Aditi Ramesh Iyer, Shawn Ray, Aubrey Reeves, Zeynep Sahin, Justin Simms, Nikhil Srinivas, Suhaani Srireddy, Julian Stewart, Daniel Thomas, Gracie Wakefield, Sophia Wei, April White, Hazel White, Benjamin Who, William Witherspoon

Utah: Anvar Boskailo, Elorah Dobrinski, Zuhal Kariparduc, Katherine Kim, Alexandar Straley

Virginia: Timothy Cline, Rudra Dave, Eren Demirel, Nicholas Flanigan, Namith Gangireddyvari, Kendan Hopkins, Begum Hussain, Zara Sophia Javeri, Evan Kinsel, Joshua Lee, Pierson Lee, Daniel Lian, Yashvir Sabharwal, Serena Sindhi, Rishika Singh, Mark Wilson, Burhan Yasakci, Mert Esat Yercel

Vermont: Katherine Bartlett, Megan Henderson

Washington: Irene Batta, Celeste Blair, Sara Cambron, Amalia (Molly) Dudley, Lauren Evans, Varshini Hari, Jason Kim, Ryan Kinder, Lilah Moore, Betul Orhan, Raigan Ryhter, Naren Selvam, Jonathan Tang, Liam Urie, Anisha Vaish

Wisconsin: Jessica Becker, Michael Brierton, Sandra Brierton, Pranav Nair

Wyoming: Thomas Audley, Jonnina Edmunds, Cambry Jenks, Aidan Kim-Miller, Caleb Miller, Jackson Neishabouri, Elise Newton, Hunter Sabat, Isabell Salas, Aubrey Smedley, Greyson Smith, Ava Taylor

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING USAA

● Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, Texas is proudly home to roughly 1.4 million veterans, more than any other State in the country. I am honored that these American heroes have chosen to call Texas home, and I have no doubt that their decision was based, at least in part, on our State's deep-rooted tradition of military service and the network of support it has created.

Across Texas, businesses, nonprofits, and veterans organizations provide these men and women with a range of resources, from job training to mental health services. Their support is a testament to the profound respect and gratitude Texans hold for those who have given so much in service to our country.

One of the staunchest advocates for veterans in Texas and across the country is the United Services Automobile Association, or USAA. USAA was founded in 1922 by 25 Army officers who were unable to secure auto insurance. The group met in San Antonio and decided to insure each other in an effort to solve a problem facing many servicemembers and their families at the time. Over a century later, USAA now serves millions of members and continues to pursue its mission to empower the military community.

One year ago, USAA launched a significant initiative to combat veteran suicide, the second leading cause of death among post-9/11 veterans. More than 120,000 veterans have died by suicide since 2001, a suicide rate 57 percent higher than the national average.

In keeping with their commitment to America's military, USAA established Face the Fight, a collaborative effort of corporations, foundations, nonprofit groups, and veteran-focused organizations charged with raising awareness of veteran and military suicide prevention.

The USAA-led coalition includes two founding members, the Humana Foundation and Reach Resilience, and is guided by its academic partner and scientific adviser, the University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio. The coalition is managed by the Elizabeth Dole Foundation and has grown to include more than 160 members working to break the stigma surrounding suicide in the military community by fostering real, open conversations around support and hope.

America's veterans are a powerful reminder of the sacrifices that have been made by generations of heroes to protect the freedoms we enjoy, and it is our collective duty to ensure they receive the support they need when they return to civilian life. The honor-bound agreement between our men and women in uniform and our Nation does not end at retirement. No veteran should ever be forgotten. I commend USAA's efforts to prevent veteran suicide and support America's heroes.●

TRIBUTE TO DAN GIVENS

● Mr. KAINE. Madam President, I wish to recognize Mr. Dan Givens for his outstanding contributions to the Commonwealth of Virginia, the aerospace sector and the national security of the United States. Dan will retire on June 29, 2024, after serving as the spaceport director for the Virginia Spaceport Authority's Mid-Atlantic Regional Spaceport (MARS) since 2021. Dan was hired as operations manager in 2019 and has served as a strategic member of the Virginia Spaceport Authority—VSA—team as it works to fulfill its mandates of developing and operating an operational spaceport that facilitates reliable access to space while stimulating aerospace-related economic activity across the Commonwealth of Virginia.

During his tenure, Dan oversaw the management and operations of over $240 million worth of spaceport assets, including multiple launch pads, multiple support facilities, and a UAS airfield. He supported the construction of the newest two orbital launch pads at MARS, as well as two support facilities and supervised modifications to existing pads for continued use into the future. He oversaw nine successful launches of the Antares rocket, four of the Electron rockets—including Electron's first flight from U.S. soil—and two national security missions for the intelligence community. Dan was instrumental in establishing the Virginia Spaceport Authority's partnership with Vandenberg Space Force Base, including marking the first mission VSA supported outside of the Commonwealth of Virginia. Finally, Dan supported 14 customers with 20 different programs at the UAS airfield, reflecting 630 sorties and 959 flight hours in support of emerging unmanned capabilities. During his tenure, MARS grew 108 percent, from 60 to 108 employees.

VSA and MARS are fortunate to have such an effective leader in Dan Givens. I am pleased to reflect on his contributions to our Commonwealth here today and wish him a peaceful and relaxing retirement after a job well done.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13466 OF JUNE 26, 2008, WITH RESPECT TO NORTH KOREA—PM 56

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to

the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to North Korea that was declared in Executive Order 13466 of June 26, 2008, expanded in scope in Executive Order 13551 of August 30, 2010, addressed further in Executive Order 13570 of April 18, 2011, further expanded in scope in Executive Order 13687 of January 2, 2015, and under which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13722 of March 15, 2016, and Executive Order 13810 of September 20, 2017, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2024.

The existence and risk of the proliferation of weapons-usable fissile material on the Korean Peninsula; the actions and policies of the Government of North Korea that destabilize the Korean Peninsula and imperil United States Armed Forces, allies, and trading partners in the region, including its pursuit of nuclear and missile programs; and other provocative, destabilizing, and repressive actions and policies of the Government of North Korea, continue to constitute an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States.

For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13466 with respect to North Korea.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 13, 2024.*

REPORT OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13405 OF JUNE 16, 2006, WITH RESPECT TO BELARUS—PM 57

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report, which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to Belarus that was declared in Executive Order 13405 of June 16, 2006, which was expanded in scope in Executive Order 14038 of August 9, 2021, is to continue in effect beyond June 16, 2024.

The actions and policies of certain members of the Government of Belarus and other persons, and the Belarusian regime's harmful activities and long-standing abuses, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13405 with respect to Belarus.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 13, 2024.*

REPORT ON THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY THAT WAS ORIGINALLY DECLARED IN EXECUTIVE ORDER 13219 OF JUNE 26, 2001, WITH RESPECT TO THE WESTERN BALKANS—PM 58

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency with respect to the Western Balkans that was declared in Executive Order 13219 of June 26, 2001, under which additional steps were taken in Executive Order 13304 of May 28, 2003, and which was expanded in scope in Executive Order 14033 of June 8, 2021, is to continue in effect beyond June 26, 2024.

The acts of extremist violence and obstructionist activity, and the situation in the Western Balkans, which stymies progress toward effective and democratic governance and full integration into transatlantic institutions, outlined in these Executive Orders, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13219 with respect to the Western Balkans.

JOSEPH R. BIDEN, Jr.,
THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 13, 2024.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:59 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 138. An act to amend the Tibetan Policy Act of 2002 to modify certain provisions of that Act.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

S. 4541. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make certain provisions with respect to qualified ABLE programs permanent.

PRIVILEGED NOMINATIONS REFERRED TO COMMITTEE

On request by Senator J.D. VANCE, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations: Jay T. Snyder, of New York, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2023.

On request by Senator J.D. VANCE, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations: Jay T. Snyder, of New York, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2026.

On request by Senator J.D. VANCE, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations: James J. Blanchard, of Michigan, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2025.

On request by Senator J.D. VANCE, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Leslie N. Bluhm, of Illinois, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service for a term expiring October 6, 2028.

On request by Senator J.D. VANCE, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation for a term expiring October 3, 2024.

On request by Senator J.D. VANCE, under the authority of S. Res. 116, 112th Congress, the following nomination was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Christopher H. Schroeder, of North Carolina, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the James Madison Memorial Fellowship Foundation for a term expiring October 3, 2030.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–4997. A communication from the Program Analyst, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Onions Grown in Certain Designated Counties in Idaho and Malheur County, Oregon; Increased Assessment Rate'' (Docket No. AMS–SC–23–0033) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4998. A communication from the Program Analyst, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Salable Quantities and Allotment Percentages for the 2024–2025 Marketing Year'' (Docket No. AMS–SC–23–0068) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–4999. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Large Trader Reporting'' (RIN3038–AF27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5000. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Request for Applications: Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children Workforce—Implementation Projects Competitive Cooperative Agreement Program'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5001. A communication from the Program Analyst, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Substance Use Prevention Education in the Women, Infants, and Children Program—Fiscal Year 2024 Request for Applications'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 5, 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–5002. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a semiannual report entitled, ''Acceptance of Contributions for Defense Programs, Projects, and Activities; Defense Cooperation Account'' and a semiannual listing of personal property contributed by coalition partners; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–5003. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a certification that the export of the listed items to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5004. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Additions to the Entity List; Amendment to Confirm Basis for Adding Certain Entities to the Entity List Includes Foreign Policy Interest of Protection of Human Rights Worldwide'' (RIN0694–AJ20) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5005. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Removal of Obsolete Regulations for Section 236 of the National Housing Act'' (RIN2502–AJ74) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5006. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Legislative Affairs, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024–01: Preferencing and steering practices by digital intermediaries for consumer financial products or services [*Note: The CFPB has concluded that this Circular is not a 'rule' within the meaning of 5 USC 804(3). Nevertheless, out of an abundance of caution, the CFPB is submitting it to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General consistent with the procedures set forth in 801(a).]'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5007. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Legislative Affairs, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024–03'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5008. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Legislative Affairs, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Consumer Financial Protection Circular 2024–02: Deceptive Marketing about the speed or cost of a remittance transfer [*Note: The CFPB has concluded that this Circular is not a 'rule' within the meaning of 5 USC 804(3). Nevertheless, out of an abundance of caution, the CFPB is submitting it to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General consistent with the procedures set forth in 801(a).]'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5009. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Legislative Affairs, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Required Rulemaking on Personal Financial Data Rights; Industry Standard-Setting'' (RIN3170–AA78) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5010. A communication from the Executive Director for Workforce Diversity and Inclusion, Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office of the Comptroller's 2023 Office of Minority and Women Inclusion Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5011. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Registry of Nonbank Covered Persons Subject to Certain Agency and Court Orders'' (RIN3170–AB13) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 6, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–5012. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a legislative proposal to amend the Mercury Export Ban Act of 2008 (Public Law 110–414) to clarify that a facility of the Department of Energy may include a leased facility; remove the requirement for collection of a fee at time of mercury delivery to provide additional flexibility; and clarify that the fee covering long term management and storage includes ultimate mercury treatment and disposal, when available, as well as storage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5013. A communication from the Chief of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status With Critical Habitat for Guadalupe Fatmucket, Texas Fatmucket, Guadalupe Orb, Texas Pimpleback, Balcones Spike, and False Spike, and Threatened Species Status With Section 4(d) Rule and Critical Habitat for Texas Fawnsfoot'' (RIN1018–BD16) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5014. A communication from the Management Analyst of the Policy and Regulations Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulations To Implement the Big Cat Public Safety Act'' (RIN1018–BH23) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5015. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; West Virginia; 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Limited Maintenance Plans for the Charleston Area and the West Virginia Portion of the Steubenville-Weirton Area'' (FRL No. 9822–02–R3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5016. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of California; Coachella Valley; Extreme Attainment Plan for 1997 8-Hour Ozone Standards'' (FRL No. 11677–02–R9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5017. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Revision to Approved Motor Vehicle Emissions Budgets'' (FRL No. 11847–02–R4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5018. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Definitions'' (FRL No. 11915–01–R5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5019. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''PFAS National Primary Drinking Water Regulation; Correction'' ((RIN2040–AG18) (FRL No. 8543–04–OW)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024;

to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–5020. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Multi-Pollutant Emissions Standards for Model Years 2027 and Later Light-Duty and Medium-Duty Vehicles; Correction'' ((RIN2060–AV49) (FRL No. 8953–05–OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WYDEN for the Committee on Finance.

*James R. Ives, of Virginia, to be Inspector General, Department of the Treasury.

*Rose E. Jenkins, of the District of Columbia, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Kashi Way, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Adam B. Landy, of South Carolina, to be a Judge of the United States Tax Court for a term of fifteen years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. ROMNEY (for himself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. VANCE, and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 4529. A bill to permanently establish the E–Verify employment eligibility verification system, to mandate the use of E–Verify by all employers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4530. A bill to authorize an exception to the restriction on construction of Coast Guard vessels in foreign shipyards for certain construction in shipyards in North Atlantic Treaty Organization countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4531. A bill to authorize an exception to the prohibition on the construction of naval vessels in foreign shipyards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BROWN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. MORAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. VANCE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BUDD, Mr. KAINE, Mr. HAWLEY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. FETTERMAN, Ms. WARREN, and Ms. CORTEZ MASTO):

S. 4532. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish requirements with respect to the use of prior authorization under Medicare Advantage plans; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mrs. HYDE–SMITH (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 4533. A bill to expand and promote research and data collection on reproductive health conditions, to provide training opportunities for medical professionals to learn how to diagnose and treat reproductive health conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4534. A bill to establish a national human trafficking database at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and to incentivize certain State law enforcement agencies to report data to the database; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. WELCH):

S. 4535. A bill to require transportation network companies to provide customers notice when a driver has a camera in their motor vehicle and provide customers an opportunity to opt out of riding in motor vehicles with cameras, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself and Mr. WARNOCK):

S. 4536. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 600 East First Street in Rome, Georgia, as the ''Harold L. Murphy Federal Building and United States Courthouse.''; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. RISCH:

S. 4537. A bill to provide for congressional oversight of proposed changes to arms sales to Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4538. A bill to adjust certain ownership and other requirements for passenger vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHMITT (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. WELCH, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. KAINE, Mrs. BRITT, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MULLIN, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 4539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make certain provisions with respect to qualified ABLE programs permanent; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4540. A bill to enable passenger vessels that were not built in the United States to receive coastwise endorsement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SCHMITT:

S. 4541. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make certain provisions with respect to qualified ABLE programs permanent; read the first time.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CORNYN):

S. 4542. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to discount FHA single-family mortgage insurance premium payments for first-time homebuyers who complete a financial literacy housing counseling program; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

S. 4543. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to allow States to waive certain administrative requirements for recertification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4544. A bill to exempt large cruise ships from certain requirements applicable to passenger vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 4545. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 with respect to emergency assistance for farmworkers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 4546. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand the prohibition on destruction of veterans' memorials to include other memorials and to establish mandatory minimum sentences for violations of that prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 4547. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 4548. A bill to make a technical correction to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 by repealing section 5101 and enacting an updated version of the Foreign Extortion Prevention Act; considered and passed.

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

S. 4549. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require additional information on math and clerical error notices; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. LEE (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 4550. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to authorize block grants to States for prekindergarten education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 4551. A bill to amend the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 to modify the BARD Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. BUTLER, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 4552. A bill to enhance the rights of domestic employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4553. A bill to ensure access to certain public land, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs.

BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BRITT, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. YOUNG):

S.J. Res. 97. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to ''Defining and Delimiting the Exemptions for Executive, Administrative, Professional, Outside Sales, and Computer Employees''; 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. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCHMITT, and Mr. YOUNG):

S. Res. 732. A resolution celebrating the 247th anniversary of the creation of the flag of the United States and expressing support for the Pledge of Allegiance; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. DAINES, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. Res. 733. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Patrick Gottsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. Res. 734. A resolution recognizing 30 years since the International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo, Egypt, and reaffirming the goals and ideals of the International Conference on Population and Development Programme of Action, including comprehensive sexual and reproductive health and rights; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. Res. 735. A resolution designating July 17, 2024, as ''Glioblastoma Awareness Day''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. Res. 736. A resolution recognizing the importance of trademarks in the economy and the role of trademarks in protecting consumer safety, by designating the month of July as ''National Anti-Counterfeiting and Consumer Education and Awareness Month''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 133

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 133, a bill to extend the National Alzheimer's Project.

S. 134

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 134, a bill to require an annual budget estimate for the initiatives of the National Institutes of Health pursuant to reports and recommendations made under the National Alzheimer's Project Act.

S. 234

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 234, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the new markets tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 465

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 465, a bill to require Federal law enforcement agencies to report on cases of missing or murdered Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 815

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 815, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to the female telephone operators of the Army Signal Corps, known as the ''Hello Girls''.

S. 1024

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor 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. 1253

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1253, a bill to increase the number of U.S. Customs and Border Protection Customs and Border Protection officers and support staff and to require reports that identify staffing, infrastructure, and equipment needed to enhance security at ports of entry.

S. 1427

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1427, a bill to exempt certain entities from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 with respect to releases of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes.

S. 1429

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1429, a bill to exempt certain entities from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 with respect to releases of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes.

S. 1430

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1430, a bill to exempt certain entities from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 with respect to releases of perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes.

S. 1432

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1432, a bill to exempt certain entities from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 for the release of certain perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes.

S. 1433

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1433, a bill to exempt certain aviation entities from liability under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 for the release of certain perfluoroalkyl or polyfluoroalkyl substances, and for other purposes.

S. 1669

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1669, a bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring access to AM broadcast stations in motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

S. 2085

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2085, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multi-cancer early detection screening tests.

S. 2498

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2498, a bill to prohibit unfair and deceptive advertising of prices for hotel rooms and other places of short-term lodging, and for other purposes.

S. 3277

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3277, a bill to amend the Marine Debris Act to reauthorize the Marine Debris Program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

S. 3530

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) 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. 3629

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3629, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to revise recidivist penalty provisions for child sexual exploitation offenses to uniformly account for prior military convictions, thereby ensuring parity among Federal, State, and military convictions, and for other purposes.

S. 4075

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4075, a bill to prohibit payment card networks and covered entities from requiring the use of or assigning merchant category codes that distinguish a firearms retailer from a general merchandise retailer or sporting goods retailer, and for other purposes.

S. 4122

At the request of Mr. VANCE, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4122, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to develop national quality standards for continuous skilled nursing services provided through Medicaid, and for other purposes.

S. 4387

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4387, a bill to prohibit transportation of any alien using certain methods of identification.

S. 4502

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4502, a bill to prohibit forced arbitration in work disputes, and for other purposes.

S. 4511

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4511, a bill to provide for the crediting of funds received by the National Guard Bureau as reimbursement from States.

S. 4521

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4521, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 4524

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4524, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit discrimination against health care entities that do not participate in abortion, and to strengthen implementation and enforcement of Federal conscience laws.

S.J. RES. 33

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 33, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the use of slavery and involuntary servitude as a punishment for a crime.

S. RES. 599

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 599, a resolution protecting the Iranian political refugees, including female former political prisoners, in Ashraf-3 in Albania.

S. RES. 630

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 630, a resolution supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and recognizing its 75 years of accomplishments.

S. RES. 684

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 684, a resolution supporting the role of the United States in helping save the lives of children and protecting the health of people in low-income countries with vaccines and immunization through Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance (''Gavi'').

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. REED, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 4547. A bill to prohibit the award of Federal Government contracts to inverted domestic corporations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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. 4547

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 ''American Business for American Companies Act of 2024''.

SEC. 2. PROHIBITION ON AWARDING CONTRACTS TO INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATIONS.

(a) CIVILIAN CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 4715. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

''(a) PROHIBITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

''(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

''(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is held by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

''(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of $10,000,000, other than a contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

''(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

''(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

''(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

''(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

''(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

''(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes on or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

''(B) after the acquisition, either—

''(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

''(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

''(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has

substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

''(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on January 18, 2017.

''(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

''(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

''(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

''(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

''(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

''(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on January 18, 2017, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to 'foreign country' and 'relevant foreign country' as references to 'the United States'. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

''(c) WAIVER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is—

''(A) required in the interest of national security; or

''(B) necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or federally funded—

''(i) programs that provide health benefits to individuals; or

''(ii) public health programs.

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an executive agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of the waiver to the relevant authorizing committees of Congress and the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

''(d) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

''(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

''(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'expanded affiliated group', 'foreign incorporated entity', 'person', 'domestic', and 'foreign' have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

''(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 47 of title 41, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4714 the following new item:

''4715. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.''.

(b) DEFENSE CONTRACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 363 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 4663. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations

''(a) PROHIBITION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may not award a contract for the procurement of property or services to—

''(A) any foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity; or

''(B) any joint venture if more than 10 percent of the joint venture (by vote or value) is owned by a foreign incorporated entity that such head has determined is an inverted domestic corporation or any subsidiary of such entity.

''(2) SUBCONTRACTS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The head of an executive agency shall include in each contract for the procurement of property or services awarded by the executive agency with a value in excess of $10,000,000, other than a contract for exclusively commercial items, a clause that prohibits the prime contractor on such contract from—

''(i) awarding a first-tier subcontract with a value greater than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract to an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1); or

''(ii) structuring subcontract tiers in a manner designed to avoid the limitation in paragraph (1) by enabling an entity or joint venture described in paragraph (1) to perform more than 10 percent of the total value of the prime contract as a lower-tier subcontractor.

''(B) PENALTIES.—The contract clause included in contracts pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall provide that, in the event that the prime contractor violates the contract clause—

''(i) the prime contract may be terminated for default; and

''(ii) the matter may be referred to the suspension or debarment official for the appropriate agency and may be a basis for suspension or debarment of the prime contractor.

''(b) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a foreign incorporated entity shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

''(A) the entity completes on or after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

''(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation; or

''(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership; and

''(B) after the acquisition, either—

''(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

''(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation; or

''(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership; or

''(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, as determined pursuant to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

''(2) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A foreign incorporated entity described in paragraph (1) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group.

''(B) SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall establish regulations for determining whether an affiliated group has substantial business activities for purposes of subparagraph (A), except that such regulations may not treat any group as having substantial business activities if such group would not be considered to have substantial business activities under the regulations prescribed under section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as in effect on January 18, 2017.

''(3) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of paragraph (1)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

''(i) the employees of the group are based in the United States;

''(ii) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States;

''(iii) the assets of the group are located in the United States; or

''(iv) the income of the group is derived in the United States.

''(B) DETERMINATION.—Determinations pursuant to subparagraph (A) shall be made in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (2) as in effect on January 18, 2017, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to 'foreign country' and 'relevant foreign country' as references to 'the United States'. The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

''(c) WAIVER.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an agency may waive subsection (a) with respect to any Federal Government contract under the authority of such head if the head determines that the waiver is required in the interest of national security or is necessary for the efficient or effective administration of Federal or federally funded programs that provide health benefits to individuals.

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The head of an agency issuing a waiver under paragraph (1) shall, not later than 14 days after issuing such waiver, submit a written notification of

the waiver to the congressional defense committees.

''(d) APPLICABILITY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section shall not apply to any contract entered into before the date of the enactment of this section.

''(2) TASK AND DELIVERY ORDERS.—This section shall apply to any task or delivery order issued after the date of the enactment of this section pursuant to a contract entered into before, on, or after such date of enactment.

''(3) SCOPE.—This section applies only to contracts subject to regulation under the Federal Acquisition Regulation and the Defense Supplement to the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

''(e) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—

''(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms 'expanded affiliated group', 'foreign incorporated entity', 'person', 'domestic', and 'foreign' have the meaning given those terms in section 835(c) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)).

''(2) SPECIAL RULES.—In applying subsection (b) of this section for purposes of subsection (a) of this section, the rules described under 835(c)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 395(c)(1)) shall apply.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 363 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 4662 the following new item:

''4663. Prohibition on awarding contracts to inverted domestic corporations.''.

(c) REGULATIONS REGARDING MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary's delegate) shall, for purposes of section 4714(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 41, United States Code, and section 4663(b)(1)(B)(ii) of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsections (a) and (b), respectively, prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(2) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—The regulations prescribed under paragraph (1) shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 732—CELEBRATING THE 247TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CREATION OF THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES AND EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. BRAUN (for himself, Mr. BUDD, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCHMITT, and Mr. YOUNG) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 732

Whereas, on June 14, 1777, the Continental Congress approved the design of the flag of the United States;

Whereas, over the years, the flag of the United States has preserved the standards of the original design comprised of alternating red and white stripes accompanied by a union consisting of white stars on a field of blue;

Whereas, on May 30, 1916, President Woodrow Wilson issued Presidential Proclamation 1335, an announcement asking the people of the United States to observe June 14 as Flag Day;

Whereas, on August 3, 1949, President Harry Truman signed into law House Joint Resolution 170, 81st Congress, a joint resolution designating June 14 of each year as Flag Day;

Whereas, on August 21, 1959, President Dwight Eisenhower issued Executive Order 10834 (24 Fed. Reg. 6865), an order establishing the most recent design of the flag of the United States;

Whereas the Pledge of Allegiance was written by Francis Bellamy, a Baptist minister, and first published in the September 8, 1892, issue of The Youth's Companion;

Whereas, in 1954, Congress added the words ''under God'' to the Pledge of Allegiance;

Whereas, for more than 60 years, the Pledge of Allegiance has included references to the United States flag, to the United States having been established as a union ''under God'', and to the United States being dedicated to securing ''liberty and justice for all'';

Whereas, in 1954, Congress believed it was acting constitutionally when it revised the Pledge of Allegiance;

Whereas the United States was founded on principles of religious freedom by the Founders, many of whom were deeply religious;

Whereas the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States embodies principles intended to guarantee freedom of religion through protecting the free exercise thereof and by prohibiting the Government from establishing a religion;

Whereas patriotic songs, engravings on United States legal tender, and engravings on Federal buildings also contain general references to ''God'';

Whereas, in Elk Grove Unified School District v. Newdow, 542 U.S. 1 (2004), the Supreme Court of the United States overturned the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit in Newdow v. U.S. Congress, 328 F.3d 466 (9th Cir. 2003), a case in which the Ninth Circuit concluded that recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance by a public school teacher violated the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit subsequently concluded that—

(1) the previous opinion of that court in Newdow v. U.S. Congress, 328 F.3d 466 (9th Cir. 2003) was no longer binding precedent;

(2) case law from the Supreme Court of the United States concerning the Establishment Clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States had subsequently changed after the decision in Elk Grove Unified School District v. Newdow, 542 U.S. 1 (2004); and

(3) Congress, in passing the new version of the Pledge of Allegiance, had established a secular purpose for the use of the term ''under God''; and

Whereas, in light of those conclusions, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit upheld the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance by public school teachers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 247th anniversary of the creation of the flag of the United States;

(2) recognizes that the Pledge of Allegiance has been a valuable part of life for the people of the United States for generations; and

(3) affirms that the Pledge of Allegiance is a constitutional expression of patriotism and strongly defends the constitutionality of the Pledge of Allegiance.

SENATE RESOLUTION 733—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF PATRICK GOTTSCH

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH (for herself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. DAINES, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 733

Whereas Patrick Gene Gottsch was born on June 3, 1953, in Elkhorn, Nebraska;

Whereas Mr. Gottsch was raised on his family's farm and cattle operation, which instilled in him the values of rural America;

Whereas Mr. Gottsch obtained a wide array of career experiences that enabled him to be a trailblazer in the rural and agricultural programming space;

Whereas Mr. Gottsch worked as a commodity broker on the Chicago Mercantile Exchange, in the home satellite dish industry, and as Director of Sales for the Superior Livestock Auction in the Fort Worth Stockyards;

Whereas Mr. Gottsch launched Rural Free Delivery Television (RFD-TV) in 2002;

Whereas Mr. Gottsch was the founder and president of Rural Media Group, Inc., which, in addition to RFD-TV, grew to consist of RFD-TV The Magazine, RFD HD, RURAL TV, RURAL RADIO, and The Cowboy Channel;

Whereas millions of individuals in the United States have benefitted from Mr. Gottsch's innovative approach to educating the populace on rural and agricultural issues through the use of television and other mediums; and

Whereas Mr. Gottsch's work to represent farmers, ranchers, and rural America through television was unprecedented and has left an indelible mark on the hearts of millions of individuals in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life and legacy of Patrick Gottsch, particularly the devotion of Mr. Gottsch—

(A) to rural America;

(B) to espousing the values of rural America through agricultural and rural programming; and

(C) to advocating for a greater understanding of the importance of rural America to the economy, culture, and progress of the nation;

(2) extends its gratitude to Mr. Gottsch for a life well-lived, and will continue to remember his legacy; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Mr. Gottsch.

SENATE RESOLUTION 734—RECOGNIZING 30 YEARS SINCE THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN CAIRO, EGYPT, AND REAFFIRMING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME OF ACTION, INCLUDING COMPREHENSIVE SEXUAL AND REPRODUCTIVE HEALTH AND RIGHTS

Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 734

Whereas the United States played a central role in the creation of the United Nations in 1945 following World War II to promote international cooperation;

Whereas the United States encouraged the establishment of the United Nations Population Fund (in this preamble referred to as ''UNFPA'') in 1969 and continues to serve on the Executive Board of the UNFPA;

Whereas the International Conference on Population and Development (in this preamble referred to as ''ICPD''), which was attended by officials from the Executive Office of the President, Congress, and United States civil society and private sector organizations, was convened by the UNFPA and the Population Division of the United Nations Department for Economic and Social Information and Policy Analysis in Cairo, Egypt, from September 5 to September 13, 1994, for the purpose of addressing critical issues regarding population, development, and human rights;

Whereas the resulting ICPD Programme of Action, to which the United States is a signatory, asserts that the focus of development policy must be the human rights and dignity of individuals and the improvement of individual lives, measured by progress in addressing inequalities;

Whereas civil society played an indispensable role in shaping and executing the ICPD Programme of Action and continues to do so today;

Whereas, since the adoption of the ICPD Programme of Action in 1994, significant progress has been made towards universal access to sexual and reproductive health and rights, including—

(1) a global increase in voluntary access to modern contraception by 25 percent;

(2) a decline in the number of deaths due to unsafe abortion from 69,000 in 1990 to 22,800 in 2014, due to liberalization of abortion laws and increased access to safe, and effective methods of abortion across the globe;

(3) a decrease in maternal deaths by 34 percent globally; and

(4) enhanced access to medical advances, such as the development of antiretroviral therapies, which 29,800,000 people living with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) accessed in 2022, contributing to significant decreases in HIV acquisition and transmission;

Whereas gaps and challenges in achieving the goals of the ICPD Programme of Action remain as progress has been unequal and fragmented and new challenges have emerged, such as—

(1) the 218,000,000 women globally who have unmet contraceptive needs;

(2) the 287,000 women who die annually from complications during pregnancy and childbirth globally, nearly all of which are preventable and 1 out of 4 of which could be prevented by access to contraception;

(3) the approximately 11 percent of maternal deaths that can be attributed to unsafe abortion;

(4) the more than 1,000,000 sexually transmitted infections (STIs) that are—

(A) acquired globally every day because access to education about STIs and STI testing is not universally available due to a lack of trained personnel, comprehensive sexual education, laboratory capacity, and medicines;

(B) too often untreated, as an estimated 133,000,000 women of reproductive age in low to middle income countries need but do not receive treatment for 1 of the 4 major curable STIs— chlamydia, gonorrhea, syphilis, and trichomoniasis; and

(C) exacerbated by the separation of STI services from other services, such as primary health care or family planning;

(5) the reduction in maternal mortality that has stalled in 133 countries and increase in maternal mortality in 17 countries from 2016 to 2020;

(6) the individuals living with HIV or at risk of HIV transmission, including the—

(A) 1,700,000 individuals who became newly infected with HIV in 2022, 54 percent of which are among key populations, and their sexual partners, whose risk of acquiring HIV is 22 times higher among men who have sex with men, 22 times higher among people who inject drugs, 21 times higher for sex workers, and 12 times higher for transgender individuals; and

(B) adolescent girls and young women (ages 15 to 24), who are at a higher risk of becoming infected with HIV and who account for 4 out of 5 new infections among all adolescents (aged 15 to 19) in sub-Saharan Africa;

(7) the 35 percent of women globally who have experienced physical or sexual intimate partner violence or sexual violence, or sexual violence by a non-partner at some point in their lives, a vulnerability that may increase as a result of characteristics such as sexual orientation, disability status, HIV status, and pregnancy, or contextual factors, such as humanitarian crises and conflict; and

(8) the 48,000,000 women and girls of reproductive age who are in need of humanitarian assistance;

Whereas the ICPD Programme of Action and other international human rights standards recognize that access to evidence-based, comprehensive sexual and reproductive health care, including abortion, is an essential human right, and that ending gender-based violence and the prevention and treatment of HIV are key priorities to advancing sexual and reproductive health and rights for all people, and attaining the ICPD Programme of Action milestones and the Sustainable Development Goals [of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs];

Whereas the ICPD Programme of Action calls for the right of all people to have a satisfying and safe sex life, the capability to reproduce, and the freedom to decide if, when, and how often to do so;

Whereas the ICPD Programme of Action calls for the right of all people to be informed and to have access to safe, effective, affordable and acceptable methods of family planning of their choice, free of coercion, violence, misinformation, and discrimination;

Whereas the ICPD called on governments to commit, at the highest political level, to achieving the goals and objectives of the Programme of Action and to take a leading role in coordinating the implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of follow-up actions;

Whereas the United Nations General Assembly—

(1) endorsed the ICPD Programme of Action in 1995;

(2) affirmed that governments should commit themselves to the goals and objectives of the Programme of Action; and

(3) called upon all governments to give the widest possible dissemination of the Programme of Action and seek public support for the goals, objectives, and actions of the Programme of Action;

Whereas 400 youth delegates from 60 countries, including the United States—

(1) met for the ICPD30 Global Youth Dialogue in Cotonou, Benin, on April 4 to 5, 2024, to reaffirm the pivotal and active role young people have played globally in promoting, protecting, and delivering the ICPD Programme of Action and through the resulting Cotonou Youth Action Agenda; and

(2) called on all United Nations Member States, duty bearers, and stakeholders to implement, resource, and institutionalize global commitments that provide youth-centered, accessible, safe, gender-responsive, quality sexual and reproductive health services, and supplies within universal health coverage programs, including menstrual health management, the full range of modern contraceptives, comprehensive abortion care services, HIV services, and self-managed care;

Whereas members of parliament from all regions of the world, with presence from the House of Representatives, met in Oslo, Norway, on April 10 to 12, 2024, for the eighth International Parliamentarians' Conference on the Implementation (in this preamble referred to as ''IPCI'') of the International Conference on Population and Development and through the resulting Oslo Statement of Commitment, members expressed deep concern about the global backlash against the sexual and reproductive health and rights agenda that has been observed in multiple countries, including the lack of agency for women and girls, which deepens social inequalities and undermines human rights, democracy, gender equality, and the collective efforts to build more inclusive and resilient societies;

Whereas, in the 2024 State of the World Population Report, UNFPA reviewed progress in achieving the ICPD Programme of Action, indicating that significant progress has been made, but entrenched inequalities deprive millions of individuals from fundamental sexual and reproductive health and rights;

Whereas the inability of the international community to reach the most marginalized individuals globally is largely due to unwillingness to confront the legacies of gender inequality, racial discrimination, and misinformation that underlie health systems;

Whereas the United States Government, in its Statement at UN Commission on Population and Development's 57th Annual Session on April 30, 2024, affirmed that reproductive rights are central to an inclusive, thriving society, and that seeking to achieve such rights unequivocally transforms the lives of women and girls, in all of their diversity, around the world, for the better; and

Whereas the Blueprint for Sexual and Reproductive Health, Rights, and Justice calls on the United States Government to mark the 30th anniversary of ICPD with a high level event that recommits the United States Government to the ICPD Programme of Action and delivers sexual and reproductive health and rights for all through rhetoric and action on programs, policy, and funding: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends the notable progress made in achieving the goals set in 1994 at the International Conference on Population and Development (referred to in this resolution as the ''ICPD'') and the follow up and outcomes of subsequent review conferences;

(2) recommits to the achievement of the goals of the ICPD;

(3) champions the right to bodily autonomy and self-determination for all people;

(4) recognizes that sexual and reproductive health and rights, including safe abortion, are human rights, and that sexual and reproductive health and rights are a precondition for the empowerment of women, gender equality, and the well-being and prosperity of all people;

(5) commits to advocating for and providing comprehensive and factual information and a full range of sexual and reproductive health care services that are accessible, affordable, acceptable, of good quality, and convenient to all individuals;

(6) acknowledges that without a clear commitment to a human rights-based approach to development, reproductive health, and gender equality, meeting the goals of either the ICPD or the Sustainable Development Goals will not be possible;

(7) acknowledges and condemns the recent backsliding that—

(A) has occurred domestically and the egregious impact such backsliding has had globally, particularly regarding abortion access and the rights of the LGBTQIA+ community; and

(B) is contrary to evidence-based health practices and established human rights norms and could set back the progress made on reducing unsafe abortions, reducing maternal mortality, and reducing stigma against treatment for the human immunodeficiency virus and acquired immunodeficiency syndrome;

(8) accepts the responsibility of the United States, as the largest funder of global health, to uphold the goals of ICPD and set a global example through United States funding and policies, which affirmatively advance Federal development commitments and the realization of human rights;

(9) supports the urgent need to scale up funding for bilateral international family planning and reproductive health programs and the United States contribution to United Nations Population Fund, which have been flat funded for 14 years, and to permanently end harmful policies like the global gag rule and Helms Amendment, which undermine global access to comprehensive health care information and services and the ability to achieve the vision laid out in the ICPD Programme of Action;

(10) opposes and condemns reproductive coercion in all forms, consistent with the ICPD Programme of Action, including—

(A) the use of incentives or disincentives to lower or raise fertility;

(B) the use of incentives or targets for the uptake of specific contraceptive methods;

(C) withholding of information on reproductive health options; and

(D) forced abortion, forced sterilization, and forced pregnancy; and

(11) calls on the Administration of President Joseph R. Biden, Jr., to fully implement the National Strategy on Gender Equity and Equality, including the strategic priority to ''Protect, Improve, and Expand Access to Health Care, including Sexual and Reproductive Health Care''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 735—DESIGNATING JULY 17, 2024, AS ''GLIOBLASTOMA AWARENESS DAY''

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. COONS, and Mr. BARRASSO) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 735

Whereas approximately 14,490 new cases of glioblastoma were diagnosed in the United States in 2023;

Whereas glioblastoma is—

(1) the most common malignant (cancerous) brain tumor, accounting for approximately ½ of all primary malignant brain tumors; and

(2) the most aggressive, complex, difficult to treat, and deadly type of brain tumor;

Whereas it is estimated that more than 10,000 individuals in the United States will succumb to glioblastoma each year;

Whereas the 5-year survival rate for glioblastoma patients is only 6.9 percent, and the median length of survival for glioblastoma patients is only 8 months;

Whereas glioblastoma is described as a disease that affects the ''essence of self'', as the treatment and removal of glioblastoma presents significant challenges due to the uniquely complex and fragile nature of the brain, the primary organ in the human body that controls not only cognitive ability, but also the actions of every organ and limb;

Whereas patients and caregivers play a critical role in furthering research for glioblastoma;

Whereas, relative to the patients of other types of cancers, brain cancer patients pay the second highest out-of-pocket costs for medical services in both the initial and end-of-life phases of care;

Whereas, although research advances may fuel the development of new treatments for glioblastoma, challenging obstacles to accelerating progress toward new treatments for glioblastoma remain, and there are no screening or early detection methods;

Whereas, in 2021, the World Health Organization reclassified brain tumors and made significant changes to the molecular characteristics of a glioblastoma diagnosis, necessitating critical biomarker testing for patients suspected of having glioblastoma;

Whereas, although glioblastoma was first described in medical and scientific literature in the 1920s, and despite its devastating prognosis, only 5 drugs and 1 medical device have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration to specifically treat glioblastoma since the 1920s, and the mortality rates associated with glioblastoma have changed little during the past 30 years;

Whereas, since the first Glioblastoma Awareness Day, the National Cancer Institute established the Glioblastoma Therapeutics Network in 2020, a network of multi-institutional teams that enhance and support the discovery and development of glioblastoma therapies by driving therapeutic agents through pre-clinical studies and early-phase clinical trials, which are necessary to rapidly evaluate potential treatments to advance toward cures and improved quality of life; and

Whereas there is a need for greater public awareness of glioblastoma, including awareness of both—

(1) the urgent unmet medical needs of glioblastoma patients; and

(2) the opportunities for research of, and treatment advances for, glioblastoma: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 17, 2024, as ''Glioblastoma Awareness Day'';

(2) encourages increased public awareness of glioblastoma;

(3) honors the individuals who have died from the devastating disease of glioblastoma or are currently living with the disease;

(4) supports efforts to develop better treatments for glioblastoma that will improve the long-term prognosis for, and the quality of life of, individuals diagnosed with the disease;

(5) recognizes the importance of molecular biomarker testing to the diagnosis and treatment of glioblastoma;

(6) expresses support for the individuals who are battling brain tumors, as well as the families, friends, and caregivers of those individuals;

(7) urges a collaborative approach to brain tumor research among governmental, private, and nonprofit organizations, which is a promising means of advancing the understanding and treatment of glioblastoma; and

(8) encourages continued investments in glioblastoma research and treatments, including through the Glioblastoma Therapeutics Network and other existing brain tumor research resources.

SENATE RESOLUTION 736—RECOGNIZING THE IMPORTANCE OF TRADEMARKS IN THE ECONOMY AND THE ROLE OF TRADEMARKS IN PROTECTING CONSUMER SAFETY, BY DESIGNATING THE MONTH OF JULY AS ''NATIONAL ANTI-COUNTERFEITING AND CONSUMER EDUCATION AND AWARENESS MONTH''

Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. TILLIS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 736

Whereas public awareness is crucial to safeguard consumers and businesses from unsafe and unreliable products that, through illicit activity, threaten intellectual property rights, the economic market, and even the health and well-being of consumers;

Whereas Federal statutes such as the Act of July 5, 1946 (commonly referred to as the ''Trademark Act of 1946'' or the ''Lanham Act'') (60 Stat. 427, chapter 540; 15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.) (referred to in this preamble as the ''Lanham Act'') and the Trademark Counterfeiting Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–473; 98 Stat. 2178) regulate the unlawful act of producing and selling counterfeit products;

Whereas the Lanham Act provided the foundation for modern Federal trademark protection, creating legal rights and remedies for brand owners suffering from trademark infringement, helping consumers make informed choices by reducing the amount of confusingly similar products, and making the marketplace more fair, competitive, and safe for all;

Whereas October 12, 2024, marks the 40th anniversary of the enactment of the Trademark Counterfeiting Act of 1984 (Public Law 98–473; 98 Stat. 2178);

Whereas, according to the World Intellectual Property Organization, there was an estimated 82,500,000 active trademark registrations around the world in 2022, a 9.4 percent increase from the previous year;

Whereas counterfeit products undermine laws, including the Lanham Act, that ensure the safety of consumers, businesses, and brand owners against illegitimate products in the marketplace, from which criminal groups and bad actors are benefitting at the expense of the public and private sector;

Whereas counterfeiters use different online platforms to attract consumers to buy illegitimate goods, usually enticing consumers through cheaper prices;

Whereas the growth of both global commerce and electronic commerce has expedited the evolving problem because it has

given third-party actors an enhanced opportunity to reach consumers that they may have not previously been able to reach;

Whereas the deceptive tactics of counterfeiters and their counterfeit products pose actual and potential harm to the health and safety of United States citizens, especially the most vulnerable consumers in society, such as senior citizens and children;

Whereas, according to the 2024 Special 301 Report issued by the Office the United States Trade Representative, counterfeit items often do not comply with regulated safety standards, and as a result, vast amounts of unsafe products are constantly circulating the market and endangering the public;

Whereas goods originating in China and Hong Kong account for more than 80 percent of all global customs seizures of dangerous counterfeit goods, including foodstuffs, pharmaceuticals, cosmetics, and other goods;

Whereas counterfeit medical products pose a particular threat to the safety and health of consumers in the United States because the counterfeit product does not provide the same level of protection as an authentic article;

Whereas, in September 2021, the Drug Enforcement Administration issued its first Public Safety Alert in 6 years to warn the public about the alarming increase in the availability and lethality of fake prescription pills in the United States, pills that often contain deadly doses of fentanyl, and in 2023, the Drug Enforcement Administration seized a staggering 80,000,000 fentanyl-laced prescription pills;

Whereas counterfeit products threaten the United States economy and job creation, and according to United States Customs and Border Protection, counterfeiting and piracy cost businesses in the United States more than $275,000,000,000 per year and have led to the loss of more than 750,000 jobs;

Whereas, in 2023, United States Customs and Border Protection seized more than 23,000,000 counterfeit goods, with an estimated manufacturer's suggested retail price of over $2,750,000,000 if the goods were genuine, which equates to about $7,534,246 in counterfeit goods seizures every day;

Whereas the manufacturing, trade, and consumption of counterfeit products are on the rise;

Whereas, according to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, as of 2020, at least 20 percent of counterfeit and pirated goods sold abroad displace sales in the United States, and of the $143,000,000,000 sold of such goods, the United States economy suffers a loss of around $29,000,000,000 per year;

Whereas businesses of all sizes collectively spend millions of dollars to protect and enforce their own brand and products by removing counterfeit products from both online and physical marketplaces;

Whereas businesses must devote resources to combating counterfeit products instead of using those resources to grow their business by hiring new employees and developing new products;

Whereas one of the most effective ways to protect consumers from the dangers of counterfeit products is through educational campaigns and awareness programs; and

Whereas organizations such as the Congressional Trademark Caucus, Federal enforcement agencies, the National Intellectual Property Rights Coordination Center, and State enforcement agencies are actively working to raise awareness of the value of trademarks and the impact and harms caused by counterfeit products on both the national and State economies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the month of July 2024 as ''National Anti-Counterfeiting and Consumer Education and Awareness Month'';

(2) supports the goals and ideals of National Anti-Counterfeiting and Consumer Education and Awareness Month to educate the public and raise public awareness about the actual and potential dangers counterfeit products pose to consumer health and safety;

(3) affirms the continuing importance and need for comprehensive Federal, State, and private sector-supported education and awareness efforts designed to equip the consumers of the United States with the information and tools needed to safeguard against illegal counterfeit products in traditional commerce, internet commerce, and other electronic commerce platforms; and

(4) recognizes and reaffirms the commitment of the United States to combating counterfeiting by promoting awareness about the actual and potential harm of counterfeiting to consumers and brand owners and by promoting new education programs and campaigns designed to reduce the supply of, and demand for, counterfeit products.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have six requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet in closed session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 13, 2024, at 8:30 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 13, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 13, 2024, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet in executive session during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 13, 2024, at 9:45 a.m.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 13, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, June 13, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct an executive business meeting.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Harrison Dougherty and Zahra Naeini—interns in my office—be granted floor privileges until June 14, 2024.

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

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the notice of proposed rulemaking from the Office Of Congressional Workplace Rights be printed in the RECORD.

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

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS (''OCWR'')

U.S. CONGRESS, OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS,
Washington, DC, June 13, 2024.

Hon. PATTY MURRAY,
President Pro Tempore, U.S. Senate,
U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM PRESIDENT: Section 207(d) of the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), 2 U.S.C. 1316a(d), requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights (Board) to issue substantive regulations implementing section 207 of the CAA relating to the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019 (FCA).

Section 304(b)(1) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1384(b)(1), requires that the Board issue a general notice of proposed rulemaking by transmitting such notice to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate for publication in the *Congressional Record* on the first day of which both Houses are in session following such transmittal.

On behalf of the Board, I am hereby transmitting the attached Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate. I request that this notice be published in the Senate section of the *Congressional Record* on the first day on which both Houses are in session following receipt of this transmittal. In compliance with section 304(b)(2) of the CAA, a comment period of 30 days after the publication of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is being provided before adoption of the rules.

Any inquiries regarding this notice should be addressed to Martin J. Crane, Executive Director of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, Room LA–200, 110 Second Street S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540–1999; 202–724–9250.

Sincerely,

BARBARA CHILDS WALLACE,
Chair of the Board of Directors,
Office of Congressional Workplace Rights.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE RIGHTS ("OCWR")

Re NEW PROPOSED REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING CERTAIN SUBSTANTIVE RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS FOR JOB APPLICANTS, AS REQUIRED BY SECTION 207 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995, AS AMENDED (''CAA'')

Background

The purpose of this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (''Notice'') is to propose substantive regulations that will implement the

Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019 (''FCA'') in the legislative branch of the federal government. The FCA, as applied by section 207 of the CAA, codified at 2 U.S.C. §1316b, places limitations on employing office requests for criminal history record information from job applicants prior to a conditional offer of employment.

The CAA applies the rights and protections of numerous federal labor and employment statutes to covered employees and employing offices in the legislative branch. Section 1316b of the CAA prohibits employing offices from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the employing office makes a conditional offer of employment to that applicant. Section 1316b also provides that applicants for employment may rely on the CAA's existing claims procedures under subchapter IV and, through incorporation of 5 U.S.C. §9204, establishes minimum penalties and procedures to be followed before such penalties may be assessed against an employee who violates the FCA.

What is the authority under the CAA for these proposed substantive regulations?

The authority under the CAA for these proposed substantive regulations is found in two sections of the CAA. Section 1316b applies certain provisions of the FCA, title 5, chapter 92 of the United States Code. Section 1316b provides rights and protections to job applicants against criminal background checks prior to a conditional offer of employment. Subsection 1316b(d) requires the OCWR Board of Directors (''Board'') to issue substantive regulations to implement these protections that are:

the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management . . . except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section.

The second CAA section that provides authority to the Board to promulgate these regulations is section 304, codified at 2 U.S.C. §1384. These proposed substantive regulations implement the statutory protections embodied in section 1316b.

Although Congress has required the Board to propose substantive regulations that are the same as the FCA regulations promulgated by the Office of Personnel Management (''OPM''), Congress has not required the Board to adopt OPM's procedural regulations for FCA violations. Section 1316b(c)(2) instead provides that:

An applicant for employment as a covered employee who alleges a violation of subsection (b)(1) may rely on the provisions of subchapter IV (other than section 1407 or 1408 of this title, or a provision of this subchapter that permits a person to obtain a civil action or judicial review) . . . .

Accordingly, the Board will address procedures through amendments to the OCWR Procedural Rules, under section 1383 of the FCA.

Do similar rights and protections currently apply via the CAA to legislative branch employing offices and covered employees?

No. Section 1316b creates a unique framework under the CAA providing for penalties against employees who violate the FCA.

What rights and protections are applied to eligible employees under section 1316b?

Congress enacted the FCA in December 2019, and the final regulations promulgated by OPM for the executive branch became effective in October 2023. The FCA's provisions prohibit Federal employers, including employing offices in the legislative branch, from requesting that applicants for most jobs disclose criminal record history information prior to extending a conditional job offer to the applicant. The FCA enforces this prohibition through the assessment of penalties against employees responsible for violations.

The selected statutory provisions that Congress incorporated into the CAA and determined would apply to employing offices are subsections 9201(1), (4), and (5) and sections 9202, 9204, and 9206 of title 5. These sections incorporate definitions found in other code sections, in particular 5 U.S.C. §7501, 5 U.S.C. §9101, and 18 U.S.C. §115(c).

Congress adopted the definitions of the terms ''agency,'' ''criminal history record information,'' and ''suspension,'' as found in subsections 9201(1), (4), and (5) respectively, ''except as otherwise modified by'' section 1316b. Section 1316b does not further modify the definitions of ''agency'' or ''criminal history record information,'' but section 1316b(c)(1) does further clarify that a ''suspension'' is to ''be considered . . . a suspension with the level of compensation provided for a covered employee who is taking unpaid leave under section 1312'' of the CAA.

Section 9202 establishes a general prohibition against inquiries regarding criminal history record information. An employee of an employing office may not request, in oral or written form, that an applicant for a position disclose criminal history record information prior to the employing office extending a conditional offer to the applicant.

Section 9202 also incorporates a number of exceptions. These exceptions allow criminal background history inquiries for law enforcement officers, for employees who would have access to classified information or who would serve in a sensitive national security position, for acceptance or retention in the armed services, or for other purposes as otherwise required by law.

Section 9204 provides for adverse actions against employees found, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing on the record, to have violated the prohibition regarding inquiries into applicants' criminal history record information. The adverse actions include suspension of and fines imposed upon liable employees. Section 9204 additionally provides that fines and suspensions escalate based upon whether the employee has previously been found to have violated the FCA.

Section 9206 further clarifies that the FCA prohibits the request of sealed or expunged records or records relating to acts of juvenile delinquency. Section 9206 also clarifies that the FCA does not create a private right of action for any person.

Procedural Summary

How are substantive regulations proposed and approved under the CAA?

Pursuant to section 1384, the procedure for proposing and approving such substantive regulations provides that:

(1) the Board of Directors propose substantive regulations and publish a general notice of proposed rulemaking in the *Congressional Record*;

(2) there be a comment period of at least 30 days after the date of publication of the general notice of proposed rulemaking;

(3) after consideration of comments by the Board of Directors, the Board adopt regulations and transmit notice of such action (together with the regulations and a recommendation regarding the method for Congressional approval of the regulations) to the Speaker of the House and President pro tempore of the Senate for publication in the *Congressional Record*;

(4) there be committee referral and action on the proposed regulations by resolution in each House, concurrent resolution, or by joint resolution; and

(5) final publication of the approved regulations in the *Congressional Record*, with an effective date prescribed in the final publication.

For more detail, please reference the text of section 1384. This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is step (1) of the outline set forth above.

Are these proposed substantive regulations also recommended by OCWR's Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director for the Senate, and the Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives?

As required by section 1384(b)(1), the substance of these regulations is also recommended by the Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director for the Senate, and the Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives.

Has the Board of Directors previously proposed substantive regulations implementing these rights and protections pursuant to section 1316b?

No.

What is the approach taken by these proposed substantive regulations?

The Board will follow the procedure as enumerated above and as required by statute to ensure that the regulations contemplate and reflect the practices and policies particular to the legislative branch.

What responsibilities would employing offices have in effectively implementing these regulations?

Employing offices have the responsibility of ensuring that their hiring announcements and hiring processes comply with the prohibition against requesting criminal history record information prior to making a conditional offer of employment, as required by these regulations and the FCA more generally.

Are there substantive differences in the proposed regulations for the House of Representatives, the Senate, and the other employing offices?

No. The Board of Directors has identified no good cause for varying the text of these regulations. Therefore, if these regulations are approved as proposed, there will be one text applicable to all employing offices and covered employees.

Are these proposed substantive regulations available to persons with disabilities in an alternate format?

This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is available on the OCWR's website, www.ocwr.gov, which is compliant with Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended, 29 U.S.C. §794d. This Notice can also be made available in large print, Braille, or other alternative format. Requests for this Notice in an alternative format should be made to the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, 202–724–9250 (voice); 202–426–1913 (fax); or ADAaccess@ocwr.gov (e-mail).

30 Day Comment Period Regarding the Proposed Regulations

How long do I have to submit comments regarding the proposed regulations?

Interested parties may submit comments regarding OCWR's proposed regulations set forth in this Notice for a period of thirty (30) days following the date of the appearance of this Notice in the *Congressional Record*.

How do I submit comments?

Comments must be made in writing to the Executive Director, Office of Congressional

Workplace Rights, via e-mail at rule-comments@ocwr.gov.

Am I allowed to view copies of submitted comments by others?

Yes. Copies of submitted comments will be available for review on the Office's website at www.ocwr.gov.

Supplementary Information:

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, PL 104–1, was enacted into law on January 23, 1995, and amended on December 21, 2018, by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 Reform Act. The CAA, as amended, applies the rights and protections of numerous federal labor and employment statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the legislative branch of the federal government. Included among those rights are the protections provided to applicants regarding their criminal history record information in section 207 of the CAA. These protections are the subject of these regulations.

Section 301 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. §1381) establishes the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights as an independent office within the legislative branch.

More Detailed Discussion of the Text of the Proposed Regulations

The Board proposes these substantive regulations with minimal changes from OPM's regulations. The Board made numerous editorial changes necessitated by adaptation to the legislative branch, e.g., ''employing office'' for ''agency,'' or for consistency with the CAA, e.g., ''claim'' for ''complaint.'' The Board relied extensively on section 1316b(d), which requires that these regulations be the same as the substantive regulation promulgated by the Director of OPM unless it determines, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for implementation of the rights and protections under section 1316b. Where the Board determined that good cause existed to require a modification, it so modified the regulations.

Introduction to the Regulations under the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2019 General Provisions

The Purpose of FCA

The FCA, as applied by the CAA, protects job applicants in the legislative branch by prohibiting employing offices from inquiring into an applicant's criminal history record information prior to a conditional offer of employment. The FCA, as applied by the CAA, provides that employees who inquire into an applicant's criminal history record information in a manner that violates the FCA may be subject to discipline including suspensions from employment and fines.

The FCA, as applied by the CAA, provides that applicants are to rely upon the procedures set forth in subchapter IV of the CAA. As a result, OCWR's procedures will differ from those contained in part 754 of the OPM regulations. The FCA, as applied by the CAA, does not provide for civil actions or judicial review of administrative determinations.

OPM Regulations

Section 1316b(d)(2) requires the Board to promulgate substantive regulations for the legislative branch. Congress required such regulations to be:

the same as substantive regulations issued by the Director of [OPM] . . . except to the extent that the Board may determine, for good cause shown and stated together with the regulation, that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under [the FCA].

OPM's regulations implementing the FCA became effective on October 1, 2023. OPM's regulations consist, in part, of minor amendments acknowledging application of the FCA to five parts of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations: parts 302 (''Employment in the Excepted Service''), 317 (''Employment in the Senior Executive Service''), 319 (''Employment in the Senior-Level and Scientific and Professional Positions''), 330 (''Recruitment, Selection, and Placement (General)''), and 731 (''Suitability''). OPM's regulations also create two new parts of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations, parts 754 (''Complaint Procedures, Adverse Actions, and Appeals for Criminal History'') and 920 (''Timing of Criminal History Inquiries Prior to Conditional Offer''). Part 754 sets forth procedures for processing of complaints regarding violations of the FCA. Part 920 contains substantive regulations implementing the FCA.

Section-by-Section Analysis

Parts 302, 317, and 319

OPM made additions to parts 302, 317, and 319 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations to incorporate the requirements of the FCA into existing regulations governing the excepted service, senior executive service, and ''senior-level and scientific and professional positions,'' respectively. Since there are no existing regulations in the legislative branch parallel to those OPM regulations, the Board found good cause not to propose parallel regulations.

Parts 330 and 731

Parts 330 and 731 relate to suitability of applicants for employment. The suitability provisions of title 5 do not apply in the legislative branch. The Board has therefore found good cause not to propose parallel regulations.

Part 754

The FCA, in section 9202(c)(2), requires that OPM adopt substantive regulations. In addition, section 9203(2) directs OPM to ''establish and publish procedures under which an applicant for an appointment to a position in the civil service may submit a complaint, or any other information, regarding compliance with 5 U.S.C. §9202.'' OPM, citing its general authority to promulgate regulations under 5 U.S.C. §1103(a), created a new 5 CFR part 754 to implement the complaint procedure requirements of the FCA. *See* Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs, 87 Fed. Reg. 24885–01, 24887 (April 27, 2022).

The Board has found good cause not to adopt part 754 for use in the legislative branch. Part 754 of OPM's regulations is entirely procedural in nature. As such, it is outside the scope of Congress's mandate that OCWR adopt substantive regulations that are the same as substantive regulations issued by the Director of OPM except upon a finding of good cause. Rather than requiring the Board to follow OPM's procedural regulations and as Congress provided in section 1316b(c)(2), OCWR must process FCA claims using subchapter IV of the CAA (2 U.S.C. §1401 et seq.). OCWR has established interim procedures and will amend its Procedural Rules to implement procedures for FCA claims in the legislative branch pursuant to section 1383 of the CAA.

Part 920

OPM adopted 5 CFR, part 920 to set forth general rules regarding the FCA. The Board found good cause to modify part 920 to adapt it from the executive branch to the legislative branch.

Subpart A

Subpart A of part 920 of OPM's regulations contains general provisions that are applicable to the timing of criminal history inquiries. Section 920.101 contains definitions necessary for the administration of this part.

For section 920.101, the Board has found good cause to modify the definitions. The Board proposes omitting the definition of ''agency'' and replacing it with a definition of ''employing office'' based on sections 1301(a)(9) and 1301(b) of the CAA.

The Board proposes omitting the definition of ''appointing authority.'' Section 9201(2) of the FCA defines ''appointing authority'' as ''an employee in the executive branch of the Government of the United States that has authority to make appointments to positions in the civil service.'' That definition is inapplicable to the legislative branch. Moreover, since liability under the FCA attaches to individual employees, regardless of whether they have hiring authority, the term ''appointing authority'' is not essential to the application of the FCA in the legislative branch.

The Board proposes modifying the definition of ''conditional offer'' to include a CAA-specific definition of the term. Section 1316b(b)(1)(B) defines ''conditional offer'' as ''an offer of employment as a covered employee that is conditioned upon the results of a criminal history inquiry.''

The Board proposes replacing the definition of ''employee'' with a definition of ''covered employee'' based upon sections 1301(a)(3) and 1301(b) of the CAA.

The Board proposes omitting the definitions of ''political appointment,'' as well as section 920.201(b)(2), which exempts applicants for political appointments from FCA coverage. None of the definitions of ''political appointment'' apply to covered employees in the legislative branch. The Board proposes this omission as opposed to the creation of an alternative definition or definitions of that term. Neither the FCA nor the CAA provides a basis for the Board to create an alternative definition of ''political appointment'' for the legislative branch or to exempt from the FCA's coverage employees falling within the scope of such a definition.

Subpart B

Subpart B of OPM's regulations addresses when inquiries into an applicant's criminal history record information may be made. Section 920.201(a) states that an agency cannot request an applicant's criminal history record information orally or in written form prior to giving a conditional offer of employment. This includes the following points in the recruitment and hiring process: (1) initial application, through a job opportunity announcement on USAJOBS, or through any recruitment/public notification such as on the agency's website/social media, etc.; (2) after an agency receives an initial application through its back-end system, through shared service providers/recruiters/contractors, or orally or via email and other forms of electronic notification; and (3) prior to, during, or after a job interview. This prohibition applies to agency personnel, shared service providers, contractors involved in the agency's recruitment and hiring process, automated systems (specific to the agency or governmentwide), etc. Other than minor amendments to employ terminology used in the legislative branch, the Board proposes no changes to section 920.201(a).

Section 920.201(b) of OPM's regulations tracks the requirements of 5 U.S.C. §9202(b) and (c)(1), allowing inquiries into a job applicant's criminal history, prior to making a conditional job offer to that applicant, if doing so is otherwise required by law, if the position requires a determination of eligibility for access to classified information or employment in a sensitive position (designated under the Position Designation System issued by OPM and the Office of Director of National Intelligence), or eligibility for acceptance or retention in the armed forces

(as described in 5 U.S.C. §9101(b)(1)(A)(i), (ii), or (iii)) such as for dual-status military technicians, or if it is a Federal law enforcement officer position (as defined in section 115(c) of title 18).

Paragraph (b) also makes an exception for applicants for political appointments. Pre-employment criminal history screening may be required for these positions prior to a conditional offer of employment, because of the utmost trust and discretion required in these positions. Paragraph (b) also describes other circumstances for which OPM may grant exceptions in response to a request from a hiring agency.

The Board proposes modifying subparagraphs (b)(1)(iii), (b)(1)(iv), and (b)(2), which relate to exceptions from the FCA, by omitting them. Subparagraph (1)(iii) relates to positions that have been designated under the Position Designation System as sensitive. The Board is aware of no positions in covered employing offices that would be subject to such designation. Similarly, the Board is unaware of any dual-status military technicians in the legislative branch, thereby obviating the need for subparagraph (1)(iv). The Board is also proposing to omit subparagraph (b)(2), since, as was noted above, the Board lacks the authority to create a legislative branch-specific definition of ''political appointment.''

Paragraph (c) adds the requirement that agencies notify applicants of the prohibition in job opportunity announcements and on agency websites/portals for positions that do not require a posting on USAJOBS, such as excepted service positions, in addition to information about agency complaint processes as required by part 754 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Other than minor amendments to employ terminology used in the legislative branch, the Board proposes no changes to section 920.201(c).

Section 920.202 of OPM's regulations defines what constitutes a violation of the FCA.

Paragraph (a) defines a violation as any oral or written request for criminal history information prior to a conditional job offer. Paragraph (b) explains that a violation occurs when a prohibited inquiry is made by agency personnel, including when they act through shared service providers, contractors involved in the agency's recruitment/hiring process, or automated systems (specific to the agency or governmentwide).

Section 920.202 of OPM's regulations also outlines several situations in which a violation could occur. An agency cannot request criminal history information upon the initial application, through a job opportunity announcement on USAJOBS, or through any recruitment/public notification such as on the agency's website/social media. An agency also cannot request this information after an agency receives an initial application through its back-end system, through shared service providers/recruiters/contractors, or orally or via email and other forms of electronic notification prior to giving the conditional offer. Additionally, the agency cannot request the information verbally prior to, during, or after a job interview prior to giving a conditional offer. Other than minor amendments to employ terminology used in the legislative branch, the Board proposes no changes to sections 920.202(a) and (b).

Paragraph (c) provides that when a prohibited request, announcement, or communication is publicly posted or simultaneously distributed to multiple applicants, it constitutes a single violation. This resolves an ambiguity in the language of 5 U.S.C. §9202(a) and prevents the absurd and unintended outcome of thousands of violations and complaints arising from a single job opportunity announcement on USAJOBS. Other than minor amendments to employ terminology used in the legislative branch, the Board proposes no changes to section 920.202(c).

Paragraph (d) of section 920.202 of OPM's regulations explains that any violation as defined in paragraph (a) is subject to the complaint and penalty procedures in part 754 of title 5 of the Code of Federal Regulations. The Board proposes modifying paragraph (d) to replace reference to part 754 with reference to subchapter IV of the CAA and OCWR's Procedural Rules.

PART 920—TIMING OF CRIMINAL HISTORY INQUIRIES

Subpart A—General Provisions

Subpart B—Timing of Inquiries Regarding Criminal History

§ 920.101 Definitions.

For the purpose of this part:

Employing office means:

(1) The personal office of a Member of the House of Representatives or of a Senator;

(2) A committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate or a joint committee;

(3) Any other office headed by a person with the final authority to appoint, hire, discharge, and set the terms, conditions, or privileges of the employment of an employee of the House of Representatives or the Senate; or

(4) The Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, the United States Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Office of the Attending Physician, the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights, the Office of Technology Assessment, the Library of Congress, the Stennis Center for Public Service, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission, Congressional-Executive Commission on China, and the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Applicant means a person who has applied to an employing office under its procedures for accepting applications consistent with governmentwide regulations, as applicable.

Conditional offer means an offer of employment as a covered employee that is conditioned upon the results of a criminal history inquiry.

Covered employee means any employee of—(1) the House of Representatives; (2) the Senate; (3) the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services; (4) the United States Capitol Police; (5) the Congressional Budget Office; (6) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; (7) the Office of the Attending Physician; (8) the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights; (9) the Office of Technology Assessment; (10) the Library of Congress; (11) the Stennis Center for Public Service; (12) the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom; (13) the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission; (14) the Congressional-Executive Commission on China; or (15) the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Criminal history record information—(1) Has the meaning given the term in section 9101(a) of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) Includes any information described in the first sentence of section 9101(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code, that has been sealed or expunged pursuant to law; and

(3) Includes information collected by a criminal justice agency, relating to an act or alleged act of juvenile delinquency, that is analogous to criminal history record information (including such information that has been sealed or expunged pursuant to law).

§ 920.102 Positions covered by Fair Chance Act regulations.

(a) Positions covered. Except as provided in paragraph (b), this part applies to all positions in any employing office.

(b) Exempt positions. For purposes of this part an exempt position is any position for which an employing office is required by statutory authority to make inquiries into an applicant's criminal history prior to extending an offer of employment to the applicant.

Subpart B—Timing of Inquiries Regarding Criminal History

§ 920.201. Limitations on criminal history inquiries.

(a) Applicability. An employee of an employing office may not request, in oral or written form (including through the Declaration for Federal Employment (Office of Personnel Management Optional Form 306) or any similar successor form, the USAJOBS internet website, or any other electronic means) that an applicant for employment with an employing office disclose criminal history record information regarding the applicant before the employing office extends a conditional offer to the applicant. This includes the following points in the recruitment and hiring process:

(1) Initial application, through a job opportunity announcement on USAJOBS, or through any recruitment/public notification such as on the employing office's website/social media, etc.;

(2) After an employing office receives an initial application through its back-end system, through shared service providers/recruiters/contractors, or orally or via email and other forms of electronic notification; and

(3) Prior to, during, or after a job interview. This prohibition applies to employing office personnel, including when they act through shared service providers, contractors (acting on behalf of the employing office) involved in the employing office's recruitment and hiring process, or automated systems (specific to the employing office or governmentwide).

(b) Exceptions for certain positions. (1) The prohibition under paragraph (a) of this section shall not apply with respect to an applicant for an appointment to a position:

(i) Which is exempt in accordance with §920.102(b);

(ii) That requires a determination of eligibility for access to classified information;

(iii) Is a Federal law enforcement officer position meeting the definition in section 115(c) of title 18, U.S. Code.

(c) Notification to applicants. Each employing office must publicize to applicants the prohibition described in paragraph (a) of this section in job opportunity announcements and on employing office websites/portals for positions that do not require a posting on USAJOBS.

§ 920.202. Violations.

(a) An employing office employee may not request, orally or in writing, information about an applicant's criminal history prior to making a conditional offer of employment to that applicant unless the position is exempted or excepted in accordance with §920.201(b).

(b) A violation (or prohibited action) as defined in paragraph (a) of this section occurs when employing office personnel, shared service providers, or contractors (acting on behalf of the employing office) involved in the employing office's recruitment and hiring process, either personally or through

automated systems (specific to the employing office or governmentwide), make oral or written requests prior to giving a conditional offer of employment—

(1) In a job opportunity announcement on USAJOBS or in any recruitment/public notification such as on the employing office's website or social media;

(2) In communications sent after an employing office receives an initial application, through an employing office's talent acquisition system, shared service providers/recruiters/contractors, orally or in writing (including via email and other forms of electronic notification); or

(3) Prior to, during, or after a job interview or other applicant assessment.

(c) When a prohibited request, announcement, or communication is publicly posted or simultaneously distributed to multiple applicants, it constitutes a single violation.

(d) Any violation as defined in paragraph (a) of this section is subject to the claim and penalty procedures under subchapter IV of title 2 (other than section 1407 or 1408 of title 2, or a provision of that subchapter that permits a person to obtain a civil action or judicial review) and the OCWR Procedural Rules, consistent with these regulations.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 870

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader, it be in order for the Chair to lay before the Senate the House message to accompany S. 870, and the leader or his designee be recognized to make a motion to concur in the House amendments; further, that there be up to 2 hours of debate equally divided, and upon the use or yielding back of that time, the Senate vote on the motion to concur with the House amendments without further intervening action or debate; finally, if the motion is agreed to, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have some very good news. Today, we reached an agreement to move forward on bipartisan legislation to support our firefighters. Our firefighters—paid and volunteer—are brave. They risk their lives for us. And they run toward danger, not away from it. In that sense, they are like our domestic soldiers.

Passing this bipartisan legislation would be the best way to support our firefighters and ensure they have the equipment and personnel they need to do their jobs.

I have long supported this legislation. I was involved in putting it together originally, way back when, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to bring this legislation to the floor for a vote as soon as possible. We need to help our firefighters.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I come to the floor to discuss the differences between Democrat foreign policy and Republican foreign policy.

There seems to be a pattern where if a Republican President is elected, partisan pundits warn that it will be very bad for our international relations. Now, by contrast, when a Democrat President takes over from a Republican, the same partisan pundits often promise smooth overall international relations. These same left-leaning pundits then breathe a sigh of relief that our alliances will be shored up and everything will be miraculously harmonious, but if you look at the record, it often doesn't work out that way.

President Carter presided over a string of foreign policy disasters, leaving the United States looking weak and humiliated.

Ronald Reagan was portrayed as a dangerous cowboy who might start a nuclear war. On the contrary, Reagan's calculated efforts to push back against Soviet communism resulted in fewer nuclear arms and freed millions of people from repressive regimes.

In 2009, the new Vice President, Joe Biden, went to Munich to deliver the Obama administration's first major foreign policy address. That address was hailed by some in the media as announcing a more cooperative approach with European countries.

Biden's promise to defer more to other countries rather than setting the agenda was a foreshadowing of President Obama's infamous ''leading from behind'' policy, which turned out to be a disastrous policy.

Biden also said:

> It's time to press the reset button and to revisit the many areas where we can and should be working together with Russia.

Then look at what Russia did after that comment. This comment was 6 months after Russia had invaded and occupied territory of the Republic of Georgia, which, if you remember, had sent significant forces to fight alongside the American military in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Now, can you believe that in a unilateral effort to show good—meaning good will—towards Russia, the Obama-Biden reset included abruptly scrapping planned missile defense cooperation with the Czech and Polish allies of America.

To add insult to injury, the Obama administration made the announcement about abandoning our missile defense cooperation with the Czech Republic and Poland on the anniversary of the Soviet invasion of Poland—not an ideal time to make that announcement—and, of course, that announcement turned out to be a grave error. Not only did it offend some of our most pro-American allies, but it also sent the very exact wrong message to dictator Vladimir Putin.

Putin's Russia, like the old Soviet Union before, only understands strength. They respect even enemies that have strength. They are not going to take advantage of somebody that shows strength. Unilateral concessions are perceived by Putin as weakness and actually encourage further aggression, just like we saw against Ukraine in 2014.

The Obama response to the 2014 invasion of Ukraine was, again, dangerously weak. Sending such a signal to Putin is the wrong thing to do. This signal amounted to wagging its proverbial finger at Russia while denying Ukraine the defensive weapons needed to repel the Russian invasion.

So what did Obama do? His policy was to send helmets and blankets and then push for negotiations—another show of weakness—doing all this while leaving Ukraine helpless, with a gun to its head.

Obviously, negotiations under such circumstances effectively meant Russia keeping what it gained by force and freezing the conflict until Russia could take more land.

Is there any wonder, then, that Putin felt he could get away with taking the rest of Ukraine in February of 2022? Do you know what he was getting away with at the same time? Killing women, children, grandmothers, grandads, really kidnapping maybe 20,000 children, taking them to Russia.

President Obama's pursuit of a nuclear deal with Iran at all costs alienated our closest ally in the Middle East. That close ally we all know is Israel. But the Iran agreement also alarmed Saudi Arabia, which has been a longtime strategic partner of the United States.

Then you will remember the drawing of the infamous redline in Syria at the time Syria was going to gas people to death and this infamous redline, before immediately abandoning it, as Obama did, sending a very dangerous signal about America's weakness to the axis of Iran, Russia, and China, now very much cooperating as an axis like Germany, Italy, and Japan did before World War II and during World War II.

Now, all of this about the redline no doubt played into Vladimir Putin's calculations when he chose to invade Ukraine for the first time a few months later.

So far, I have just talked about Democrat administrations. I want to talk about Republican.

When Trump was elected, he scrapped the nuclear deal. This repaired the trust with our gulf partners, and not only repairing trust but leading and setting the stage for the Abraham Accords, which accords were cooperation that nobody thought could ever happen between Israel and Arab Nations because previous administrations said: We can't expect any sort of close working relationships between Israel and Arab countries if we don't have a Palestinian State. But President Trump didn't wait for a Palestinian State. Yet he had success bringing Israel into economic relationships with a lot of Gulf partners.

This major diplomatic breakthrough went way beyond the long-sought recognition of Israel by Arab and Muslim countries; it also opened the door to economic and people-to-people ties that have the potential to foster a new era of mutual understanding and peace in the Middle East.

President Obama was also overly cautious in dealing with China's aggression in the South China Sea and too overly deferential to China's imperialistic sensitivities toward Taiwan.

Now, do you remember that in 1979, the Taiwan Relations Act passed, and it mandated strong, if unofficial, economic and military ties, including military sales. This has been the basis of U.S. policy with Taiwan for decades.

The more you slow-walk military sales to Taiwan out of deference to China's feelings, the more China feels really empowered to dictate aspects of our bilateral relationships with Taiwan.

President Trump abandoned this weak and this dangerous Obama policy of appeasement.

President Trump imposed sanctions against the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline, which Russia was clearly pursuing to give Russia geopolitical leverage over Europe and Ukraine because supplying energy to other countries brings that leverage.

The Trump administration armed and trained the Ukrainian military and cooperated closely with our frontline allies like the Baltic nations and Poland.

The Trump administration stopped being deferential towards China. Arm sales to Taiwan became a regular occurrence, and U.S. Government officials got the blessing to interact with their Taiwanese counterparts. Can you imagine China feeling it has a right to tell Senators and people in the administration or U.S. House of Representatives Members: You can't go to Taiwan.

Now, this message that Trump sent—China got that message that it couldn't get away with breaking trade rules and pushing around our allies and partners in the region.

Most recently, President Biden's insistence on returning to failed Obama-era policies has resulted in foreign policy setbacks. The cascade of countries joining the Abraham Accords would likely have continued, to include even Saudi Arabia, but the Biden administration's repeated efforts to resurrect the defunct Iran nuclear deal once again damaged the trust of our regional allies and our partners—at the same time, empowering Iran.

President Biden promised to repair relations with our European allies. What he meant became clear when he dropped sanctions on the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline. This was a sign of deference towards Germany at the expense of our Eastern European allies. Germany is indeed a close ally in Europe, but Germany is not all of Europe.

Also, while it is known that there was a personality conflict between President Trump and former Chancellor Merkel of Germany, our alliance with Germany is deep enough to survive both personality conflicts and differences over Nord Stream 2.

In hindsight, everyone, even including the Germans, can see the folly in giving Vladimir Putin the ability to turn the heat on and the lights off throughout all of Europe. And he would be glad to have that power. This gesture of good will towards Germany was certainly not worth bolstering Putin and upsetting several Central and Eastern European allies, who saw clearly what was at stake if you gave Putin that power.

Let's face it: Trump does ruffle feathers. But his policies—including pushing delinquent NATO members to spend the agreed amount on defense that they are obligated to spend on NATO security—these countries were better for it, and European security was better for it than the Obama and Biden policies that simply sought applause from certain European leaders.

There are those strongly backing Trump and then, as we know, those strongly opposed to Trump—both claiming, though, to know what he would do in a second term. I do not have much time for pontificating and political prognosticating based upon speculation. I prefer to look at the record, and I hope I have reminded people of that record.

We should demand a foreign policy based on American strength. Sometimes we talk about peace through strength, or sometimes we forget to remind people that a strong American military is the best tool to bring about world peace. So we should demand a foreign policy based upon that strength.

And we should also be on guard to not accept a failure of American leadership spun as a more collaborative approach with our allies. Our allies who are closest to the threats from Russia and China really want strong American leadership and need us to push our more reluctant allies to do what it takes to defend the free world.

That is what we saw in the first Trump administration, and it is the kind of leadership we badly, badly need right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4541

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4541) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make certain provisions with respect to qualified ABLE programs permanent.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

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

GLIOBLASTOMA AWARENESS DAY

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 735, 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. 735) designating July 17, 2024, as ''Glioblastoma Awareness Day''.

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

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent 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. 735) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

FOREIGN EXTORTION PREVENTION TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4548 introduced earlier today.

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4548) to make a technical correction to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 by repealing section 5101 and enacting an updated version of the Foreign Extortion Prevention Act.

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

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 4548) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 4548

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 ''Foreign Extortion Prevention Technical Corrections Act''.

SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTION TO 2024 NDAA.

(a) REPEAL OF PREVIOUS VERSION OF FEPA.—Section 5101 of the National Defense

Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118–31) is repealed, and each provision of law amended by that section is amended to read as it read on the day before the date of enactment of that Act.

(b) PROHIBITION OF DEMAND FOR BRIBE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"§ 1352. Demands by foreign officials for bribes

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) FOREIGN OFFICIAL.—The term 'foreign official' means—

''(A)(i) any official or employee of a foreign government or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof; or

''(ii) any senior foreign political figure, as defined in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation;

''(B) any official or employee of a public international organization;

''(C) any person acting in an official capacity for or on behalf of—

''(i) a government, department, agency, or instrumentality described in subparagraph (A)(i); or

''(ii) a public international organization.

''(2) PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION.—The term 'public international organization' means—

''(A) an organization that is designated by Executive order pursuant to section 1 of the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288); or

''(B) any other international organization that is designated by the President by Executive order for the purposes of this section, effective as of the date of publication of the order in the Federal Register.

''(b) PROHIBITION OF DEMAND FOR A BRIBE.—

''(1) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official to corruptly demand, seek, receive, accept, or agree to receive or accept, directly or indirectly, anything of value personally or for any other person or nongovernmental entity, by making use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce—

''(A) from—

''(i) any person (as defined in section 104A of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (15 U.S.C. 78dd–3), except that that definition shall be applied without regard to whether the person is an offender) while the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official, or a person acting on behalf of the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official, is in the territory of the United States;

''(ii) an issuer (as defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))), or any officer, director, employee, or agent of an issuer or any stockholder thereof acting on behalf of the issuer; or

''(iii) a domestic concern (as defined in section 104 of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (15 U.S.C. 78dd–2)), or any officer, director, employee, or agent of a domestic concern or any stockholder thereof acting on behalf of the domestic concern; and

''(B) in return for—

''(i) being influenced in the performance of any act or decision of the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official in the official capacity of the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official;

''(ii) being induced to do or omit to do any act in violation of the lawful duty of the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official;

''(iii) conferring any improper advantage; or

''(iv) using the influence of the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official with a foreign government or instrumentality thereof to affect or influence any act or decision of that government or instrumentality,

in connection with obtaining or retaining business for or with, or directing business to, any person.

''(2) PENALTIES.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than $250,000 or 3 times the monetary equivalent of the thing of value, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.

''(3) JURISDICTION.—An offense under paragraph (1) shall be subject to extraterritorial Federal jurisdiction.

''(4) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of State as relevant, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and post on the publicly available website of the Department of Justice, a report—

''(A) focusing, in part, on demands by foreign officials for bribes from entities domiciled or incorporated in the United States, and the efforts of foreign governments to prosecute such cases;

''(B) addressing United States diplomatic efforts to protect entities domiciled or incorporated in the United States from foreign bribery, and the effectiveness of those efforts in protecting such entities;

''(C) summarizing major actions taken under this section in the previous year, including enforcement actions taken and penalties imposed;

''(D) evaluating the effectiveness of the Department of Justice in enforcing this section; and

''(E) detailing what resources or legislative action the Department of Justice needs to ensure adequate enforcement of this section.

''(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This subsection shall not be construed as encompassing conduct that would violate section 30A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78dd–1) or section 104 or 104A of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (15 U.S.C. 78dd–2; 15 U.S.C. 78dd–3) whether pursuant to a theory of direct liability, conspiracy, complicity, or otherwise.''.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''1352. Demands by foreign officials for bribes.''.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2024

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 17; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Oler nomination; 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.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following my remarks.

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

(Mr. FETTERMAN assumed the Chair.)

ANNIVERSARY OF DACA

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise today because this Saturday marks the 12th anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals policy, or DACA, as many know it.

This policy has given hope to so many hard-working individuals who call America home. It has allowed children of immigrants who were brought here as kids to flourish, strengthen our economy, and remain in the only country they have ever really known. These are our children.

When President Obama created DACA in 2012, it was a temporary solution focused on helping young people thrive. And with the establishment of DACA, we told them that if they stayed in school, they worked hard, and they contributed, we would help them stay here. That was a real promise that gave so much hope to thousands of amazing young people.

Now, it has been 12 years, and DACA recipients have done what they promised to do. They have gone to college. They have become part of our workforce. They pay billions of dollars in taxes. And listen to this: 49 percent of the initial group of DACA recipients in 2012 are college educated. As of 2023, there are over 544,000 recipients in the United States. And 10,730 of them live in my home State of Nevada.

But Dreamers aren't percentages and figures. They are people. I have had the honor of meeting many of them, and, let me tell you, these Nevadans make our State stronger. They are teachers. They are doctors, engineers, small business owners, and community leaders. And they have families. And they have spent the last 12 years holding up their end of the bargain, and it is past time for us to hold up ours.

This has been especially urgent in recent years, when litigation challenging DACA and attacks on the program by former President Trump and his allies have caused turmoil for Dreamers in this country. By failing to pass legislation to permanently protect Dreamers and put them on a path to citizenship, we are failing to fulfill our promise to these individuals. We are leaving them behind.

We know that their status in this country, their safety and stability in their homes could change soon because of lawsuits that are still making their way through the courts. Dreamers abide by our laws. They have worked hard for an education, and they contribute to their communities every single day. They have earned their place

in our country and deserve the privilege, protection, and responsibility of citizenship.

Now is the time to pass the Dream Act, to ensure that Dreamers can continue contributing to the only home they have ever known, without living in fear that their lives may be upended.

But here is the deal. At the end of the day, it all comes down to this: My colleagues on the other side of the aisle need to step up, keep their word, and pass a permanent solution to Dreamers.

Now, I wish I didn't have to stand here and give this speech. This is supposed to be a bipartisan issue that we can all get behind. The American people certainly feel that way. But we are running into the same issue over and over again.

How many times have I stood right here on the Senate floor and told stories about the Dreamers I know in my State? And how many times have I called for the Dream Act to pass and pushed to give Dreamers the certainty that they deserve?

I want to be honest with the Dreamers in my State and around the country. The reason we haven't passed that legislation in the Senate yet is because we need bipartisan support.

And some Senate Republicans have said over and over that we need to fix DACA and protect Dreamers. So where are they now? They are turning their backs on people who are depending on them, because the reality is that far-right extremists are only interested in Dreamers when they can use them as political pawns.

First—I remember this—some of my Republican colleagues said they needed to pair a solution for Dreamers with border security. I remember this because we had a real proposal to support border security and protect Dreamers in 2018. And then President Trump said: If you bring me that bipartisan bill, I will sign it into law.

And what did he do? He didn't sign it. He changed his mind.

And then my colleagues on the other side of the aisle said: Wait. Here is what we will do. If you work on border security—if you work on that first and you make some policy changes, then we are willing—then we are willing—to help Dreamers, and we will focus on that afterward.

So just this year—we remember—we had a bipartisan legislation to secure our border that was actually endorsed by the National Border Patrol Council, and the immigration attorneys said it was a great first step. But what happened? Again, former President Trump requested that Senate Republicans tank the bill. And why? So that he could campaign on the chaos and not give a win to this Congress or this current administration.

Well, I will tell you what. Like the Dreamers in my home State and across this country, I am frustrated. I am angry that politics are causing so many Dreamers across the country to put their lives on hold. It is unacceptable. That is not what this Congress—that is not what working with the White House—should be. We should be solving problems in this country, not using people and their families as political pawns.

The time for stalling is over. It is time for my Republican colleagues to uphold their end of this deal and protect Dreamers, because while they tie themselves in knots and play all these political games, hundreds of thousands of lives are hanging in the balance.

These aren't just statistics here in Washington. They are real people in our States, in our communities, with families, contributing to our economy and an essential part of our workforce.

Enough is enough. Let's come together on this and work out a solution that is going to help Dreamers and continue to benefit this country. In 12 years—in 12 years—it is the least we can do for a generation of people who have given everything they have to the United States. I, for one, won't stop trying.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2024, AT 3 P.M.

PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until Monday, June 17, 2024, at 3 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3:09 p.m., adjourned until Monday, June 17, 2024, at 3 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

CAROLINE A. CRENSHAW, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 5, 2029. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL

GORDON I. ITO, OF HAWAII, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FINANCIAL STABILITY OVERSIGHT COUNCIL FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE THOMAS E. WORKMAN, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

KRISTIN N. JOHNSON, OF GEORGIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, VICE GRAHAM SCOTT STEELE.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION

CHRISTY GOLDSMITH ROMERO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE MARTIN J. GRUENBERG.

CHRISTY GOLDSMITH ROMERO, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL DEPOSIT INSURANCE CORPORATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 21, 2028, VICE MARTIN J. GRUENBERG.

THE JUDICIARY

MARY KATHLEEN COSTELLO, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE CYNTHIA M. RUFE, RETIRED.

LAURA MARGARETE PROVINZINO, OF MINNESOTA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA, VICE WILHELMINA MARIE WRIGHT, RETIRED.

NOEL WISE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, VICE EDWARD J. DAVILA, RETIRING.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM J. CREEDEN

IN THE ARMY

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. MARK H. LANDES

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. PAUL T. STANTON

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. MATTHEW W. MCFARLANE

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. DAVID J. FRANCIS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) PHILIP E. SOBECK

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 13, 2024:

FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION

JUDY W. CHANG, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2029.