



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 18, 2024

No. 103

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.

God of grace and glory, in the darkness of our limited knowledge, we turn to You whose dwelling place is light.

Today, send our lawmakers forth with Your light to do the right as You give them the ability to see it.

Lord, help them to keep their minds on You so that Your peace will provide the foundation for their confidence.

In their dealings with each other, keep them from unkind words and unkind silences. Kindle on the altar of their hearts a devotion to freedom's cause in all the world, as You bring their thoughts and actions into conformity to Your will.

Lord, lift their hearts in gratitude to You for our heritage in this land of rich resources, high privilege, and durable freedom.

We pray in Your sovereign 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 18, 2024.

To the Senate:

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

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 4554

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4554) to express support for protecting access to reproductive health care after the Dobbs v. Jackson decision on June 24, 2022.

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

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

BUMP STOCK LEGISLATION

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it should never take a tragedy of a mass shooting for the Senate to pass commonsense gun safety legislation.

Thankfully, today, we have a chance to make our community safer if Republicans don't stand in the way.

This afternoon, my colleague Senator HEINRICH will come to the floor and seek passage of a Federal ban on bump stocks. I applaud this effort. I applaud his bill. I am proud to support and speak on behalf of it.

We must act because a few days ago, the MAGA Supreme Court struck once again saying the Federal Government has no power to ban the sale of bump stocks.

The MAGA Court's decision is an utter disgrace that will endanger our communities, endanger law enforcement, and make it easier for mass shooters to unleash carnage.

Last week's decision is another warning sign that this MAGA Court is going off the deep end, aligning with the most extreme elements of the hard right.

Bump stocks are truly dangerous devices. They allow people to use rifles essentially as machine guns, which the national Firearms Act banned in the 1930s. Even Donald Trump banned bump stocks shortly after the deadliest shooting in U.S. history, when a shooter in Vegas used bump stocks to fire over 1,000 rounds in 10 minutes. And we know the tragic results of 60 people dead and hundreds and hundreds injured. Donald Trump is no friend of gun safety, but there was such huge pressure after we saw the carnage that bump stocks created that even he introduced a resolution to ban them.

What today's bill does is return things to the status quo set by Donald Trump, saying bump stocks are dangerous and should be prohibited. Senate Republicans, by and large, supported Trump's ban on bump stocks back then, so they should support this bill today.

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S4119

But, sadly, some of our colleagues on the other side are making it clear they will ignore the immense worry most Americans have about gun violence, and they will block today's bill.

Some on the other side say this bill is political theater; that it does nothing; that it is a stunt. Go tell the families of those who lost loved ones that this is a stunt. Go tell the many who have recovered from injuries that this is a stunt.

Are my Republican colleagues serious? Do they really think banning bump stocks is some kind of stunt? Again, they should tell that to the people of Nevada who have dead relatives because of bump stocks.

Whenever Republicans use the cliche "show vote" argument, that is their way of saying they don't want to engage the issue on the merits.

Remember what happened 2 years ago on the Senate floor: Democrats and Republicans worked together to pass bipartisan gun safety legislation—something almost nobody thought possible. I am very proud that both sides persevered because we passed that bill, and it has done a lot of good for this country already.

Today, we have a chance to add to the success of 2 years ago by passing a simple measure that restores the Trump-era prohibition on bump stocks.

I implore—I implore—my Republican colleagues not to stand in the way of today's bill because if we can pass it today, we will be one step closer to ensuring that a tragedy like what happened in Las Vegas never happens again. But if Republicans get in the way today, if they decide to side with the gun lobby instead of parents and teachers and law enforcement, they are asking for another tragedy to strike sooner or later.

REPRODUCTIVE RIGHTS

MR. SCHUMER. Mr. President, on MAGA extremism in terms of abortion, yesterday, I took the first procedural step to place on the legislative calendar the Reproductive Freedom for Women Act, sponsored by Senator MURRAY and myself and cosponsored by every woman Senator on our side of the aisle.

This measure affirms a woman's fundamental right to choose and calls for enshrining the protections of Roe into law, as most Americans say they want. I will work with my colleagues to bring it to the floor as soon as possible.

As we approach the 2-year anniversary of Roe v. Wade being overturned, this month could have been a month when the Senate came together to protect Americans' reproductive freedoms. This could have been a month when both sides came together to pass commonsense legislation protecting reproductive care like contraception and IVF. This could have been a month when we put to rest the worries of the millions of women across America enduring attacks on their reproductive

freedoms in the aftermath of Roe. But instead, June has been a dismal month for MAGA Republicans and their attacks on women, families, and reproductive rights.

In the last 2 weeks, Senate Republicans have shown that, for all their attempts to sound moderate on reproductive care, when it comes time to vote, they choose MAGA extremism over the wishes and desires of the American people. When Republicans blocked Federal protections for contraception a few weeks ago, they chose MAGA extremism over the American people. When Republicans blocked Federal protections for IVF a few days ago, they chose MAGA extremism over the American people.

And when Donald Trump continues, to this day, to brag about working with Senate Republicans to confirm three hard-right Supreme Court Justices to eliminate Roe, that is choosing MAGA extremism over the American people.

Republicans cannot run away from a basic truth. That is why, when we return, our bill to make sure that Congress ensures the right to choose, the right to an abortion, will be before the Senate for a vote. Republicans cannot run away from a basic truth: Their record on women's healthcare is outright abysmal; it is shameful; and it is dangerously out of step with the views of most Americans.

FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY ACT

MR. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on the fire bill, on a happier note, I am proud to say the Senate will send to the President's desk bipartisan legislation to support our brave firefighters in New York, on Long Island, and across the country. Our firefighters are heroes, whether it is New York's bravest at the FDNY or the smaller volunteer departments protecting suburban communities in Long Island and in Westchester or protecting rural communities throughout Upstate New York. Our firefighters represent the best of our community. They rush to danger every day to protect us, putting all else aside to help those in need.

Now it is time for the Senate to be there for our firefighters. The Fire Grants and Safety Act reauthorizes a series of important grants that help keep our fire departments up to speed with Federal dollars. I was proud to help create these grants years back, and I have long supported this legislation to protect our firefighters so they have the support they need.

The Federal funding in these grants goes directly to making sure that they have the lifesaving equipment and personnel they need to do their jobs safely and effectively. When it comes to protecting firefighters, we should spare no expense, and this legislation shows our firefighters that we have their backs as they rush to danger, as they risk their lives for our safety. This is especially true in smaller, more rural areas and in more suburban areas where there is

often not enough revenue to afford more resources. Our volunteer firefighters are brave. They volunteer. They don't get paid. But they need the best equipment just like all the other firefighters, and this grant makes sure that that happens in many places.

So this bipartisan legislation will ensure that our firefighters can continue working to keep their communities safe—in the larger cities where there are paid fire departments and in suburban and rural America where there are volunteer fire departments. It unites both of them in this legislation.

I look forward to voting yes and sending this bill to the President's desk today.

IMMIGRATION

MR. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now on immigration, 12 years ago this week, President Obama announced the creation of DACA, one of the most important programs in our country's history on immigration. It changed the lives of hundreds of thousands of young people for the better, people who came to this country when they were very little and who, for all intents and purposes, knew America as their only home.

Today, President Biden is announcing the most significant relief program for immigrants since DACA, expanding protection for hundreds of thousands of undocumented spouses of U.S. citizens. They are not documented, but they are married to a U.S. citizen.

I applaud President Biden for today's truly significant announcement. It is going to help keep hundreds of thousands of families together. That is what it does: bring families together, keep them together. And it will provide peace of mind and dignity and, most of all, opportunity to contribute so that these people can contribute to this country even more.

The announcement will help make our economy stronger, as these spouses will be eligible for work permits at a time when there is a shortage of workers in so many different professions and give them a long-term path to stability.

The announcement is an affirmation of what America is truly about at its core: a land built by immigrants; a land of opportunity for people who want to contribute to this country, who know that our way of life is the best way if you work hard to get ahead and provide a better life for your children. The vast majority of those who will benefit from today's announcement have been in this country for decades—an average of 23 years they have been here—but in a state of limbo, according to the White House. To them, America is home. America is where they have built families. America is where they gained skills, worked hard, contributed to our economy, earned a living, and had children who will often go on and do better things than they.

That is the American dream. That is the American story. And that has been

true for generation after generation, until a MAGA group of Republicans decided that they were anti-immigrant.

Let's not forget, President Reagan, President H. W. Bush, and President George W. Bush were all pro-immigration until this 180-degree reversal by the Republican Party to be anti-immigrant, which hurts America.

Of course, we need to secure our borders—of course. No one denies that. But to just bash immigrants is bad for America, bad for America.

Fighting for Dreamers and pushing for comprehensive immigration reform is one of the issues that has burned strongest inside me since I joined the Senate. I was proud of leading the Gang of 8—bipartisan—with John McCain over 10 years ago to pass comprehensive immigration reform, which passed the House with strong bipartisan support. I think it got 68 or 69 votes before House Republicans killed the bill—House Republicans poisoned by the thinking of the MAGA Republicans in their midst.

I celebrate today's announcement. But Congress must do its part. Republicans must stop getting in the way of meaningful, comprehensive immigration reform and getting in the way of border security. They wouldn't even support our tough border bill, put together with bipartisan efforts.

We are going to keep working until we get the job done, both in securing the border and in making America welcome to many immigrants who will work hard and become American citizens eventually.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

ANTI-SEMITISM

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, it has been a few weeks now since most of America's college students went home for the summer. The outbreak of organized hate that swept the campuses of the Nation's so-called elite universities has somewhat quieted down. Apparently, even the most zealous of Hamasnik tent-dwellers had summer plans to attend to. Some, no doubt, expect to join the radical road show for a reunion tour of Chicago during the Democratic National Convention in August—as if Chicago's own soft-on-crime politicians haven't done enough to damage what used to be a thriving city.

But even as places like Berkeley and George Washington University are cleaned and repaired after their occupation by Marxist vandals, the shameful events of this past spring have left deep and lasting scars. At Columbia, the task force responsible for investigating rampant anti-Semitism on campus in the wake of October 7 has

released a new report, and the findings are chilling. On top of well-documented outbursts by student radicals, members of Columbia's faculty turned classrooms into safe spaces to indulge the world's oldest form of hate. So I would like to share with our colleagues some of the initial coverage of the report.

One professor encountering a Jewish-sounding surname while reading names before an exam asked the student to explain their views on the Israeli government's actions in Gaza. Another told their class to avoid reading mainstream media, declaring that "it is owned by Jews." A third revealed a student's complaint about an offensive comment regarding Jews by publicly displaying their email to fellow students.

This isn't coming from the professional activists who swept in to occupy the academy. It is coming from the heart of the academy itself. The rot runs deep. It is impossible to ignore. The scourge of anti-Semitism is a blight on once-prestigious institutions across our country, and unfortunately it reaches from college campuses right here to the U.S. Capitol.

Next month, a growing list of elected Democrats will boycott a joint session of Congress welcoming the duly elected leader of the world's only Jewish State and the only democracy in that region.

Their plans, of course, are predictable. When Prime Minister Netanyahu last addressed Congress in 2015, nearly 60 Members refused to attend. In the years since, Washington Democrats have ceded more and more influence to despicable causes like the Boycott, Divest, and Sanction movement and to high-profile newcomers who traffic in unvarnished anti-Semitism.

I am proud to live in a country that, as our former colleague Ben Sasse has put it, protects people's rights to make abject idiots of themselves, and far too many powerful people have taken the horrific attacks of October 7 as an invitation to do exactly that. But I am also proud to live in a country that the world expects to stand with our allies, and the President's conduct towards America's closest ally is straining that expectation. Unfortunately, so is the conduct of other elected Democrats.

Grotesque attempts to interfere in Israel's politics by calling for the removal—the removal—of its Prime Minister have lowered the bar for outrageous behavior, and micromanagement and withholding assistance have repeatedly made Israel's task to restore its security and bring terrorists to justice even more difficult.

Next month's joint session ought to be an opportunity to demonstrate to the world that America's commitments to allies facing existential threats cannot be held hostage by the loudest fringes of our politics, that they are not at the mercy of our lapses in moral clarity.

The last thing a sovereign democracy under siege needs is a public tongue-lashing from the White House or a

scolding speech from the floor of the Senate. Israel needs the weapons the President has withheld. It needs the time and space to finish the job against terrorists trying to destroy it. It needs the freedom to operate on its own timetable based on tactical reality in the Middle East, not on the political whims in Washington. And Americans should be united in support.

NOMINATION OF NANCY L. MALDONADO

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, now on another matter, I need to return today to another of the Biden administration's unfit judicial nominees: Judge Nancy Maldonado.

Alongside a crop of nominees distinguished by their radical views and affiliations and ties to dark money groups, Judge Maldonado's claim to notoriety is the historic backlog of unfinished work she has accumulated in her time on the district court in Chicago.

Earlier this month, I pointed out that with 125 motions pending for more than 6 months, Judge Maldonado sits behind more than 99 percent of all district judges nationwide for her ability to clear casework in a timely manner. She is the worst in her circuit, and it is not even close.

Our Democratic colleagues on the Judiciary Committee don't seem all that concerned about the alarming aspect of her record. Perhaps they think there is more to being a judge than deciding cases, such as, perhaps, checking diversity boxes. In any case, they voted in lockstep to advance her nomination this spring.

But listening to some of our colleagues' comments from more recent committee meetings, you might wonder whether they made a terrible mistake. The senior Senator from Connecticut, a seasoned prosecutor familiar with the frustrations of the judicial process, recalled:

I can remember waiting literally years for a decision from a district court judge, and there is nothing anyone can do . . . other than seeking mandamus from the Circuit Court of Appeals, which is . . . close to a death sentence for any litigator.

Our colleague described such delays as "frustrating and . . . costly." In no uncertain terms, he said that ending those delays is essential to "achieving swifter, more expeditious justice."

But just a couple of months ago, he voted to advance the nomination of a judge with a demonstrated inability to deliver swifter or more expeditious justice. With every other Democrat on the committee, he voted to give Nancy Maldonado and her Biden backlog lifetime tenure on the court of appeals.

It is incredible how clear-eyed our colleague sounds when he is not burdened with the uncomfortable responsibility of rubberstamping a favorite of the left's dark money royalty. His fellow Democrats should take note.

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 Oler nomination, which the clerk will report.

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.

Mr. MCCONNELL. 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.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PADILLA). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY ACT

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about why the funding decisions we make here in this building matter and how the Fiscal Responsibility Act spending caps will continue to hold America back, undercutting our economy, competitiveness, and future, unless the Senate can come together and take action.

The Appropriations Committee has now held nearly 40 hearings on the resources that we will need in fiscal year 2025. We have discussed exactly what our Nation needs to stay strong, safe, and competitive, and there is a big, obvious takeaway from those hearings: The FRA caps for fiscal year 2024 are already causing serious pain and serious challenges, and the caps for fiscal year 2025 are grossly inadequate.

In fiscal year 2024, the FRA froze nondefense funding while increasing defense funding by nearly 30 billion more, to say nothing of the billions in the supplemental. In fiscal year 2025, the caps mean just a 1-percent increase for nondefense and defense alike. Needless to say, that does not begin to keep pace with inflation or other rising expenses. That means net cuts in terms of real resources across the government.

Let's all remember why we have these caps in the first place. House Republicans took the debt ceiling hostage and demanded funding caps and cuts in exchange for not destroying our Nation's credit. I warned at the time that we passed the FRA—and I have warned repeatedly since—that these caps undermine our country's future in a really serious way. That is not speculation. I am speaking from experience.

Back in 2011, the last time a large group of Republicans leveraged the full faith and credit of the United States to extract spending caps under a Democratic President, we got sequestration, which both parties quickly recognized was a disaster, and we got a decade of harmful caps. The effects of that still echo today.

Nondefense funding, except veterans' medical care, is down 6 percent from 2010 when you adjust for inflation and down 14 percent when you adjust for inflation and population growth. That is not just a number on a page. That is less support for families, fewer research grants to keep us on the cutting edge, fewer officers cracking down on crime in neighborhoods. It is just so many opportunities lost, and I can't, for the life of me, understand why we would want to go through something like that again.

Now, I am glad so many of my Republican colleagues are in strong agreement, at least when it comes to defense, but every Senator calling to boost defense spending alone is seriously missing the point. And any Senator who thinks I will let us leave non-defense spending behind is seriously misreading the situation. There is a simple reason I pushed for the principle of parity when I struck the budget deal that ended the worst of sequestration with Paul Ryan in 2013, and it still applies today.

Nondefense investments matter to families. They matter to our economy, our competitiveness, our future, and, yes, it matters to national security. I can't emphasize that enough.

Here in Washington, DC, we call it nondefense discretionary spending, or NDD—very wonky. Back home, we call it making sure parents have childcare, helping families put food on the table, supporting quality affordable healthcare in our communities, fixing our roads. Back home, we call it clean water, safe food, fresh air, affordable housing.

When air traffic controllers keep our planes operating safely, that is NDD. When the FDA pulls an unsafe product off the shelf, that is NDD. When kids go to a public school or get a Pell grant that makes college possible for them, that is NDD. NIH researchers working to cure cancer, weather forecasters warning us of a disaster, agents cracking down on the flow of fentanyl and going after criminal organizations, fighting wildfires, enforcing sanctions against Russia, negotiating tough agreements with allies and adversaries alike—that is NDD.

So I hope I have made my point. What we are talking about here is spending that is, by no stretch of the imagination, the largest portion of our budget—just about one-eighth of our total budget. But that makes a real tangible difference in family's lives and our country's safety and success every single day.

We are also talking about things Americans overwhelmingly support.

Seriously, I encourage my colleagues to go ask your constituents in any part of this country—conservative, liberal, Washington to Kentucky: Do you care if you have clean water? Do you care if your kids get sick from foodborne illness? Do you want to wait longer when you call the Social Security office, if you can reach anyone at all? Do you want someone making sure that the bridges that you drive across are safe? Do you want to stall our progress on cures and treatments for cancer or Alzheimer's or other deadly diseases?

And yet NDD has been consistently underfunded, and it is a constant target for cuts by House Republicans, as we are now seeing.

I am here to say: Enough is enough. If we keep cutting and stretching and shortchanging those programs, something is going to snap—something important.

But more cuts are exactly what a 1-percent cap actually means—not treading water, not keeping up. A 1-percent cap means pain.

If we let families down, that means we let our competitors get ahead. It means we leave our Nation vulnerable. That is not politics; it is cold, hard math. One percent is not enough to keep up with rising costs, growing needs, and new challenges.

The issue here isn't whether we can make more tough choices. It is whether we are going to be honest about the tough realities of a 1-percent cap. There are so many priorities lawmakers on both sides of the aisle care about that just can't happen with a 1-percent increase.

Here is what 1 percent means in practice: 1 percent means letting families go hungry. WIC, a literal lifeline for nearly 7 million mothers and babies is going to need a nearly 10-percent increase next year. Anything less will force us to choose which moms, which babies are getting the food they need and which are getting put on a wait list. Think about that.

One percent means we are letting rural families lose their homes. We need a 5-percent increase for rural rental assistance alone. Falling short means thousands of rural families will lose assistance and may face eviction.

How is that right?

One percent means losing law enforcement. The FBI already can't fill about a thousand open positions because of what happened in fiscal year 2024. At 1 percent, in fiscal year 2025, it would have to trim another 1,300 positions. That is far fewer agents going after transnational criminal organizations, fentanyl traffickers, violent crime, cyber attackers, and more.

Meanwhile, DOJ would have to lose or freeze nearly 5,000 positions. We are talking about attorneys and agents that defend our civil rights, prosecute dangerous criminals, and keep our Nation safe.

Do Republicans really want to defund law enforcement?

One percent means slashing pay for our Federal firefighters. Any family

whose house has been threatened by one of the many devastating wildfires in recent years will tell you firefighters are not an optional expense. But over a quarter of the Forest Service's wildland firefighting jobs are vacant. And unless we provide funding to save our firefighters from a pay cut, those vacancies will get worse.

This is the very definition of a "must-have," not a "nice-to-have," kind of investment.

One percent means we are blunting momentum for lifesaving biomedical breakthroughs.

NIH is looking at a \$280 million shortfall as Cures Act funding tapers off. That absolutely cannot be filled with a 1-percent bump. And that is on top of the \$678 million in NIH Cures Act funding that already expired last year that we couldn't make up for because of the caps.

There are countless patients who would be devastated to hear that totally arbitrary spending caps are stifling research that could save their lives.

But that is barely scratching the surface. One percent means no major new funding for the opioid or mental health crisis.

It means fewer kids in Head Start, which is facing now a severe staffing shortage.

It means long waiting times for seniors and people with disabilities who need help with their Social Security benefits.

It means laying off meat inspectors and consumer product safety workers.

And let's not forget that 1 percent means we are giving up ground to our competitors and adversaries in just about every way.

It means delaying NASA missions.

It means letting adversarial governments fill the void in global politics and influence, failing to counter an aggressive Putin in Russia and allowing partners to succumb to economic coercion from Beijing and withdrawing from the world stage to let competitors set the international norms that impact our safety and economic strength.

It means falling way behind on innovation, which we should be leading the way.

Do you know how much the Chinese government is increasing their research and development spending this year? It's 10 percent—10 percent.

How do we expect to compete at 1?

You know, we authorized some truly transformative programs and funding levels in the bipartisan Chips and Science Act, but that doesn't matter if we don't provide bipartisan investments that live up to those ambitions.

The FRA has already forced us to fall short; and without more nondefense funding, it will force us to fall behind the Chinese government.

I have covered a lot, but here is the rub: This is not even close to a comprehensive list of what those spending caps mean for our country.

I cannot emphasize enough that under the caps for nondefense, every-

thing struggles to keep up with rising costs. Programs that our kids, the future of our country, depend on—public schools, public health, nutrition assistance, to name a few—cannot get by on 1 percent.

Programs that keep our economy strong and growing—childcare, training for our workers, support for small business and for farmers, cutting-edge research—cannot get by on 1 percent.

Programs that help communities thrive—affordable housing, transportation, broadband, and, of course, support for our Tribes—cannot get by on 1 percent.

Programs that keep us safe—diplomacy, Border Patrol, food inspectors, law enforcement—cannot get by on 1 percent.

It is entirely self-defeating to box our future in, leave our families behind, and give our adversaries an opening to charge ahead.

Congress needs to decide, Do we want a stronger America?

House Republicans are saying "no" and writing fiscal year 2025 bills that ignore the deals that they negotiated in favor of devastating cuts to non-defense.

The Senate, however, needs to come together and chart a different path in a bipartisan way that says "yes" to a stronger America.

So, to me, the path for the Senate is clear: We have got to provide additional resources beyond the caps to address major shortfalls and new challenges.

I appreciate my colleagues who want to do more for defense. I also think the defense cap is too low. But I feel strongly that that increase cannot happen in a vacuum. We have to do more for nondefense as well.

Parity is the order of the day because investments in our families, in our economy, in communities' safety and success are no less important than investments at the Pentagon. They are, actually, in fact, connected. After all, a new submarine isn't just built with money; it is actually built by people who need schools and childcare for their kids, roads and public transportation to get to work, safe food and water, workforce training programs so they can take on new roles in advanced manufacturing, and more.

So let me be clear: I will not let us boost defense alone while leaving families and our country's future in the dust. That is a core principle for me. It is who I am.

Now, I want you to know I am not asking for the moon here. Parity for defense and nondefense is not new or radical; it was the norm. I should know.

When I sat down across from Paul Ryan—a principled conservative—to reach a deal that undid the worst of sequestration a decade ago, we didn't agree on everything. In fact, we didn't agree on a lot of things. Family and football and fishing was all we agreed to start with. That is where we started.

But we both understood the only way we were going to reach a deal, undo massive cuts, and help folks back home was by working together and producing a deal that may not be what we would have written alone but addressed concerns that both of us brought to the table.

A cornerstone of that agreement—and of numerous agreements since—was parity for defense and nondefense.

Parity is not new. It is not some antiquated concept either; it is as relevant today as ever, because I think we can all agree that making sure planes fly safely overhead, making sure we invest in R&D as the Chinese government now spends 10 percent more, making sure our kids don't get hungry is not some second order priority.

So we cannot shortchange either side of the ledger. We increased defense funding by tens of billions this year while nondefense was held flat; and I worked extremely hard alongside my colleagues to ensure we delivered on a \$95 billion national security supplemental to address the major global threats we are facing.

In fiscal year 2025, I cannot accept net cuts in real resources to NDD, which is what a 1-percent increase means.

Our duty to our constituents is to pass bills that make their lives better: to provide funds that let us actually meet this moment, support families, protect our Nation, and stay ahead of our competitors.

That will require more resources for nondefense. And I am ready to work with my colleagues to provide the same for defense.

Last year, we were able to produce strong, bipartisan bills in committee. I am very hopeful we are going to be able to do the same again this year.

I plan to hold our first fiscal year 2025 markup the week we return from the Fourth of July recess. And I look forward to working with all of my colleagues to make sure we meet this moment, take the concerns that we are hearing back home, and write and pass strong, bipartisan Senate Appropriations bills.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be allowed to speak prior to the scheduled rollcall votes: Myself for up to 10 minutes, Senator CORNYN for up to 15 minutes, and Senator MERKLEY for up to 5 minutes.

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

SENATE LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, with election day approaching in less than 5 months, Democrats are getting understandably concerned.

After all, a historic 3-year-plus border crisis and a historic 3-year-plus inflation crisis are not exactly an ideal record on which to run. And so Democrats have been doing what they can

here in the Senate to brighten their election prospects with a series of show votes designed to put Republicans in a difficult position—or so the Democratic leader hopes.

I said “show votes.” And I say that because all of these votes were clearly designed to fail. The Democratic leader knew that Republicans were not going to support a border bill that had previously been rejected, a contraception bill that would jeopardize the religious freedom of healthcare providers, or an IVF bill that would allow for human cloning and genetic engineering of human embryos.

These were not serious attempts by the Democratic leader to legislate. These were future campaign talking points.

If the Democratic leader really wanted to legislate, he would be bringing up something like Senator ERNST’s legislation to promote access to contraception, which has a number of Republican cosponsors—or any one of the numerous commonsense border proposals Republicans have advanced, like Senator BLACKBURN’s measure to allow State and local law enforcement to detain criminal illegal aliens for ICE to deport. But that is not the legislation the Democrat leader is bringing up, because, as I said, he is not interested in legislating; he is interested in boosting Democrats’ electoral chances—he hopes—this fall.

I know the Democratic leader is trying his hardest to put Republicans in a difficult spot. But as I have said before, if he hopes to have us quaking in our boots over taking these votes, he should think again because Republicans are happy to have the chance to talk about the Democrat agenda, to talk about the disaster President Biden created at our southern border—a disaster he allowed to thrive unchecked for years, despite the serious danger to our national security; or to talk about how, under the guise of protecting access to contraception—something that is not under threat, I might add—the Democratic leader brought up legislation that would not only funnel money to Democrats’ allies at Planned Parenthood but would wipe out—wipe out—conscience protections for healthcare providers.

Democrats’ bill specifically targets the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which is bipartisan legislation passed in 1993, back when Democrats actually believed in defending our First Amendment freedoms.

And this is not Democrats’ only attempt to target this legislation and to dictate how and when Americans can live according to their faith. Take, for example, Democrats’ so-called Women’s Health Protection Act—more accurately called the “Abortion on Demand Act,” which would prevent healthcare providers from claiming protection under the Religious Freedom Restoration Act if their faith prevents them from performing abortions.

Apparently the “personal freedoms” that the Democratic leader mentioned

earlier this month don’t include religious freedom—at least not when your faith conflicts with Democrats’ policy positions.

Speaking of the Abortion on Demand Act, I find it very interesting that in a month the Democrat leader intended to be dedicated to “reproductive freedoms,” he chose not to bring up Democrats’ signature abortion legislation. Is it possible that he thought that in a month in which he hoped to paint Republicans as extremists, it might not be a great idea to bring up Democrats’ radical abortion legislation, lest Americans see just how extreme Democrats are on this issue? In fact, the Democrats’ bill might be the most extreme abortion legislation ever considered by Congress.

The so-called Women’s Health Protection Act would not only allow abortion through all 40 weeks of pregnancy, it would sweep away almost every commonsense restriction that has been upheld under Roe and would make abortion on demand at any time, for essentially any reason, the law of the land, not to mention wiping out the ban on taxpayer funding of abortion—something that has been agreed upon by both sides for nearly 50 years.

Needless to say, this is far out of step with the American people, a majority of whom believe abortion should generally be illegal during the second 3 months of pregnancy and 70 percent of whom believe abortion should generally be illegal during the final 3 months, not to mention the fact that it is also out of step with European abortion law, with 46 out of 50 European U.N. member countries restricting abortion on demand after 15 weeks. But that is certainly not stopping Democrats from pursuing one of the most radical abortion regimes in the world.

In the coming weeks, I expect we will see the Democrats’ summer of show votes continue, but I suspect the American people will not be fooled by Democrats’ politicking.

As for Republicans, we are happy to discuss the Democrat agenda anytime Democrats would like to bring it up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

JUNETEENTH NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, one of the most defining days for our country throughout our Nation’s history was when President Lincoln issued the Emancipation Proclamation on January 1, 1863, freeing all slaves. It marked the end of one of the most shameful chapters in our country’s history. But slaves in Texas wouldn’t learn this life-altering news for nearly 2½ years.

It wasn’t until June 19, 1865—the day we now know as Juneteenth—that Major General Gordon Granger and the Union troops arrived at Galveston, TX, and shared the news that all formerly enslaved people were now free. These newly freed men and women set out from Galveston and spread the news, and they began their lives anew. Many

traveled toward nearby Houston, and the news eventually reached the more than 250,000 slaves throughout the State of Texas.

In 1979, Texas was the first of what would become many States to proclaim the day Juneteenth as an official State holiday—1979. Every year on June 19, you will find parades, concerts, church picnics, family barbecues, and countless other Juneteenth events throughout the State.

I have joined a number of those Juneteenth celebrations over the years, but the one in 2021 in Galveston, the birth place of Juneteenth, will always stand out as one of my favorites.

Just 2 days before that celebration, a bill I authored with Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE was signed into law, officially establishing Juneteenth as a national holiday—not just a State holiday, a national holiday. This marked the culmination of many years of hard work by Juneteenth advocates in Texas, and it was an honor to celebrate with many of those advocates in Galveston exactly 156 years after Major General Gordon Granger and his troops arrived there.

I would be remiss if I didn’t recognize the most tenacious advocate for the Juneteenth holiday, my friend Ms. Opal Lee, who is widely known as the grandmother of Juneteenth. Ms. Opal was driven from her Fort Worth home by a racist mob at the tender age of 12 years. Rather than turn that tragedy into hate, she made it her life’s work to recognize the 2½ years it took the news of the Emancipation Proclamation to reach Texas by walking 2½ miles in different areas of the country to build awareness.

Even though Juneteenth is now a national holiday, Ms. Opal, at the tender age of 97, still walks 2½ miles in the Texas heat—she will do that tomorrow—to underscore the importance of continuing to strive for a more perfect Union. Juneteenth National Independence Day would not have been possible without her perseverance and humility, and I hope she understands and appreciates the importance of her work.

By making Juneteenth a national holiday, we have ensured that the history and significance of this day will not be relegated to footnotes in history books. Instead, it will preserve the history of Juneteenth for generations to come and serve as a reminder of the hard-fought struggle for freedom and reconciliation.

This holiday gives us the opportunity to confront the flaws of our past, to honor the progress that we have made, and to resolve to continue to work together for a brighter future.

I appreciate the hard work and dedication of those who made Juneteenth National Independence Day possible, and I wish everyone a happy Juneteenth.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

NOMINATION OF MUSTAFA TAHER KASUBHAI

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, last fall, Senator WYDEN and I had the privilege of introducing Judge Mustafa Kasubhai to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Judge Kasubhai is unquestionably qualified to be the next U.S. district judge for the District of Oregon. I know that he will do an exceptional job for the people of our State and the people of the United States under the vision of equal justice for all.

His record on the bench reflects his commitment to the U.S. Constitution, to the rule of law, and to precedent.

I will quote the judge directly. He said:

I have presided over 5,000 matters in my judicial career, and I have issued over 400 written opinions as a United States Magistrate Judge. My judicial opinions have been upheld over ninety percent of the time.

Some in this Chamber have asked: But is the judge in the mainstream?

Absolutely you are in the mainstream when you have that type of stellar record.

It is no surprise that he brings support from across Oregon, from across the legal profession, and from across the political spectrum to his judicial nomination.

He has been endorsed with the “full support” of the Oregon Association of Chiefs of Police for his unwavering commitment to supporting crime victims and law enforcement, which, in the police chief’s opinion, “make him an exemplary candidate for this esteemed position.”

He brings bipartisan support. He was nominated by President Biden, and his nomination has been endorsed by appointees of both President George Bush and President Donald J. Trump. President Bush’s appointee, a senior judge for the U.S. district court of Oregon, called Judge Kasubhai “the very soul of fairness.”

Let me tell you about the judge some things that Oregon has known for more than 30 years. His leadership in the law has been grounded in public service since he served as president of the Student Bar Association at the University of Oregon School of Law.

After graduation, he went into private practice—not in a high-rise downtown, working for a big corporation, but serving ordinary folks in small towns and rural communities in southern and eastern Oregon. He has seen firsthand the day-to-day difficulties working families face in these rural areas.

He brings to the bench a sense of fairness and justice for all. Shouldn’t that be the foundation for a judge, that they really understand the perspective of justice for all—not justice for the powerful, not justice for the billionaires, justice for all?

His service to Oregon and leadership in the law only increased in the following years, serving as a member of the Oregon Workers’ Compensation Board, serving as a judge on the Lane

County Circuit Court until, in 2018, he was elected by the active and senior Federal court judges of the District of Oregon to serve alongside them as a U.S. magistrate judge. When you are elected by other judges, you are a judge’s judge. It says a lot about how highly he is respected.

He was honored in 2022 with the Wallace P. Carson Award for Judicial Excellence, which recognizes those who make exemplary contributions to Oregon’s judiciary.

He is a standout judicial nominee with sterling credentials, an exemplary record, endorsement of law enforcement, and bipartisan support. He has earned the respect and admiration of his peers and colleagues. He is an outspoken champion for justice for all, a fierce believer in our democratic republic, and a passionate defender of the rule of law.

When he visited Washington last fall, he told me he went to the National Archives to, in his words, “pay tribute” to the Constitution. He just wanted to see an original copy of the Constitution directly.

So it is with some pride in his record in Oregon and a substantial amount of admiration for his service to the people of our State and the service he will give to the people of our Nation that I urge my colleagues to support Judge Mustafa Kasubhai to be the next U.S. district judge for the District of Oregon.

VOTE ON OLER NOMINATION

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

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN).

Further, if present and voting: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) would have voted “nay.”

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 199 Ex.]

YEAS—52

Baldwin	Carper	Hassan
Bennet	Casey	Heinrich
Blumenthal	Collins	Hickenlooper
Booker	Coons	Hirono
Brown	Cortez Masto	Kaine
Butler	Duckworth	Kelly
Cantwell	Gillibrand	King
Cardin	Graham	Klobuchar

Luján	Reed	Tillis
Manchin	Romney	Van Hollen
Markey	Rosen	Warner
Merkley	Sanders	Warnock
Murkowski	Schatz	Warren
Murphy	Schumer	Welch
Murray	Shaheen	Whitehouse
Ossoff	Smith	Wyden
Padilla	Stabenow	
Peters	Tester	

NAYS—42

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

NOT VOTING—6

Cramer	Fetterman	Menendez
Durbin	Hoeven	Sinema

The nomination was confirmed.

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

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to the Kasubhai nomination be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Not hearing an objection, it is withdrawn.

The cloture motion was withdrawn.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S. 870

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume legislative session and the Chair execute the order of June 13, 2024; further, I ask unanimous consent that the order be modified so that the time until 5:45 p.m. be for debate, equally divided, with all other provisions of the previous order remaining in effect.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY ACT OF 2023

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 870) entitled “An Act to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs.”, do pass with an amendment and an amendment to the title.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to concur in the House amendment to S. 870.

RECESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly caucus meetings.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:52 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BOOKER).

FIRE GRANTS AND SAFETY ACT OF 2023—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today deeply concerned that the far-right majority on the Supreme Court is preparing to sow further chaos in our country.

Any day now, the Court is expected to rule on two cases pertaining to the Chevron doctrine, a 40-year-old doctrine with roots that go back to our country's founding that is critical to a functioning Federal Government.

The Chevron doctrine is pretty simple. It recognizes that Congress delegates authority to technical experts at Federal Agencies so that those Agencies can effectively and efficiently implement Federal laws in their areas of expertise in line with congressional intent. As a result, for nearly four decades, courts generally have deferred to reasonable interpretations by administrative Agencies where the law is unclear or ambiguous.

In fact, before 1984, lower court judges were criticized for overriding agency experts and imposing their own policy views. That is why the Court handed down the Chevron decision in the first place.

The Chevron doctrine was originally favored by conservative judges, including the conservative majority on the Supreme Court during the Reagan administration who viewed it as a check against judicial activism.

In recent years, however, many on the right have turned against the Chevron doctrine, viewing it as an impediment to their efforts to consolidate power and enable far-right judges to legislate from the bench.

Now the same far-right ideologues who fought to end Roe are all in for ending Chevron as well. Justice Gorsuch, one of the most outspoken critics of Chevron, has gone so far as to call for the Court to give the doctrine “a tombstone no one can miss.” The so-called Alliance Defending Freedom—the same group leading the charge to eliminate access to mifepristone, as approved by the FDA—has called for the Chevron doctrine to go, asserting without evidence that it allows Agency experts to “impos[e] personal political agendas that Congress has not authorized.”

To be clear, this case is not about the so-called major question doctrine but about the sorts of day-to-day decisions that Federal Agency experts make

when implementing law. Overturning Chevron would undermine these sorts of everyday decisions and, in doing so, jeopardize the regulatory system on which much of our country and our economy rests. It would empower the hundreds of individual Federal judges to overrule carefully considered rule-making decisions by Agency experts, turning a consistent regulatory framework into a chaotic mess of conflicting opinions.

At its core, this case is about who should be making policy decisions on issues that affect our lives—subject matter experts or Federal judges. Who gets to determine the safety of the air we breathe—environmental scientists at the EPA or Federal judges? Who decides whether or not a new drug is actually effective—doctors at the FDA or Federal judges? Who determines whether nursing homes are meeting safety standards—eldercare experts at HHS or Federal judges? With no disrespect to our Federal judges, they lack the expertise to make these kinds of decisions.

While Congress enacts legislation at a high level, it recognizes that the institutional capacity and expertise to implement legislation exists within executive Agencies. That is why our Federal Agencies exist—to implement informed, evidence-based regulations that provide a level of regulatory certainty and stability.

Eliminating Chevron now, after more than four decades, would sow chaos and confusion on Agency actions moving forward as well as the nearly 18,000 Federal cases that have been decided based on the Chevron doctrine. Even if the Court stops short of fully eliminating Chevron, significantly narrowing it will have much the same effect.

Overturning Chevron is yet one more component of the far-right's broader agenda to capture the courts, advance their conservative ideological agenda, and hollow out our regulatory system.

The Court will hand down a decision in this highly important case in a matter of days, and we will see whether this case becomes yet another cautionary tale for a Court that has been busy overturning decades of precedent, sowing chaos left, right, and center.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

NICARAGUA

Mrs. BRITT. Mr. President, as Americans, we believe that every person on the planet is created by their Creator with certain unalienable rights. Religious freedom is at the top of that list, and for me, I believe it must be protected at every turn.

That is why I continue to be deeply concerned with what is happening in Nicaragua. Since 2018, the Nicaraguan regime has persecuted Christians, including the Catholic Church and various Christian missions and charities. This lawless behavior has only escalated recently.

In December, Nicaraguan police arrested approximately a dozen individuals—mostly pastors—associated with Mountain Gateway. These Christian faith leaders have been unjustly imprisoned since then and were handed down a sham sentence in March. The regime has imposed a fine totaling nearly \$1 billion—so that is about 6 percent of that country's entire GDP—along with 12 to 15 years of imprisonment.

Let's be very clear: These Christians are in prison today because of their faith. Their very freedom has been taken away because they chose to preach the Gospel. And the regime doesn't seem to want to stop there. In addition to those arrested and imprisoned, Nicaragua has issued arrest warrants for three more Americans. They are all associated with Mountain Gateway.

Mountain Gateway is an American nonprofit, a faith-based organization that was founded by an Alabamian and is based in Texas. Mountain Gateway recruits, trains, commissions, and sends out ordained Christian ministers to spread the Gospel.

In Nicaragua, the organization has advanced God's Kingdom through discipleship, through feeding and clothing those in need, through providing assistance after natural disasters and sharing the Gospel of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. These individuals doing this work should be celebrated, not persecuted.

Earlier this year, I joined a bicameral group of colleagues in criticizing Nicaragua's regime and this egregious violation of religious freedom. Led by Congressman ROBERT ADERHOLT and Congressman BARRY MOORE, Alabama's entire congressional delegation has been united against this and on this very important bipartisan issue.

We have written letters. We introduced resolutions in both Chambers of Congress, and we called on the Biden administration to utilize all sanctions enforcement powers and leverage in any diplomatic way. Any options that are in the toolbox should be used to force Nicaragua to remedy the situation.

Today, I want to emphasize that we cannot and we will not stop speaking up against this religious persecution in Nicaragua. We are calling on the Biden administration to do more now. This regime must stop targeting American citizens, and it needs to begin faithfully upholding religious freedom in compliance with international law and universal standards of human rights.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

S. 870

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask to be recognized, and I am pleased to be here with you today.

I rise today in strong support of critical bipartisan legislation that will come to the Senate floor—not later

this year, later this week, or this month, but later today. It is called the Fire Grants and Safety Act.

Importantly, this legislation includes two—not one, but two—critical pieces of bipartisan legislation that I have been working on with Senator SHELLEY CAPITO and a bipartisan coalition of our colleagues—literally, for years.

The first part is called the Accelerating Deployment of Versatile, Advanced Nuclear for Clean Energy Act. That is a mouthful, but it is also known as the ADVANCE Act. And we coupled that with legislation involving support for our firefighters across the United States of America.

Last month, the House of Representatives passed these two bills, not as one but as a package, by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of—get this—393 to 13. Now, we don't pass a lot of bills by margins like that over in the House or the Senate, but today we have an opportunity in the Senate to do something very much the same.

Before this evening's vote, though, I want to take a few minutes to highlight the significance of both the Fire Grants and Safety Act as well as the so-called ADVANCE Act. In my role as cochair of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus, along with Senators SUSAN COLLINS and LISA MURKOWSKI, I have shared here on the Senate floor, many times over the years, that every day—every day—our Nation's firefighters bravely run toward danger in order to save lives across America.

In my home State of Delaware, there are more than 6,000 firefighters—6,000—and a great majority of them are volunteers. The same is true in many States across America. Yet despite their extraordinary dedication to protecting our communities, their jobs are not getting any easier. In fact, they are getting harder, and the risks that they continue to face grow each year.

Annually, I am told that there are over 36 million emergency calls that fire services respond to—36 million. That is a 20-percent increase in the last 12 years. This is in no small part due to climate change and the resulting increases in extreme weather events across our country, which are translating directly into hotter, bigger, and more dangerous fires. Just this week, our country is experiencing record-breaking temperatures from New England to California, where heat risks have been categorized by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration as “extreme.”

It is clear that the kinds of emergencies that our firefighters must respond to are changing, and the demands on fire departments across this country are changing as well. For example, last year when a devastating tornado touched down in southern Delaware, in Sussex County, it was our firefighters who showed up to lead people to safety. We have seen similar acts of service across our Nation, especially on the west coast, where firefighters have long helped families escape the hazards of wildfires.

I believe we have a moral obligation, which I believe is a shared responsibility, to provide the resources that firefighters need to continue to protect the rest of us, our families, and our businesses. And today we have an opportunity to do just that.

The Fire Grants and Safety Act reauthorizes not one but two critical grant programs that fire departments across our Nation rely on to safeguard our communities. The first is called Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Grant Program, and it provides funding to local fire departments to hire much needed personnel to respond around the clock to emergency situations. The second is the Assistance to Firefighters Grant Program, which helps provide fire departments and emergency medical service organizations with the vital training and equipment, like firetrucks and protective gear that they need.

Fire departments across Delaware have contacted my office to share how these grant programs are a lifeline—a lifeline for their work that they do every day—and I am sure our colleagues have heard similar stories of the essential roles that these programs play in fire departments across America.

For example, fire departments in Colorado reported a lack of critical funding and supply, which could be aided by the Assistance for Firefighters Grant Program. Firefighters in Vermont, where our Presiding Officer is from, and firefighters in West Virginia, who cosponsored this legislation—where I was born—have reported being overwhelmed and understaffed in light of recent emergencies in their community.

It is clear as day that reauthorizing these grant programs is imperative. The Fire Grants and Safety Act will also enable the U.S. Fire Administration to continue to provide leadership, coordination, and training for first responders and emergency medical personnel.

As the lead Federal Agency for fire data collection, public fire education, fire research, and fire service training, the U.S. Fire Administration ensures that the fire service is prepared to respond to any and all hazards.

Firefighters put their lives on the line for us every single day. I am proud to work with Senator GARY PETERS, as well as with my Congressional Fire Services Caucus cochairs, Senator COLLINS and Senator MURKOWSKI, on this legislation to equip our firefighters with the tools and training they need to do their jobs and do them safely.

There is an African proverb that many of my colleagues have heard because I have said it enough, but the African proverb goes something like this: If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together.

I think that is true: If you want to go fast, go alone. If you want to go far, go together.

Today, on the Senate floor, with this legislation we are going far, and, as it

turns out, we are going together, both Democrats and Republicans from all across the country and in concert with the administration, with the President, who supports this legislation.

And we are doing it by considering not one but two bipartisan priorities at the same time. That second priority before us today is legislation known as the ADVANCE Act. This is legislation that Senator SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO of West Virginia, my native State, and Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE and I have worked on tirelessly for years in both a bipartisan and a bicameral manner.

The ADVANCE Act accelerates the deployment of our Nation's largest source of clean power, and that is nuclear energy. Nuclear energy powers millions of homes and businesses across this country every day with zero emissions. It is an indispensable tool in our ongoing efforts to address the climate crisis and strengthen our Nation's energy security.

My own personal interest in the potential for nuclear energy goes all the way back to my days as a Navy ROTC midshipman and later as a naval flight officer, tracking nuclear submarines throughout the oceans of the world. I witnessed how, initially, our submarines and, later, our aircraft carriers could travel millions of miles safely on nuclear power.

Largely because of the success of the Navy Nuclear Propulsion Program, the United States had the technology and the workforce at the ready to build a commercial nuclear energy industry that could provide safe, reliable, and clean energy to American homes and businesses.

Today, nuclear energy provides about 20 percent of America's electricity—20 percent—but nearly half of America's clean energy.

Let me repeat that: Nuclear energy provides about 20 percent of America's electricity but nearly half of America's clean energy.

There is no question that this carbon-free source of energy can and will help us meet—it is helping us meet—our climate goals. That is why I have long believed that nuclear energy needs to be part of our work to address climate change, while also creating thousands of jobs—tens of thousands of jobs, in fact—across this Nation of ours.

The ADVANCE Act empowers the Nuclear Regulatory Commission with the tools and with the workforce that it needs to keep our current reactors safe and to review new nuclear technologies efficiently. These resources will enable the Commission to provide the certainty needed to deploy more clean energy and to make sure that our commitment to safety remains paramount at this crucial moment in the history of our planet.

The ADVANCE Act also directs the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to support 21st century applications of nuclear energy. For example, the ADVANCE Act requires the Commission

to explore how to repurpose retired fossil fuel-fired powerplants, as well as existing infrastructure, to support new, clean nuclear energy production.

Additionally, this legislation fundamentally—and I think firmly—maintains the core of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's mission, and that is to ensure the safety of America's nuclear power. Unless the Nuclear Regulatory Commission diligently ensures the safety of our nuclear fleet of reactors every day—every day—as well as new nuclear technologies, the United States will not be able to realize the potential of this carbon-free energy source.

And the Nuclear Regulatory Commission must maintain this commitment to safety while considering all stakeholder views and concerns equally in order to maintain the public trust and confidence.

Ultimately, this bill addresses the most pressing needs of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and will lay the foundation for the safe and successful deployment of the next generation of advanced reactors. As a result, we will strengthen America's leadership on nuclear energy and provide climate leadership on the world stage.

Let me be clear, the ADVANCE Act will strengthen our energy and our national security and reduce greenhouse gas emissions, as well as creating thousands of new jobs while growing our economy.

I am not sure what our colleagues would call that in their States, but in Delaware, something like that, we call that a win-win-win situation. We need more of those.

In closing, the legislation we vote on today will provide fundamental support for our Nation's firefighters, while bringing our Nation one step closer to a clean energy future.

Once again, I want to share my heartfelt gratitude to our colleagues and our staff members who have worked with us—Democrat and Republican, House and Senate—in some cases, not just for days or weeks or months but, literally, for years in order to bring these provisions across the finish line.

So many of our colleagues have had a hand in this effort, but, in particular, I want to thank Senator GARY PETERS, who chairs the Committee on Homeland Security; Senator SUSAN COLLINS and Senator LISA MURKOWSKI, who have been great leaders in the Fire Services Caucus over the years; Senator SHELLY CAPITO, who, literally, is the lead author on the ADVANCE Act; and Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, who has been very much involved in drafting that legislation as well. We could not have done this and be where we are today without each of you.

Before I close, there is something else I want to mention. This is not something that I get to do every day, but I want to also thank the Speaker of the House, Congressman JOHNSON, for ensuring this bill's passage through his

Chamber with resounding bipartisan support. I think it was about 393 to 13. That is an amazing, amazing outcome in legislation of this magnitude.

I want to thank our own majority leader, Senator SCHUMER, for working with us and his staff to bring this legislation up for a vote today. Some people might be watching this across the country and think: What is this all about, and why would we take legislation dealing with firefighters and the tools and the resources of firefighters and why would we couple that with legislation involving nuclear energy? What is the connection?

And the connection is this: Last year was the hottest year on record on this planet—the hottest year ever. This week may be the hottest week we will have had in this country and maybe on this planet—the hottest week. And what is causing that?

Well, we know what is causing it. It is too much carbon dioxide in the air, and we need to reduce it. And one of the great sources of carbon dioxide in the air is the cars, trucks, and vans that we drive. That is only about 35 percent of our carbon emissions that come from our mobile sources. Maybe another 30 percent comes from the powerplants that provide electricity for us. Maybe another 25 percent comes from our manufacturing plants.

That is where it is coming from, and we are doing a whole lot of things—House and Senate, Democrats and Republicans, working together in many cases—working with the current President and the current administration in order to try to turn it around—to turn around the fact that our planet is on fire and getting hotter.

We have passed all kinds of legislation that is being enacted now: methane emission reduction program; legislation involving the release of hydrofluorocarbons, or HFCs; legislation that is part of the bipartisan infrastructure law, including, literally, across the country, the places where people can charge and recharge their batteries—corridors and corridors across the country to recharge electric vehicles.

That is part of what we are doing—clean hydrogen—clean hydrogen which can be used, literally, to fly airplanes and to move cars, trucks, and vans, and to provide us the electricity that we need.

We are doing a lot on wind, windmills—especially windmills—not just on land but windmills on either side of our country. And a lot is going on with respect to solar, and we can be proud of all that.

Having said that—I am probably mixing metaphors here—but we are paddling against the tide. This is a tough battle, and while we have launched a lot of smart programs and smart initiatives and doing it in a bipartisan way—and we have done it with, in many cases, not just environmental groups but business groups as well—we still have a big fight ahead of us, and we

need to implement fully the Methane Emissions Reduction Act, the bipartisan infrastructure law, the Inflation Reduction Act, clean hydrogen and hydrogen hubs, and all the stuff that people hear about. And we need to not just talk about it. We need to implement it. That is what I am going to be spending the next 6 months that I serve here or am privileged to serve here in the U.S. Senate to do—to make sure that the promise of all of the legislation, all of the groundwork that we have laid will actually bear fruit.

These young pages that are sitting here, along with the Presiding Officer, have come here from all over the country. They are 16, 17, 18 years old. We want to make sure that they are going to have a planet to grow up on. We want to make sure that they have a planet to grow old on. It is up to us to make sure that that happens.

It is a shared responsibility, like most things. It is not just a Democratic responsibility. It is not just a Republican responsibility. It is not just on the President or the legislative branch. It is not just businesses. It is really all of us. We all have a dog in this fight.

A lot of us have children and grandchildren, and, hopefully, they will benefit throughout their lives from the work that we are doing here, including—including—the work that we are doing here today.

I am very proud of my colleagues for getting us to this point in time and especially anxious to have this vote later today, and I hope the kind of margin that we—it will stand up in the House. I think it was 390 to 13. I hope we can do at least as well and maybe even a little bit better.

I am grateful to the President for his strong support of what we are bringing up today. He has already telegraphed that he is prepared, when he receives this legislation, to sign it into law.

Joe Biden used to say, when he was a mere mortal, when he was a Senator from Delaware, we used to talk about volunteer fire companies. We have a bunch of them. Most of the firefighters in Delaware are members of volunteer fire companies. I think that is probably true across the country. But then-Senator Joe Biden used to say that the volunteer fire community in Delaware was really so potent, they are kind of like a third party—sort of like a third party—and they punch above their weight in many ways. They punch above their weight in many ways to make our State safer. I think that is the case across America.

We want to make sure that they have the tools, the resources that they need to do their jobs even better and to make sure they are able to do it safely, at the end of the day, so they can go home to their families and have a full and long life.

With that, I think that pretty much is what I wanted to say. I want to thank you, Mr. Presiding Officer, as someone who has been very supportive

of this initiative, and we look forward, under your leadership today, to have a strong vote, and I will look forward to coming back in an hour or so and being a part of that vote.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. 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 Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss S. 870. I am a passionately strong supporter of the effort to reauthorize the U.S. Fire Administration, the Assistance to Firefighters Grants Program, and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response Grant Program. It is essential.

I voted in favor of all of that legislation to reauthorize these key programs on April 20 of last year, and I remain strongly and staunchly in support of these efforts to support our first responders. Those who run into danger must know that we in Congress have their back. They keep our community safe, and we must keep their resources safe in return.

Unfortunately, the vote today is not just for the lifesaving programs that I am staunchly on record as supporting. On the coattails of this noncontroversial bill to protect our heroes, our colleagues in the House tacked on a dangerous additional 90-page package of provisions that merge the Senate's ADVANCE Act and the House's Atomic Energy Advancement Act.

Well, because of this airdropped provision into the fire bill, I will be opposing final passage of this bill.

So let me go now to what is the ADVANCE Act and why they would try to attach it to something that is absolutely essential. Why would they not just bring it out, try to have a big debate on it? Well, I will tell you why.

The original version of the ADVANCE Act, which I voted against in the committee, was weakened further and watered down further in negotiations with the House. The new language attempts to water down the duties of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; it puts communities on the back burner; and it dilutes existing protocols that keep our Nation safe from the threat of nuclear war. That is what we are talking about today, nuclear war.

It puts promotion over protection and corporate profits over community cleanup. Notably, the provisions from the Senate bill that would have provided a much needed \$225 million for communities affected by nuclear closures and \$100 million to clean up contaminated Tribal communities are not in the legislation anymore as it came back from the House of Representatives. But the provisions to prop up the nuclear industry, they remain.

I entered office just a year after the Nuclear Regulatory Commission was established in 1975. Why did we create a Nuclear Regulatory Commission? Very simple. Because there was an identification of a need for an independent oversight of nuclear domestic powerplants in the United States and nuclear activity, generally. And there was a decision, looking at the Atomic Energy Commission which existed, to say, That Agency is responsible for regulating nuclear power, but it is also responsible for promoting nuclear power here and around the world. And that was a fundamental conflict of interest. You promote something by minimizing the problems or ignoring the problems, and that was becoming a big problem—that they weren't dealing with the very real issues of safety that had been raised about nuclear power in our country.

This was before Three Mile Island. It was before Chernobyl. But it was anticipating the safety issues that were going to be growing and growing and growing.

So the NRC's current mission, before this bill passes, reflects this critical responsibility to the American public: regulation and licensing free from the influence of industry and that puts health and safety above all else.

So we have a separate Agency. It is called the Department of Commerce. They can go and promote anything they want. They can try to sell whatever they want, domestically or internationally. But the Agency in charge of safety is the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. They have got to make sure that anything that the Department of Commerce is pushing doesn't wind up being a danger.

So we create this dynamic tension inside of the government. Ultimately, that goal of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission that puts health and safety above all else is what protects us against nuclear accidents here or overseas, wherever we are selling nuclear powerplants.

The ADVANCE ACT, as attached to the Fire Grants and Safety Act—completely unrelated subject; one deals with the resources we are giving to firefighters, the resources we are giving to local fire departments in order to fight fires as they pop up in our local communities. That is something we all support. But what they did was they added to that bill language that would require—underline that—require the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to rewrite its mission, to state that its regulation and oversight should—and this is a quote—"not unnecessarily limit" civilian nuclear activity regardless of whether it is beneficial or detrimental to public safety and national security.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission shouldn't be the "Nuclear Retail Commission." The Commission's duty is to regulate, not to facilitate. Their job is to ask all of the safety questions; to make sure the design is OK; to make

sure that the waste is being stored properly; to make sure that an accident can't happen; to make sure that climate change, as the tides rise, doesn't swamp a nuclear powerplant near a river, near the ocean. That is their job; it is to protect all of the people who live in communities.

We have got other Agencies that are funded, able, and willing to fulfill the role of promoting nuclear power. But this legislation does nothing to assure communities at the frontline of nuclear infrastructure that nuclear expansion won't come at their expense in local communities. It compels the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to identify how it can improve efficiency in its oversight and inspection programs without asking it how it can also improve safety or public engagement so that the public can go in and ask questions about this nuclear powerplant in their neighborhood, force the CEO of the company to answer questions about concerns that people who live near a nuclear powerplant might have. It provides no redress for families living near abandoned uranium mines and unsafe nuclear waste sites.

At the very least, a rapid expansion of nuclear activity should be accompanied by rapid expansion of the resources and regulators that help protect community health and safety. If we do it, we should do it all together, one big package.

This new language also fails to ensure continued American leadership on nuclear nonproliferation overseas. It fails to do anything to strengthen our current regime, and export licenses for nuclear materials and technology could be issued to countries that do not meet our own standards for nuclear safety and cooperation. The only requirement—that is what this law now says—it will only require a notification to Congress after that nuclear license is issued in another country and exempting even this after-the-fact notification for exports of up to 20 percent enriched uranium.

And you are right. Whenever you hear the words "uranium" or "plutonium," your ears should perk up.

Because in many countries they see a nuclear powerplant as a generator of electricity that has this side effect of uranium and plutonium, but in the eyes of some countries—and we saw that in Iran, in Iraq, in North Korea—as they got nuclear powerplants, they saw it as a place where they can get uranium and plutonium that has this wonderful byproduct of electricity that it also generates.

So we should be concerned because we have already been forewarned by our experiences over the last 20 or 30 years. We can see what happens if there isn't a proper recognition of how all of this material can, in fact, be diverted.

We shouldn't get a heads-up about the fact that Saudi Arabia now has American nuclear material. That shouldn't happen after the fact; that should happen before the fact. We

should know that this is going to happen.

The bill also pushes the Secretary of Energy to identify generally authorized countries for exports beyond those with existing 123 agreements.

So what are 123 agreements in the Atomic Energy Act? Well, 123 agreements lay the foundation for the responsible exchange of nuclear materials and technology with countries that share common guardrails for nuclear safety—that is the diversion of uranium or plutonium and other nuclear materials in a way that ultimately could wind up in a bomb-making program somewhere in the world. We should not be looking for ways to work around or weaken our export standards even further.

Throughout my career, I have seen nuclear safety and nonproliferation undermined in the interest of the short-term geopolitical concerns of a particular administration or industry at the expense of the longer term nuclear nonproliferation goals, which we say are our highest foreign policy objectives.

They get compromised in the short term because one administration or another just wants to use nuclear powerplants as a way of ingratiating the United States into the good favor of a particular country—it could be Saudi Arabia soon; it could be another country right after that—but without all the safeguards that should be there in order to protect against diversion of these materials.

So the United States is supposed to be the leader in the global arena, and as a nation with nuclear capabilities, we have a duty to set the strongest possible standards for domestic and international nuclear activities as an example to the rest of the world. We also have to clean up our existing messes—particularly in Tribal and environmental justice communities—before investing in anything that might make those messes worse.

As a result, despite my strong and continued support for the fire safety grants and my respect for my colleagues working on this issue, I must vote no.

In 1982, I wrote a book about nuclear proliferation and about domestic nuclear powerplants. The book was entitled “Nuclear Peril: The Politics of Proliferation,” and it is what happens when there is a shortchanging of the safety, the security measures which should be put in place. It also dealt with the issues domestically of a reduction in the generalized supervision of nuclear powerplants in terms of having the highest possible safety standards.

There are many in this institution who want to see a vast expansion of nuclear power using plutonium and uranium in the United States. They also support a vast expansion of nuclear powerplants around the world using uranium and plutonium. I appreciate the fact that they want to do that, and many want to see that happen in the

name of climate change because it reduces greenhouse gases, but it has its own problems. It brings its own problems.

We still don't have a solution to where we are going to bury all the nuclear waste in the United States. The Yucca Mountain facility in Nevada still hasn't been completed, and in my opinion, it will never be complete. We are now up to 35 years working on it.

Similarly, overseas, if we get into a race with other countries—Russia, China—in the export of nuclear power, we should not lower the standards; we should ensure that we are in as the responsible provider of nuclear power around the world so that we reduce dramatically the threat of proliferation.

So my book in 1982 is directly relevant to this subject right here, because whether it be North Korea that converted a civilian nuclear powerplant over to a bomb-making factory, whether it be in Iraq with Saddam Hussein, whether it be in Iran—you name it—the story is the same.

So we have to be very responsible and ensure we have the highest standards, and that is my goal in coming out here. I am going to vote no because I think if we are going to be encouraging a brandnew era of nuclear power here domestically and internationally, we should have that discussion. It shouldn't be attached to the fire safety bill to make sure that firefighters can put out the fire in the house that is next door to us. We all agree on that. On this issue, however—the issue of nuclear nonproliferation and the domestic safety of powerplants in our country—that is a different subject.

But, honestly, my great friend Chairman CARPER, who is just such an incredible leader on clean energy, the chairman of the committee that produced the most important climate bill in 2022 in a generation, he is my friend, and I thank him for engaging in a colloquy with me to clarify in detail the legislative intent of some of these provisions. I look forward to continuing to work on efforts to protect communities, clean up toxic waste, and create a consent-based pathway to nuclear waste storage in our country.

The decision to put all of the nuclear waste in our country in Yucca Mountain was a political decision. I was in the room when it was made. The National Academy of Sciences said that the Yucca Mountain facility was at the bottom of the places in our country. It is near a river. It is near an earthquake fault. No wonder we haven't finished it. The safety questions were never answered at the beginning. And that is all I ask. If we are going to move into a new era of nuclear power here and around the world, let's ask the questions upfront. Let's make sure we put the safeguards in place. Let's make sure we avoid having to look back and say: How in the world did we ever allow something like that to ever occur again?

I thank you for the opportunity to be out here.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to enter into a colloquy with the senior Senator from Delaware, the chairman of the Committee on Environment and Public Works, concerning two aspects of the ADVANCE Act before us today: nuclear regulation and nonproliferation.

First is the provision regarding the mission statement of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, referenced in section 501. The current mission statement of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission—the independent regulatory Agency responsible for the safe use of nuclear energy and nuclear materials—is based upon Congress' action in the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974. That landmark legislation recognized and addressed the need to separate nuclear regulatory and safety functions. In doing so, Congress strongly declared that this separation was in the public interest. Since then, the Commission has adopted Principles of Good Regulation and organizational values that underscore its responsibility towards evidence-based, independent regulation and licensing activities.

Today, I rise to discuss the implications of the language in the ADVANCE Act regarding the mission statement of the NRC. This language, which did not move through the Senate and was not debated in the Committee on Environment and Public Works, would require the NRC to “update the mission statement of the Commission to include that licensing and regulation of the civilian use of radioactive materials and nuclear energy be conducted in a manner that is efficient and does not unnecessarily limit the civilian use of radioactive materials and deployment of nuclear energy, or the benefits of civilian use of radioactive materials and nuclear energy technology to society.”

As the chair of the Environment and Public Works Subcommittee on Nuclear Safety, I see NRC's safety mission as the primary responsibility of the Agency—not the protection of its relationship to the nuclear industry.

Chairman CARPER, can you confirm that it is not the intent, nor the direction, of the new section 501 to in any way change the Agency's safety focus?

Mr. CARPER. Yes, I can. Let me be clear on this point—and I thank the Senator for pointing it out—the ADVANCE Act does not in any way alter the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's longstanding statutory responsibility to protect public health, safety, and the environment. I do not believe that the language in section 501 in any way asks the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to do anything that it does not already do, within the limits of its existing authority and consistent with congressional intent in the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974. I believe that it is essential for the Commission to continue to adhere to congressional direction to prioritize safety in order to maintain the trust and confidence of

the public and the industry. In fact, the provisions in the ADVANCE Act, originally part of S. 1111 reported by the Committee on Environment and Public Works, provide the Nuclear Regulatory Commission with the tools and resources it needs to ensure that it can execute that safety mission efficiently and effectively into the future.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank you, Chairman CARPER, for your unequivocal statement that, under this bill, the NRC will still be required to implement a safety-first mission.

I would also like to note my concern over language directing that regulatory activities “not unnecessarily limit” civilian nuclear activity. We do not need to enable any new lines of argument for industry to protest necessary safety updates required by the NRC that may require additional investments for licensees to implement and thus “unnecessarily limit” their activity.

Chairman CARPER, can you confirm that this language should not be interpreted to suggest that the NRC should adopt a new, cost-benefit approach to decisions affecting public safety?

Mr. CARPER. Yes. The update to the mission statement does not compel the NRC to update its approach to determining how to set safety standards beyond what is required by current law.

Mr. MARKEY. Thank you, Chairman CARPER. I will continue to hold the Commission accountable to its primary safety responsibilities as outlined in the Energy Reorganization Act.

Finally, before I yield the floor, I must raise my concerns in this bill concerning nonproliferation. Chairman CARPER, section 103 under division B of the Fire Grants and Safety Act requires the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to notify the appropriate committees of Congress if an export license is issued for a covered country, defined as a country that has not ratified an Additional Protocol with the International Atomic Energy Agency or has not acceded to the amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material.

Chairman CARPER, am I correct in my understanding that these notifications occur after an export license is already issued?

Mr. CARPER. Yes. The notification is meant to provide an additional mechanism for Congress to use in the oversight of the Commission’s activities relating to nuclear exports. However, nothing in the ADVANCE Act changes the NRC’s current responsibilities under the Atomic Energy Act to determine whether the granting of an export license is inimical to the national security interests of the United States. This means that if the NRC determines that issuance of an export license to any country is inimical to the national security interests of the United States, then the NRC is required by law to deny such a license, regardless of the technology involved.

Mr. MARKEY. Chairman CARPER, is the intent of requiring congressional

notification to facilitate a better understanding of the extent and nature of export licensing activity?

Mr. CARPER. Yes. To assist Congress in understanding the extent and nature of exports to countries that have not ratified International Atomic Energy Agency safety and security protocols, the Commission must notify Congress if the NRC determines that an export license for a covered item to a covered country is not inimical to the common defense and security of the United States. This bill does not intend to establish a new standard that differs from the current inimicality requirements under the Atomic Energy Act.

Mr. MARKEY. Chairman CARPER, how will a congressional notification requirement work to address proliferation concerns, if there is no explicit direction for the Commission to deny a license for nations that do not have the strongest possible nonproliferation standards?

Mr. CARPER. The ADVANCE Act has no effect on the current authorities of the Commission, the Secretaries of Energy, State, or any other Federal Agency involved in the export of nuclear technology. The notification in section 103 exists in addition to existing authorities and does not absolve Federal Agencies charged with executing and overseeing nonproliferation policies from ensuring that the deployment of all nuclear technologies intended for peaceful civilian power uses do not contribute to proliferation, as required by law. In addition to relying on its own resources, the NRC currently, and as a matter of routine practice, consults with intelligence and other national security agencies in order to inform its inimicality determinations. I fully expect that practice will continue, and nothing in this bill would change it.

Mr. MARKEY. I commend Chairman CARPER for his efforts to maintain adequate guardrails against proliferation during negotiations with our House colleagues. But we must not export nuclear material and technology to countries that do not meet the same safety standards to which we hold ourselves, and we cannot afford to compromise decades of nonproliferation efforts to advance short-term geopolitical interests.

In addition to my concerns over the export license provision, I would like to raise my concerns over section 105 under division B of the Fire Grants and Safety Act. This section directs the Secretaries of Energy and State to assess factors beyond 123 agreements to determine a country’s Generally Authorized Destination status under part 810 of title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, which facilitates the export and transfer of certain nuclear material and technology as “general activities.” 123 agreements refer to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act, which sets out specific requirements for the United States to engage in significant civilian nuclear cooperation with another coun-

try. 123 agreements are critical to the nonproliferation apparatus. These agreements require congressional approval, include a list of nine safety criteria, and set out clear procedures governing cooperation under the agreement.

This provision provides no definition or guidance on what “other factors” qualify as adequate criteria for Generally Authorized Destination status.

Chairman CARPER, is it the intent of this provision to allow the Secretaries of Energy and State to grant Generally Authorized Destination status to countries that do not meet our own standards for nuclear safety and proliferation?

Mr. CARPER. No. The bill simply allows the Secretaries of Energy and State to explore pathways to grant generally authorized status to countries other than having 123 agreements in place. The bill does not relieve those Secretaries of their statutory responsibilities to preserve standards for nuclear safety and nonproliferation in the export of nuclear technologies to any countries, including those designated as Generally Authorized Destinations.

Mr. MARKEY. I thank the Senator from Delaware for his comments on these issues and his leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

VETERANS

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, 10 years ago, a wait-time scandal at the VA Medical Center in Phoenix, AZ, led to a nationwide access and accountability crisis for the VA healthcare system. Many of us responded to that, worked to find a solution, and we ultimately passed something called the Choice Act.

Subsequent to that, we made improvements in what we learned from the Choice Act’s implementation and usage by veterans and its consequences to the Department of Veterans Affairs, and we enacted the MISSION Act, which was signed into law 6 years ago this month.

The MISSION Act expanded the ability for veterans to seek care in their communities and made VA healthcare more accessible, convenient, and veteran-centric than ever before. The MISSION Act has also contributed to significant increases in enrollment of veterans, utilization and reliance on VA care, and improvements in quality and trust among veterans.

For veterans—particularly those in rural States like yours and mine—the ability to get care closer to home can be life-changing and lifesaving. Unfortunately, recently, VA leaders have been taking alarming actions to limit the choices that the MISSION Act affords veterans in Kansas and across the country.

It is unfathomable that the VA would consider leaving veterans with fewer options—fewer options—to seek the care they need. Yet I have seen a dramatic increase in community care-related casework requests from veterans

and VA staff in recent weeks and whistleblowers in their conversations with me, and I know that many of my colleagues have experienced the same thing.

A lot of what I know about what is going on in veterans' lives and how the VA is doing is from the conversations I have with veterans in what we as Senators and Members of Congress call casework—someone who brings us a problem with the hope that we can make a difference and find a solution. Our casework in this area has escalated dramatically.

A number of these casework requests involve—one of them, for example, involves a veteran with cancer. I mentioned this in a hearing in which VA officials were in front of our Veterans' Affairs Committee just in the last couple of weeks. But this veteran with cancer—he and others who have cancer, chronic pain, or mental health concerns are among the most vulnerable, high-risk veterans in the VA's patient population.

In one case, the VA canceled the community care authorization for a veteran in Manhattan, KS, about an hour away from Topeka, where there is a VA hospital. The issue here is, this veteran—one, why did they cancel the care? Two, this veteran had completed 58 of 60 cancer treatments, and the VA canceled the last 2 in his hometown and told him he needed to find chemotherapy at the VA in Topeka, about an hour away. The VA wanted him to drive back and forth to Topeka for his remaining treatments.

The VA, when I told them the facts, saw that something is wrong here and adjusted to allow him to have his treatments—the last 2 of the 60—where he had been receiving the first 58. But it is only one example in which the VA is rolling back the opportunities for veterans who are already receiving care in the community to continue to receive that care.

These kinds of decisions would be alarming and unacceptable to me and many of my colleagues I think at any time, but it is particularly concerning right now—and it is why I am on the Senate floor today highlighting this issue—it is particularly concerning right now given that the VA recently implemented a strategic hiring pause in the VA healthcare system and is actively working to reduce the VA workforce by 10,000 employees.

It defies my understanding, how the VA expects to limit choices for veterans in the community—in other words, forcing them into a VA direct care system—while at the same time working to reduce staff in that direct care system that are actually available to care for those veterans.

Independently, these policy goals are cause for concern. Together, they risk the welfare of veterans and the VA's workforce nationwide.

I would encourage my colleagues to take a look at the casework that their staffs are working on on behalf of veterans in their States and see if they are not experiencing the same thing that I am seeing, which is more and more veterans saying: Senator, JERRY, Senator MORAN, can you help me? I have been receiving care in the community. I like the way I am receiving that care. I like my provider. Yet the VA is pulling the rug out from under me.

These actions could cost some veterans their lives and drive other veterans away from VA healthcare benefits that they have earned and deserve. I have had several veterans tell me: I like what I am getting in the community so much, I am going to pay for it out of my own pocket.

Veterans can do better. The VA can do better. The VA must do better.

But I don't think this is just a happenstance. I don't think that the facts or the circumstances I am describing to my colleagues are just something that seems to be happening at the VA. It is a concerted effort by VA leadership to bring community-care veterans back into direct care at the VA.

As my colleagues may recall from the MISSION Act, what the law says is a veteran, in many instances—in most instances—is entitled to care in the community if he or she—the veteran—along with their provider, decide it is in the best interest of the veteran.

That decision is not made by the VA whether a veteran is entitled to care in the community; it is made by the patient—the veteran—and the provider—the doctor, the nurse practitioner, the physician assistant. Yet there is a concerted effort in VA leadership to deny veterans that care and insist that if they are going to receive care, they receive direct care within the VA healthcare system.

I am a fan of the VA healthcare system. I support it. I work hard to make sure that it has the capabilities—their assets, the necessary resources—to do its job. But I also know that there are circumstances, particularly in rural areas or certain kind of specialized treatment, in which it is the right thing to do to allow a veteran, with his or her desire, and his or her provider saying this is in the best interest of my patient to have care provided in the community.

This is a really important issue. The VA struggled to provide care for veterans in the past. Many improvements have been made. We have given veterans a choice. But the VA has no right, no ability, to undermine the choice that a veteran makes. I call on the VA to immediately reverse course.

The VA has, of course, explained to me their rationale, in some ways deny that there is any concerted effort or any policy change; but the circumstances are so evident, so prevalent, that I absolutely believe that the VA's policies, the encouragement of their staff, is to do something contrary to the law.

The VA needs to reverse its course, reaffirm the right of veterans—those who have served our country. They

have the right to seek the care that they need and desire in the community in which they live or where they believe the best absolute care can be provided to them under their current healthcare circumstances.

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.

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

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

SPECTRUM AND NATIONAL SECURITY ACT

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, today, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was slated to consider the Spectrum and National Security Act. This bill, a hard-won compromise months in the making, would have provided a balanced approach to spectrum management, protected our national defense by ensuring our military has the telecommunications capacity they need, promoted innovation by unleashing spectrum for commercial use, and essential for America's economic and international competitiveness. It also funded key bipartisan priorities that make our Nation more secure and also increases opportunities for Americans to be competitive in higher-wage jobs.

This bill was to be considered in a markup today and included shared priorities by the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Commerce. In fact, they all released a joint statement last week in support of the bill.

I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

A Joint Statement from the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Commerce on the Spectrum and National Security Act:

"The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the Secretary of Commerce support adoption of the spectrum legislation proposed by Chair Cantwell subject to a set of agreed upon changes, which both Departments, working closely with the White House, have concurred on."

Ms. CANTWELL. Why did these Agencies stop sparring and finally agree to a path forward? Simply put, it is because spectrum helps each of them meet their responsibilities on behalf of this Nation. The spectrum deal would have put policies in place that give Federal Agencies equity at each part of their Agencies and a seat at the table in spectrum decision-making.

It eliminated the disruptive interagency disputes that we have come to know that literally have impeded spectrum policy progress in the past years. It also reinstated the FCC's spectrum auction authority without compromising national security. The FCC has been without its auction authority for more than a year because the fighting

among these special interests threaten our economic growth.

Establishing a sustainable spectrum pipeline would not only spur our own economic growth and promote innovation, it would also have raised revenues to fund important critical security and economic opportunities across the United States. One of those key priorities funded through this legislation is the continuation of the Affordable Connectivity Program. And I will note that the Presiding Officer is very vocal in his support for the Affordable Connectivity Program. I thank him for his leadership.

This Affordable Connectivity Program provides affordable broadband to more than 23 million American households. Americans need broadband to speak to their doctors, to do their homework, to connect to their jobs, to stay in touch with loved ones.

It is interesting—Mr. President, you will know—that there are parts of the United States where people either can't afford broadband, nor are the fees and services requirements affordable enough for people to purchase them. I am pretty sure there are places like that in Vermont. So it is so important to have a program like the Affordable Connectivity Program.

The pandemic laid bare how important broadband access was to every American and to businesses—no different from having access to affordable electricity or heating or telephone capacity.

Who are these 23 million Americans? About half of the ACP households are military families; about a quarter are African-American; another quarter are Latino; 300,000 ACP households are on Tribal lands; over 10 million Americans who use the program are over 50. A lot of people are on a fixed income, elderly, but still count on affordable broadband for their daily lives.

Not surprising, just as in this article that was in yesterday's newspaper in my State: End of the internet subsidy puts healthcare lifeline at risk, which describes the story of a woman in Idaho who literally was trying to fix her home in a rural community and actually fell down and broke her leg and then needed that connectivity to maintain connection with her doctors and her healthcare. These are the Americans who need this program. They are in every State.

One school employee told me about a student who hadn't done their homework for weeks. Her teacher called to find out why. The student didn't want to say. They didn't want to be called out in school. They didn't want any of their friends to know they just didn't have internet services. She wasn't trying to get out of the work; she was just trying to protect her family and protect herself.

We can't be asking parents to choose between a child's food and their education. But despite this demonstrated level of need, the Commerce Committee, my colleagues on the other side

of the aisle, offered amendments to actually reduce the ACP program. They wanted to get rid of the program that helps these families who cannot afford connectivity. I am not surprised because some members on the other side don't even support the ACP program.

But blocking the committee progress will have serious consequences. For example, this legislation also funded a program called Rip and Replace to remove Chinese spyware from our telecom system.

Some providers in rural communities and telecom networks don't have the resources to, as we say, rip out the Chinese spyware and replace it with American products. This legislation would also help them.

Releasing more spectrum also would lead to greater adoption of new technologies like the Open RAN system—another alternative to an open system that would help our telecommunication providers upgrade our infrastructure to new spectrum and get rid of the Chinese technology. Getting more of the secure technology will protect our communities from network adversaries and allow Americans to be in the lead again on telecommunications network equipment.

Additionally, the all-of-government approach to spectrum management in this bill allows the United States to maintain our commercial and military leadership around the globe, including at important standard-setting bodies where adversaries are going to make inroads.

This bill would have funded a historical investment in our technology advancements that we voted for in the CHIPS and Science Act, particularly in what are called EPSCoR States, tech hubs, and essential programs to maintaining U.S. competitiveness.

There is no way that "rip and replace" should be a partisan issue. We don't want Chinese spyware in our telecom system. There is no way that ACP—affordable connectivity for people who can't afford it—should be a partisan issue. This is about tackling the cost of expensive broadband for the working poor, and it should not be a partisan issue.

Pushing ahead with grant funding enhances America's innovation and competitiveness, it protects our national security, and it helps us with the economic innovation we all want to see happen throughout the United States.

I hope my colleagues will stop with obstructing and get back to negotiating on important legislation that will deliver these national security priorities and help Americans continue to have access to something as essential as affordable broadband.

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

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

BUMP ACT OF 2023

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I am proud to come to the floor today to stand with my good friend and a great leader on this issue, Senator MARTIN HEINRICH, on a matter of life and death.

A few days ago, the MAGA Supreme Court struck once again, reversing a ban on dangerous bump stocks like the one used in the Las Vegas shooting—the deadliest mass shooting ever committed by one person.

Today, the Senate must step into the breach and pass a Federal ban on bump stocks, which Senator HEINRICH has championed. I urge Republicans not to block this commonsense safety measure.

Banning bump stocks should be the work of 5 minutes. It is an idea that even some conservative Senators have claimed to support in the past. One conservative colleague of mine on the Republican side said a while ago that if a bump stock ban "actually gets on the Senator floor, I'd vote for it."

The senior Senator from South Carolina also said:

I think doing away with bump stocks, that's achievable. . . . I'm willing to get rid of that.

Senate Republicans even supported Donald Trump when he, hardly a friend of gun safety, backed bump stocks after the Las Vegas shooting. If banning bump stocks was good enough for Republicans in the past, it should be good enough for them today.

But if Republicans block this bill today after claiming to support bump stock bans in years past—a ban even President Trump supported when he was President—shame on them. They would be siding with the gun lobby over families exasperated by gun violence.

Mr. President, it is amazing to me that the MAGA Supreme Court even went to the right of Donald Trump on this issue. It is surprising, appalling, and very, very hard to swallow that they would have this kind of reasoning.

If Republicans now believe a ban on bump stocks is simply too much, they should explain their change of heart to the families in Nevada who lost loved ones. If Republicans block this bill today after claiming to support bump stock bans in years past, shame on them. Republicans should explain to parents and teachers and students why they would rather make it easier for murderers to access dangerous weapons instead of making it harder. It is not enough for Republicans to roll their eyes and dismiss this bump stock vote as a show vote. Tell that to the families who lost loved ones.

I urge Republicans not to object. Americans are sick of gun violence. They are especially sick of lawmakers who obey the gun lobby and kill any effort to make our communities safer.

I want to thank my friend and great leader in the Senate MARTIN HEINRICH on this and so many other issues,

whether it is conservation or environment or protecting the rights of people or just helping New Mexico in every way, as he is now vowing to help them with the fires that are ravaging in his State. The Senator from New Mexico is one of our great leaders here, and I am so proud to yield to him to make the unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

SOUTH FORK AND SALT FIRES IN NEW MEXICO

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I want to begin today before we get to bump stocks by acknowledging the South Fork and Salt fires that have forced literally thousands from their homes in Lincoln County, NM, and the Mescalero Apache Nation over the last 24 hours.

I was actually just at the White House discussing these fires with Homeland Security Advisor Elizabeth Sherwood-Randall. These are no-joke fires. They are large, they are fast-moving, and they are threatening thousands of people's homes today.

I know that many are worried that they may have already lost their homes, their property, their businesses, their animals. My thoughts are with every single one of you.

I want to extend my extraordinary thanks to the wildland firefighters, the first responders, local and Tribal leaders who are working right now to protect New Mexicans. I am also grateful to all the surrounding communities that have already welcomed thousands of their neighbors.

In times of need, New Mexicans look out for each other, and I know that we will do everything possible to help our fellow New Mexicans through this immediate emergency and the recovery in the months and years ahead.

I want to stress the importance for everyone in the impacted area to please heed evacuation orders and follow directions from local authorities. Please do everything you can to stay safe.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1909

Mr. President, I am also here today to make a UC request for the Senate to consider my legislation, the Banning Unlawful Machinegun Parts or BUMP Act.

Nearly 7 years ago on October 1, 2017, more than 20,000 people gathered for a large outdoor music festival. It was the third day in a row that folks from all around the country joined their friends and family to hear music from some of their favorite musicians. No one could have anticipated the nightmare that was about to unfold that day.

Just after 10 o'clock at night, thousands were listening to the final performance of the night. And then over the music, they started to hear what at first people thought were fireworks. Rapid gunfire rained down on the crowd with shots so close together they seemed to almost bleed into each other. Complete panic erupted. And for the next terrifying 10 minutes, concertgoers ran in every direction,

searching for cover where there was none—some falling down next to bleeding friends and dying loved ones, others fleeing desperately trying to reach safety.

In total, the shooter fired more than 1,000 rounds of ammunition in just 10 minutes. He killed 58 people that night, injured hundreds more, including 2 more who ultimately perished from their wounds. It was and is the deadliest mass shooting in American history.

The Las Vegas gunman was able to murder and injure so many people so quickly because he used a deadly device known as a bump stock. Bump stocks are an attachment that modify semiautomatic firearms to dramatically increase their rate of fire, allowing them to operate as fully automatic weapons. They make it possible to shoot hundreds of rounds a minute. And let me be real clear, as a firearms owner myself, there is no legitimate use for a bump stock—not for self-defense, not in a law enforcement context, not even in military applications as they are less accurate than a standard fully automatic military platform.

But what they are tailor-made for is a mass shooting. I know there are people who will say: Guns don't kill people. People kill people. But the reality is this: Bump stocks kill and injure in the hundreds.

As someone who has owned and used firearms for most of my life for hunting, sport, for self-defense, I know for a fact that bump stocks serve no legitimate purpose. And that is why in the days and weeks that followed the horrific mass shooting in Las Vegas, NV, I led a bipartisan effort to ban bump stocks. I introduced legislation in the Senate alongside my Republican colleague and friend Jeff Flake of Arizona and Nevada's Senator CATHERINE CORTEZ MASTO. We also called on then-President Trump to use his authority to ban bump stocks in a Federal rule. President Trump actually agreed with us at the time and finalized an ATF rule to get that done.

But last week, our wildly out-of-touch Supreme Court majority invalidated that rule. In an illogical and deadly ruling, they made bump stocks legal once again.

As Justice Sotomayor said in her dissent, "When I see a bird that walks like a duck, swims like a duck, quacks like a duck, I call that bird a duck."

I agree with Justice Sotomayor. A bump stock-equipped semiautomatic rifle is a machinegun, and it should be banned just like machineguns have been banned for nearly 100 years.

Even still, within the Supreme Court majority's ruling, they gave Congress—they gave us—clear direction on the only way for us to protect Americans from these deadly devices. Congress needs to act. We need to pass my bill to ban bump stocks and do it now.

I am proud to lead the Banning Unlawful Machinegun Parts, or BUMP Act, alongside Senators like CATHERINE

CORTEZ MASTO, SUSAN COLLINS, ANGUS KING, and the more than 20 new cosponsors who joined our legislation after the Supreme Court's recent ruling. This is the same bipartisan bill that I first introduced in 2018 in the aftermath of that shooting.

The BUMP Act would prohibit the sale of bump stocks and other devices that allow semiautomatic firearms to increase the rate of fire and operate as fully automatic weapons. This is something that nearly all Americans agree should be done.

This should be a commonsense, bipartisan public safety vote that all of us should welcome if we believe that our kids should have the freedom to feel safe in their church or their classroom or their movie theater.

We should also be clear about what happens if we don't pass this legislation. We will be giving a free pass to street gangs and cartels and mass shooters to access these deadly devices and turn them against our communities. That is the harm that we are putting our communities in.

There is some skepticism out there about whether Congress can get this done, about whether all of us coming together to ban bump stocks is impossible. But 2 years ago, we proved that type of thinking is flat wrong. Over my time here in the Senate, I have learned that people are always quick to tell you there is no path forward for your legislation. And the reality is that there is never a path forward until we collectively choose to make one.

I was proud to be part of the core group of bipartisan negotiators here in the Senate that helped pass the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. That was the first significant Federal gun safety legislation signed into law in nearly three decades. During those negotiations, I worked especially close with my colleague Senator COLLINS on a successful effort to increase criminal penalties for those who would put guns into the hands of criminals and to make it illegal to traffic firearms out of our country. And by passing that law, we proved that Congress can take concrete action to protect our communities from gun violence.

Now, it is time that we take similar bipartisan action to ban these bump stocks. For my part, I refuse to stand idly by and wait for the next mass shooting. I would ask all of my colleagues to please support the BUMP Act to ban these deadly mass killing devices once and for all.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 1909, the Banning Unlawful Machinegun Parts Act, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. RICKETTS. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. RICKETTS. Welcome to another day of the Democratic summer of show votes. We need to be clear why the majority leader is holding this show vote. The Supreme Court made a decision last week he didn't like. A 6-to-3 majority Supreme Court ruled the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives overstepped their authority when they tried to reclassify bump stocks as machineguns. The Supreme Court made the right decision. In January, I joined Senator LUMMIS and other colleagues filing an amicus brief urging the Supreme Court to do what they did.

But the majority leader and his Democratic colleagues supported the gun-grabbing overreach. The majority leader decided to bring up a bill called the BUMP Act. He claims this bill will ban bump stocks. Just like his previously misnamed bills, if you actually read the bill, that is not what it does at all.

The BUMP Act targets common firearm accessories, not just bump stocks. This is from the text of the bill. The bill bans "any manual, power-driven, or electronic device primarily designed, or redesigned, so that when the device is attached to a semiautomatic firearm, the device—[i] materially increases the rate of fire on the firearm."

In short, this doesn't ban bump stocks. This bill would ban literally any item that makes a firearm easier and, in some cases, safer to shoot. We are talking about competition or adjustable triggers.

We are also talking about items that reduce the distance between a shooter's hand or trigger, like certain firearm stocks and grips. It is not just about bump stocks. That is why the disabled veterans hate this bill. I have heard about veterans in Nebraska who are concerned about this bill. Sometimes veterans who are disabled or elderly choose to adjust the stock or grip on a firearm to make it easier and safer to shoot. The Constitution protects their right to do so through the Second Amendment.

This bill would take that constitutional right away from the same men and women who fought for our Constitution.

The other problem with this bill is it doesn't even define what it is trying to regulate. The bill uses the phrase "rate of fire" 500 times. Three of those times the bill said it would ban a device that materially increases the rate of fire in the firearm. Nowhere in the bill does it define what constitutes the "rate of fire" increase.

The other two times, it says it would ban a device that approximates the action of a rate of fire of a machinegun. But under Federal law, it is not the rate of fire that makes something a machinegun. Under 26 U.S.C. 5845(b), it is a mechanical function.

So either this "rate of fire" section was written by someone who had no

idea what they are talking about, or it is a cynical attempt to include more firearm accessories than just bump stocks. I would bet the latter.

And let's be honest. Does anyone seriously believe this lawless Biden administration would interpret this law in a way that respects law-abiding gun owners? Not.

On this and other issues, the Biden administration has repeatedly expanded previous interpretations of our laws in ways that go far beyond what even the Obama administration was coupled with, and they were no friends of the Second Amendment. We cannot allow unelected bureaucrats at the ATF to abuse their authority and interpret laws in ways Congress clearly never intended.

So this bill may be called the BUMP Act, but it is not really about bump stocks. This bill is about banning as many firearm accessories as possible, giving the ATF broad authority to ban most semiautomatic firearms. It is an unconstitutional attack on law-abiding gun owners. Under this bill, owners of any semiautomatic firearm that has been modified to make it easier to fire will be forced to register their firearms alongside actual machineguns in the ATF's National Firearm Registration and Transfer RECORD Database. And if they don't, they would be in violation of the law. That is really, really scary.

If this bill becomes law, it would give the Biden administration the authority to force confiscation of any common semiautomatic firearm that has been modified to make it easier to shoot.

The majority leader knows this bill will not pass. It won't pass because enough people in this building still believe in the Constitution, and the Constitution affords Americans the right to own a firearm. This vague, overreaching bill directly infringes upon that right.

For safety, we ought to better enforce existing gun laws and address mental health issues. This bill doesn't do that. In fact, it doesn't do anything to address the root causes of gun violence. We are not addressing mental health or cultural issues driving men and women to commit these horrible crimes—the failed family structures, the depression, the division and glorification of violence on social media.

If Democrats really cared about gun violence, they would be trying to build support for a bill that could actually pass. Instead, we have a show vote on a bill that uses vague language to ban as many firearms accessories as possible and limit the Second Amendment rights of disabled and elderly Americans who may need certain accessories to use a firearm safely.

We should be working on things that actually keep America safe, like the National Defense Authorization Act.

For these reasons, therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I just want to remind our colleagues that we

actually did pass legislation, 2 years ago, to invest in mental health, and we passed a meaningful gun safety piece of legislation. But the assertion that this would ban some enormous number of firearm devices is certainly not rooted in fact. It would, however, ban bump stocks, and it would ban things like Glock switches, which also let semiautomatic firearms act as fully automatic firearms.

I think the American people understand what commonsense gun safety looks like, and that is what the BUMP Act is all about.

And I will reserve the rest of my time, but this will not be the last time you hear about these devices on the floor of the Senate.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

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

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

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise today to express my deep disappointment of what I just heard, unfortunately, from my Senate colleague from Nebraska, Senator PETE RICKETTS, who blocked Senator HEINRICH's and mine and Senator COLLINS' legislation—common sense—that would save lives. And I am talking about S. 1909, which is the Banning Unlawful Machinegun Parts Act, or what we are calling the BUMP Act.

Now, it is shocking to me that my colleagues aren't willing to move forward on such an important issue. Bump stocks are deadly firearm accessories that turn semiautomatics guns into machineguns, which are illegal, allowing a shooter to fire multiple bullets per second.

Now, my husband and I are gun owners. We don't need a bump stock. And I know any commonsense gun owner doesn't have a bump stock. What do you need it for? They are dangerous. They are incredibly deadly devices that have no place on our streets.

And I will tell you what, I know firsthand the damage that bump stocks can do because, nearly 7 years ago, when I was a brandnew Senator and had just been elected, in 2017, Las Vegas, my hometown, experienced the deadliest mass shooting in American history because of bump stocks.

On October 1, 2017, a gunman opened fire at the Route 91 Harvest Festival in my hometown of Las Vegas. He had outfitted his weapons with bump stocks, allowing him to spray over 1,000 bullets into the crowd of concertgoers. And when I say "sprayed," he was in a hotel room, knocked out the window—and it wasn't just a spray of bullets; it was raining down bullets on concertgoers below. It was intentional.

In 10 minutes—10 minutes with that bump stock—he murdered 58 people.

And 867 total people were wounded. Half of those people, 411, were wounded by gunshots, including 2 who later died as a result of their injuries. Think about that. Almost 470 people hit by bullets in under 10 minutes.

Now, I want you to imagine the terror all of those families must have felt. Unfortunately, I don't have to imagine it because I experienced it. My niece was at that concert that night. And I know exactly where I was when I found out she was there; I know exactly where I was when I found out she was safe.

And later on that evening, I went to the family reunification center and sat with those families who were waiting to hear from the coroner, who was in the back room, whether their loved one was in that back room.

Now, I am thankful that my niece was not hit by one of those bullets. But too many were either killed or hit by bullets or suffered emotional distress because of it.

I will never forget that night. I will never forget those families. It is heartbreaking. You could see their hopelessness in the room at the number of deaths and injuries being reported on TV as it continued to grow, waiting to hear.

I have to explain this because too much happens here in Washington, DC, that we just think, Oh, this is a number, or, This happened in some other community. When I am talking about raining down bullets on concertgoers, think about this: As I talked to the doctors afterwards in the emergency rooms—the people that were injured, because it rained down, it came down on their heads. It came down on their body parts. It came down in devastating locations for people who actually survived that event but were wounded.

Our hospitals were overrun. Nevadans, including me, we stood in line at blood banks for hours because there was such a need for blood in the hospitals for so many who had been injured.

And as I have said, I talked to the doctors treating these injuries, and they described to me the scene that night was like a battlefield—a battlefield, the blood everywhere, the blood on the floor. The people who picked up bodies and took them to emergency rooms, they weren't literally ambulances that were picking these people up; these were concertgoers. These were people who grabbed people to save them, put them in their own vehicles, and took them to the closest hospital.

That was what was happening that night because somebody had a bump stock, because somebody thought it was OK to outfit their guns with bump stocks so they could kill more people in rapid succession.

Now, understanding this—because this happened October 2017. We had a new President at the time; President Trump was the President at the time. Former President Trump directed his

administration to ban these bump stocks. And I tell you, President Trump came out to Las Vegas at that time. He saw. He heard.

He banned the devices because he said:

Legal weapons into illegal machine guns.

That is what these bump stocks do: They turn "legal weapons into illegal machine guns."

Now, I believe the Supreme Court was wrong to overturn the Trump administration bump stock ban. But now that it has been struck down, it is on Congress to pass legislation to keep our community safe from these deadly devices.

Now, the reason why we went through ATF and the Trump administration asked ATF was because that was the quickest way that we could do it administratively, the quickest way we could take action and keep people safe.

Now, in the most recent decision, Justice Sam Alito said it himself in his concurring opinion in the case. He said it is within Congress's power to make this right. This is from his concurring opinion:

The horrible shooting spree in Las Vegas in 2017 did not change the statutory text or its meaning. That event demonstrated that a semiautomatic rifle with a bump stock can have the same lethal effect as a machine gun.

But an event that highlights the need to amend a law does not itself change the law's meaning.

And Justice Alito went on to say:

There is a simple remedy for the disparate treatment of bump stocks and machine guns. Congress can amend the law—and perhaps would have done so already if ATF had stuck with its earlier interpretation.

Now that the situation is clear, Congress can act.

So to my colleague from Nebraska, this is not a show vote. If you were here when I was here back then, we were trying to move as quickly as possible to get something done to save lives. First administratively, couldn't do it according to the Court now. I disagree with the Court; this is a machinegun. But the Court now has put it back, back really in our realm to do something about it. And I cannot imagine any one of my colleagues standing there saying they wouldn't want to do the right thing here to continue to save lives. I don't think they want to turn a blind eye to what happened in Las Vegas. I don't think they want to turn a blind eye to the 411 people that were shot at the Route 91 Harvest Festival, the 60 who were murdered by gunfire, and the thousands of families throughout our country whose lives have been tragically upended because of bump stocks.

If we can't do something as Congress and come together in a bipartisan issue that not just Nevadans but people in this country understand, then that is disappointing and irresponsible, and it is negligent. It is negligent.

So to my Republican colleagues, if you want to do something about this

and you are not happy with the Bump Stock Act that MARTIN HEINRICH just put forward, which I think addresses all of the issues, then let's figure out how we can get this done because it is our role now to do it. And we shouldn't stop working to right this wrong.

I will tell you, I am going to keep pushing this bill to keep our communities safe. I am going to continue to work with anyone who wants to eradicate bump stocks from this country once and for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 204

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, I will ask for a unanimous consent to pass my Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. This is a very simple bill, and it should be a noncontroversial one. It simply says that a baby born alive after an attempted abortion is entitled to the same protection and medical care that any other newborn baby is entitled to.

That is all. It doesn't limit abortion. It doesn't make abortion illegal. It simply states that a baby born alive after an attempted abortion is entitled to medical care, and yet somehow this bill is too much for my Democratic colleagues. Somehow saying that a living, breathing baby born alive after an attempted abortion is entitled to medical care is a step too far.

I would be interested to know exactly what it is that they are afraid of, and I suspect they are afraid that by pointing to the humanity of the born child, they might end up pointing to the humanity of the unborn child. After all, it makes no sense to say that a baby is not a human being a second before birth and is a human being a second after.

And so I suspect that Democrats are afraid that recognizing the humanity of a living, breathing, born child in an abortion clinic might end up leading to protection for unborn children.

And Democrats are apparently so determined to ensure that the supposed right to kill unborn children is protected that they are willing to oppose a law to protect born children.

It is a tragic measure of their extremism on this issue. And if anyone thinks that abortion isn't a slippery slope, that we can somehow devalue unborn babies' lives while maintaining respect for everyone else's, well, I am here to tell them differently, because we are at a point where roughly 50 percent of the U.S. Congress opposes protecting the lives of born human beings if they happen to be born alive after an attempted abortion.

In a matter of seconds now, one of my Democratic colleagues will object to this legislation. But I hope and pray that this will not be the last word and that, one day soon, we will get to a point where legislation like this will not be controversial and where human rights of every human being, born and unborn, will be respected.

So, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 204 and that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I further ask 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. Is there objection?

The Senator from California.

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I rise in opposition to the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Despite what our Republican colleagues propose, the contents of this legislation would yield harmful impacts on patients and providers. This bill creates new and vague standards of care for physicians, providing reproductive healthcare that are not based in medicine, not based in science, and not based in fact.

It goes to unnecessary lengths to penalize doctors and patients for so-called substandard care when current Federal law already ensures doctors the obligation to provide appropriate medical care to all their patients.

This bill fails to consider a serious reality for expectant parents. Too often some parents learn late in their pregnancy that their baby wouldn't survive due to factors beyond their control. At that point, parents are often placed in a position to make one of the most difficult decisions of their lives, which is to end the pregnancy at the delivery of their baby.

That is why my Democratic colleagues and I have taken to the Senate floor over the last few weeks to plead with our Republican colleagues about protecting a patient's right to choose what to do with their own bodies.

But this bill is an attempt to once again drag our Nation backwards, and I refuse to sit idly by and watch it happen.

For those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Mississippi.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4533

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, in a few moments, I would like to ask unanimous consent for the Senate to take up and pass legislation I have introduced to support genuine solutions to infertility and empower couples with autonomy over how they build their families.

First, I want to take a moment to recognize the second anniversary of the Dobbs decision, a ruling that underscores the great significance of bringing life into this world. It still doesn't feel real that we were able to overturn Roe. What a blessing for this country that that was.

However, we are still fighting daily to protect Americans from the harmful pro-abortion agenda being pushed by the Democrats. Pro-abortion advocates have been creative in spreading fear by

using issues that Republicans support, such as access to IVF.

I have been clear about my strong support for access to IVF and am grateful for its ability to bring God's beautiful creations into this world. And while the left wants to stoke fear in this arena, it is time that we hone in on the real problem and find long-lasting, affordable solutions.

Infertility affects 15 to 16 percent of couples in the United States and is a profoundly emotional experience. While IVF is a procedure used to create life, it does not treat the underlying conditions that cause infertility and make it difficult for a woman to sustain that life in the womb.

If we are going to address the issue of infertility, then we need to start with solutions that promote genuine healing. This is the mission behind the RESTORE Act, which I introduced with Senator LANKFORD last week. "RESTORE" stands for reproductive empowerment and support through optimal restoration.

Provisions of this budget-neutral bill include: educational tools for women seeking information about reproductive health conditions and restorative reproductive medicine, training opportunities for medical professionals who feel called to help couples build their families.

They will learn how to diagnose and treat reproductive health conditions such as endometriosis, PCOS, uterine fibroids, blocked fallopian tubes, hormone imbalances, and thyroid conditions, ovulation dysfunctions, and other health conditions that cause infertility and painful menstrual cycles.

The RESTORE Act also directs HHS to conduct data collection and implement ongoing reports to assess the access women have to restorative reproductive medicine and infertility care.

We also ensure strong religious and conscience protections in the bill. What we are trying to do here is promote long-term healing for couples struggling with infertility. We want to empower childbearing generations so that families can address fertility concerns in a cost-effective manner.

This bill is separate and complementary to IVF. We have seen great success numbers come from fertility clinics that take a holistic approach to healing the root cause of infertility, and if IVF is still necessary, these clinics see a greater success rate in the first round of IVF.

This pro-family bill is one more step toward increasing successful fertility treatments for women and men.

I will continue to support those going through infertility and search for ways to help families who dreamed of bringing children into this world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 4533 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time

and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and with respect for my colleague Senator HYDE-SMITH with whom I serve on the Agriculture Committee, I fear this bill is another attempt to distract from the truth, which is that Republicans are trying to make it harder for women to access reproductive healthcare.

Now, this bill purports to empower and support women and families facing fertility challenges—something that I would certainly agree with. But instead of protecting access to IVF services and other assisted reproductive technologies, what it would do is to direct the government to actually steer people away from using evidence-based services like IVF in favor of "restorative reproductive medicine."

Now, let me be clear, women and their families deserve the freedom and the autonomy to decide for themselves how to start and grow their families in consultation with their doctors, and they don't need politicians deciding what kind of care they should or shouldn't be getting.

But if you need more evidence, the Republicans are trying to distort their record on these issues, look no further than section 2 of this bill, which would declare that Congress finds that "in vitro fertilization and other assisted reproductive technologies are not under threat at the Federal level or in any State or territory of the United States." That is in section 2.

I would say: Tell that to the families in Alabama who saw their fertility treatments interrupted by the Alabama Supreme Court's ruling.

Just last week, all but two Republicans voted against a bill that would have provided comprehensive protections for American families trying to start or grow their families through IVF.

So when they present bills like this one as evidence that they care about women's reproductive health, they should remember that in these situations, actions speak louder than words.

And their message here is clear: Republicans will do anything, except the most obvious things, to protect women, pregnant women, mothers, and families.

So for those reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I want to commend my friends and colleagues from Mississippi and South Dakota and Oklahoma for their leadership in protecting the lives of the unborn and to thank them for bringing us together in this fight for life.

Two years have passed since the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, a controversial decision that found no

basis in the text or history of the Constitution, a right that was simply made up by the nine members of the Supreme Court.

What they have done is to return the power where it belongs, to the people of the various States to protect unborn children.

And I dare say the rule in Massachusetts will be different than Texas, and you may find some different lines being drawn. But make no mistake about it, we are here to stand with the unborn who have rights of their own.

America cannot be at its best if we devalue the lives of the most vulnerable among us. They deserve protection under the law too. And that is what we are fighting to deliver.

Make no mistake, those on the other side of the aisle want abortion on demand, without limit, up to and including the point of a live birth. That is a position overwhelmingly disapproved of by the vast majority of the American people.

The Declaration of Independence guarantees the right to life. That includes the unborn, just as it does every other American.

So I am proud to stand here in defense of that right, and I am proud to stand with my colleagues today as we fight to safeguard that right, to the best of our ability.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4296

Mrs. BRITT. Mr. President, first, I would like to thank my colleague from Oklahoma, Senator LANKFORD, for putting this together today, showing that we are truly the party of life, the party of parents, the party of families.

I would also like to thank my colleague from Florida, Senator RUBIO, and my colleague from North Dakota, Senator CRAMER, for joining me in introducing the MOMS Act.

I also appreciate the 20 additional Republican colleagues who cosponsored this commonsense legislation.

The MOMS Act is straightforward. It stands for “More Opportunities for Moms to Succeed.” That is exactly what this bill would secure. As a mom, I know that there is no greater blessing in this world than that of being a mother.

And I understand many of the challenges that women face during their pregnancy journey and while raising their kids. And that is why I was proud to introduce the MOMS Act.

The MOMS Act would provide critical support for women during simple challenging phases of motherhood. It includes the prenatal, postpartum, and early childhood development stages. At the end of the day, this legislation would help mothers and their children thrive.

Let's walk through the three sections of the bill.

First, the MOMS Act would establish pregnancy.gov. This new website would feature a wide range of resources available to expecting and postpartum

moms as well as moms and families with young children.

Unfortunately, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have put out flagrantly false, outlandish information about this part of the bill. These partisan smears have been debunked by several independent fact checks. But I also want to set the record straight right now.

First, visiting this website is 100 percent voluntary.

Next, no one would have to disclose personally identifiable information to use it or to access the list of its resources. There is no database of women created; there is no registry established; and there is no tracking involved.

So why did Democrats make up these absurdly false claims? To be honest with you, I can't quite wrap my head around it.

In my 18 months in this body, I probably have never been more disappointed. I understand that we come to things from different perspectives, but to create outlandishly false and absurd things about this bill was truly a bridge too far. But ultimately, they know they can't publicly oppose what is actually in the bill.

Here are the types of resources pregnancy.gov would connect women and families to. And I am going quote some exact texts of the bill.

So mentorship opportunities, including pregnancy and parenting help, help and well-being services, including women's medical services. This includes OB-GYN services, primary care, dental care, and mental health services, financial assistance, work opportunities, childcare resources, foster care resources, adoption services, education opportunities for parents.

I could go on.

It also includes material or legal support. That material support includes: transportation, food, nutrition, clothing, household goods, baby supplies, housing, shelters, maternity homes, help with tax preparation, and more.

Also, legal support can cover: child support, family leave, breastfeeding protections, and custody issues.

I could keep listing examples of resources, but we would be here for a while.

Next, I want to touch on the second part of the bill. So this part of it would actually create two separate grant programs.

One grant program would help purchase necessary tools for prenatal and postnatal telehealth appointments, including medical equipment and technology for those in rural areas and other medically underserved areas. And the second program would establish a grant program for nonprofit entities to support, to encourage, and to assist women through their pregnancies, and to care for their babies after birth.

The grant program would be funding many of the resources I just named: mental health services, other medical care, childcare, housing assistance,

education and employment assistance, and nutritional assistance.

And, finally, the third part of the bill is Senator CRAMER's Unborn Child Support Act. It would require States to apply childcare support obligations to the time period during pregnancy if it was requested by the mother. This would be requested retroactively. And State-level requirements involving proof of paternity would still apply.

The legislation is further evidence that you can absolutely be pro-life, pro-woman, and pro-family all at the same time. The MOMS Act advances a comprehensive culture of life. It grows and strengthens families and ensures that moms have the opportunities and the resources needed so that they and their children can thrive and live the American dreams.

It is a perfect example of why I believe that the Republican Party is the party of families. What you are going to hear after I make my motion to pass the MOMS Act will be very telling about whether or not Democrats can say the same thing of their party.

They are about to answer that question: Are they more interested in scaring women and families or helping women and families? Personally, I am proud to support women throughout the seasons of motherhood, and I am honored to lead this pro-life, pro-woman, pro-family legislation.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 4296 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, with respect to my colleague and friend Senator BRITT, this bill is another attempt to shift the narrative for Republicans away from the fact that they have blocked every attempt to pass bills that would actually protect women's reproductive health and freedom.

By overwhelming majorities, Americans support protecting acts such as contraception, IVF, assisted reproductive technologies, and safe, legal abortion care. Republicans know that they are out of step with the American people, and that is what we are seeing here today.

Ever since President Trump's Supreme Court overturned Roe with the disastrous Dobbs decision, women's healthcare in this country has been thrown into chaos, and every day we hear more stories of the cruelty brought by these Trump Republican abortion bans across the country.

The solution to this problem is simple and obvious: Congress should pass comprehensive protections for contraception, for IVF, and for reproductive freedom. But, instead, Republicans have

been blocking those bills and are putting forward bills like this one, which would create a Federal Government website, among other things, that functions basically as a crisis pregnancy center. To be clear, healthcare providers who provide information about the full range of their options to women, including abortion care, would be blocked from this website.

This website would allow women to put into the website their ZIP Code, and they could then find a list of resources for adoption agencies and crisis pregnancy centers, which, I think we know, can intentionally mislead and pressure and shame pregnant women against seeking abortion care and sometimes even block them from accessing that care.

I want to be clear that this bill does not require anybody to put in their contact information, but it also does not include any restrictions on how the Federal Government could use or share that data that people input.

I don't think Americans need another government website. What they need is for their government to respect their freedom and their dignity and their autonomy to make their own decisions about if, when, and how to grow their families.

For this reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Alabama.

Mrs. BRITT. Mr. President, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague from Minnesota. However, I am disappointed that Senate Democrats have blocked the MOMS Act from passing today. It is a commonsense bill that would help vulnerable women and help families. My Republican colleagues are going to continue to fight for tangible solutions like this bill that do just that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, my guess is, if I went to every person in this room—every page, every person sitting in the Gallery, every Senator—and I pointed to this image and said, “What do you see there?” my guess is every person in this room would go, “Well, that is a baby.”

That is my guess. I mean, I haven't asked every person here, but my guess is every person would look at it, and they would go: Well, that is a sonogram of a baby.

That is what I would say: It looks like a child to me.

So the issue here in America and the next question is: Should it live or die?

The first answer is pretty obvious: That is a baby.

The second question is: Should it live or die?

That one, in America, is not quite so obvious anymore.

You know, what is interesting is that I have two daughters. They are amazing, remarkable, beautiful women. They are adults now, but I distinctly

remember that pregnancy test and seeing those little lines on that test, and my wife and I looking at each other with excitement.

I distinctly remember talking to friends and her parents and other folks, saying that we are pregnant. And as we shared our story, I don't remember a single person saying to me: Well, you are pregnant. What are you going to do with it? Are they going to live or die?

No one asked us that. No one asked us: Is it really a baby or is that just a fetus? No one said: You just have tissue.

They asked us questions like: Have you thought of a name? Have you figured out how to install the car seat yet?

Those are the questions they asked us because, every person we talked to and every person with whom we shared the news that we were pregnant, all acknowledged that reality that that is a baby.

Two years ago, the Supreme Court ruled on what is now called the Dobbs decision. It took away the Roe v. Wade decision that mandated that abortion had to be everywhere in the country and took it back to where it was for the first 180 years or so of our country, when the law was that the rules about abortion are handled in each State. That is all it did.

It didn't end abortion in America. We still have abortion in America, in very high numbers. But the decision of how that is done was not done by a Supreme Court. It was done by legislators, as it always had been. And that is what the Court said. So this is now going back to the people and the people's representatives on all levels.

So the debate is, again, scattered all across the country now, and the debate is very simply over: Is that a child? And if it is a child, what should happen to it?

I have to tell you, that baby is not mine, but she is really cute. I look at a baby like that—my daughters both slept in that same position, which we, as parents, call the touchdown position, where they both have their hands up above their heads. I am amazed at this picture of the sonogram to see that infant in the womb in that exact same position asleep.

I think the only difference between this child in the womb sleeping with her hands over her head and this child is time. That is it. That baby is as much of a baby as that baby is a baby. There is no difference there, other than time.

So we debate, and we talk about this very complicated question: When is a child valuable, and when is a child medical waste? When is a child valuable, and when is a child disposable?

We, as Americans, are grappling with that issue. The issue about when that child is a child really comes down to preference and convenience and to determine if the child is convenient. If they are convenient, then they are a child. If they are not convenient, then they are disposable.

If two ladies are walking down the same street—both of them, let's say, 18 weeks pregnant—and of those two ladies on opposite sides of the street, one of them steps into her workplace and into a baby shower, the folks at work are going to talk about how to install a car seat. They are going to talk about: Where are you going to set up the crib? They are going to talk about baby names, and they are going to talk about all the expenses and things. And the person on the other side of the street, also 18 weeks pregnant, is headed to get a surgical abortion.

And so I ask the question: Of those two children, what is the difference between those two children? They are both at 18 weeks of development. One of them is being celebrated and prepared for, and one of them will be disposed of. What is the difference between the two?

We, as Americans, are trying to figure out the answer to that exact question. And the conversation is happening all across the country.

I get it. It is a fair conversation: When is a child a child? Or when are they not a child?

Well, under this administration—this administration, by far, has been the most pro-abortion administration ever in the history of the country. That is not just an opinion. That is just the actions of the administration. That has just been their response to the Dobbs decision.

This administration was so disturbed that we might have fewer abortions in America that the Biden administration has aggressively worked to increase the number of abortions in America to offset the possibility that there could be fewer abortions, because they didn't want to see fewer abortions in America. They wanted to see as many or more.

So the Biden administration opened up, for the first time, VA hospitals to provide abortions—even late-term abortions, even up to the very final months of a viable child. For those VA hospitals, it would be the first time that they would be able to provide abortions.

They are withholding funds for pregnancy resource centers. Now, these are the centers that they really hate the most. These are pregnancy resource centers around the country that offer crazy things like diapers and formula and support for pregnant moms—that if pregnant moms walk in and say, “Hey, I am really struggling with my pregnancy, and I am afraid,” they say, “We will walk with you. We will counsel you. We will give you free materials. We will help provide diapers and baby clothes and a car seat, and we will walk along with you so you don't have to be afraid and alone.”

The Biden administration really hates those folks. So they are withholding funds from any grants going to those folks where they have received grants in the past.

HHS is now paying to move people who illegally cross our southern border

to places—even teenagers—where they can get abortions, and we have Federal dollars going to be able to move people to make sure that those people who illegally cross our border who want access to abortion be able to get it. It has been frustrating to be able to watch.

Even in my State, my State has chosen to say: We think every child is valuable. We look at these two girls, and we see them just a couple of weeks apart. But we see them both as young girls. They kind of state the obvious.

But in my State, because we don't allow abortion and promote abortion, Health and Human Services has now stripped away grant dollars from my State for one reason. Health and Human Services came to my State and said: If you don't put a 1-800 number on all of your healthcare materials stemming from the State, telling women where they can get an abortion, we will take away your Federal funding. If you don't show and give a 1-800 number where you can get an abortion, we will take away your grant funding.

They didn't take away just any grant funding, because, by the way, my State said: We are not going to do that. So the grant funding they took away from my State was for impoverished women to get cancer screenings and for AIDS patients to get testing. They took that funding away, saying: We will not allow any Federal dollars coming into your State for AIDS testing and for cancer screening for impoverished women, if you don't promote abortion in your State.

They were serious. So they did it because this administration is obsessed with increasing the number of abortions in the country and finding ways to be able to expand this and telling people not to look at this picture.

It has been a frustrating journey, the last couple of years, because we seem to be ignoring the obvious. We are so tied up here on the politics of this, even when Senator THUNE brings a bill that says, if a child is born alive after a botched abortion—they are a fully delivered, full-term baby on the table breathing—what should we do?

That is a pretty commonsense bill. Yet my Democratic colleagues have knocked it down today and said: No, that child should not have the opportunity for life.

When Senator HYDE-SMITH brings a bill that just says, "Why don't we give education to more doctors and more moms about infertility"—it doesn't limit IVF at all, at all—they are like, "No, no, not going to do that."

When Senator BRITT from Alabama brings a bill that says: Why don't we recognize, during pregnancy, that that is really expensive, and if States have the requirement to do child support for a child—well, I will just say it: for a deadbeat dad who is not paying child support. If they walk away at that point, that child support should also cover the time of pregnancy, not just after delivery. That is pretty common sense because, for any mom, they know

pregnancy is really expensive. It is a very expensive time. So child support should begin when that child is there.

A commonsense bill that, I dare say, most Americans would say, "Well, that makes sense," has been knocked down today.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4524

Mr. President, I bring one more that I think is pretty common sense. It is already the law in the United States that every person has the right to conscience. Healthcare providers that go into the profession to protect life, to save life, to heal—many of them also say: I don't want to be a part of taking human life. I went into this profession to protect life.

So they express to their clinics, their hospitals—wherever they serve—that they don't want to be a part of the taking of human life. They understand that it is happening in their hospital; they just don't want to be a part of that. They express their conscience issues.

By the way, that is protected in Federal law right now, that every one of those healthcare providers has the right to be able to express their conscience and not be required to take human life. The problem is, it requires the Federal Government to actually step in and enforce that law.

So let me show you what that looks like. A nurse in Vermont, a few years ago, went into her hospital as she normally did, and as she went into her hospital, went into work as she normally does—she is a nurse that is passionate about the life of every person, including children in the womb, and she had expressed that to the hospital. She got caught as she was going in, saying: Hey, we need you in the ER right now.

She said: No problem.

So she steps into the ER to help with a procedure, gloves up, gets ready. She is going to go assist. As she walks in, the doctor that is in the room looks at her and says: Don't hate me.

She suddenly says: What is going on?

She realizes she is being called in to be able to assist with an abortion. She has already made it clear she doesn't want to be a part of taking human life.

The hospital says: No. We will fire you if you don't help. We need your help. We are short of staff today, so you are going to do this.

A direct violation of Federal law—clearly, no question. They expressed it in the operating room. They knew they were violating her conscience.

So the Federal Government goes through the process of starting to be able to enforce the law on that hospital—until the last Presidential election occurs. When the last Presidential election occurred, the new leadership of HHS stepped in and said: We are not going to enforce that. In other words, we are dropping that case.

It would be the equivalent of a police officer walking down the street, looking at a burglary that is happening, knowing that a crime is occurring

right there, and just saying, "I am going to choose not to enforce the law today," and just walking on by. That is what is happening right now.

So the Conscience Protection Act that I bring does a simple thing. It says that if an employer violates Federal law and the Federal Government chooses not to enforce this, the individual that has had their conscience violated—that individual has the right to be able to bring a case on their own.

This is not controversial. This would not eliminate a single abortion in America. We will not have one fewer abortion in America based on this policy. But what it will do is it will say to an American: You are free to be able to live your conscience without fear of being fired for living your conscience. That is the only thing it does. I think that is pretty straightforward and pretty common sense.

Of all things that we should be able to agree to in this body, let's protect each other's right to believe and to live our faith.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. 4524 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time, passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, let me just say that the crisis facing women and families in this country is a crisis of access with respect to healthcare. The solutions to this crisis are obvious, and I am sorry to see that our Republicans are blocking those solutions at every turn.

This bill claims to protect healthcare workers if they refuse to participate in abortion care due to moral or religious obligations, but, of course, we know that those protections already exist in Federal law. And I think this bill would actually go well beyond that. It would, in fact, create a pathway for providers to object to providing other critical prevention and treatment services—for example, treatment for HIV.

So I think this is another effort to distract Americans from the core fact that Republicans are trying to restrict access to reproductive health care and reproductive freedom while Democrats are trying to protect them. I, for those reasons, Mr. President, object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, we will continue to be able to speak out. We do believe that is a child. We believe in the dignity of every human being.

My wife, when we were pregnant—every single cell in her body—every cell—from her toenails and her toes and her nose and her elbows—every single cell in her body has the exact same

DNA. It has that signature of her. But when we were pregnant, suddenly there was a group of cells that had different DNA. They didn't match hers, and they didn't match mine. They were cells with DNA that had never existed on Earth before until that moment. They were uniquely different. I think we should acknowledge that fact in the days ahead, that there is something special about those different cells.

We will continue to speak up for the conscience rights of all individuals to be able to state the obvious and to be able to live their faith. I think in the days ahead we will have a time as Americans when we will look back on this season and think, why would we turn away from what was so obvious to all of us?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be allowed to speak prior to the scheduled rollcall vote: me for 5 minutes, Senator PETERS for up to 5 minutes, and Leader SCHUMER for up to 2 minutes.

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

The Senator from West Virginia.

ADVANCE ACT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, today, I rise to encourage and urge support for our bipartisan, bicameral legislation that provides a significant boost for the future of nuclear energy here in America. After a lot of hard work and negotiations, I am thrilled to be on the floor today as we are on the cusp of getting this bill across the finish line.

I see Senator WHITEHOUSE here, my friend from Rhode Island. He was very integral in making this happen today, so I thank him.

In March of 2023, we introduced the Accelerating Deployment of Versatile, Advanced Nuclear for Clean Energy Act, or what we call the ADVANCE Act. We did so because Republicans and Democrats recognize that the development of new nuclear technologies is critical to America's energy security and our environment.

Today, nuclear power provides about 20 percent of our Nation's electricity. Importantly, it is emissions-free electricity that is 24/7, 365 days a year.

Not only is it necessary to continue developing and deploying more nuclear energy reactors from an energy and environmental standpoint, it is also vital to our national security, and it is good for the economy.

So it was important for us as lawmakers to prepare to meet the increased demand—it is predicted to be twice the demand—with policies that encourage investment and deployment of nuclear technologies right here on our shores. The ADVANCE Act does just that and preserves the United States as the destination for innovation and expansion, ensuring that we are what we should be, which is the global leader, for decades to come.

Here are just a few of the ways our bill benefits America's energy, economic, and environmental future:

The ADVANCE Act reduces regulatory costs for companies seeking to license advanced reactor technologies.

It requires the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to establish a regulatory roadmap to license new nuclear facilities on brownfield sites—something that would be very important to my State of West Virginia.

It directs the NRC to update its mission statement to reflect the beneficial uses of nuclear technology and establish a licensing structure to support an efficient, timely, and predictable regulatory review.

It establishes an initiative to more quickly license advanced nuclear fuels that are both safer and more economic.

It provides the NRC new tools to hire and retain highly qualified staff to enable the licensing of advanced reactors.

As I said, I am proud of the work we put into this legislation over the past few months and years. With the House having already passed it overwhelmingly, I am excited that we are on the verge of sending the ADVANCE Act to the President's desk.

I want to thank Chairman CARPER, and I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE, who are my—the three of us—cosponsors. I want to thank House Energy and Commerce Chair McMORRIS RODGERS and Ranking Member PALLONE. I would like to thank House Energy, Climate, and Grid Security Subcommittee Chair DUNCAN and Ranking Member DIANA DEGETTE and all of our cosponsors for their hard work and support.

I also want to sincerely thank the staff members who have put so much work into this to help us get to this point today. This has been a journey. From my team at EPW, I would like to thank Andy Zach, Will Dixon, and Maddie Blalock; from Chairman CARPER's team, Matt Marzano and Courtney Taylor; and from Senator WHITEHOUSE's team, Kara Allen.

With that, I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bipartisan legislation.

With that, I yield the floor.

S. 870

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the Fire Grants and Safety Act, which is included in the bill we are considering today. I have co-led this bill with Senator PETERS and fellow Congressional Fire Caucus cochairs, Senators MURKOWSKI, TESTER, and CARPER.

The Fire Grants and Safety Act would reauthorize the U.S. Fire Administration and critical FEMA fire prevention programs through September 30, 2028. The current authorization for appropriations for all three of these entities expired on September 30, 2023, and the AFG and SAFER programs are set to sunset on September 30 of this year, absent action from Congress. This bill before us will extend authorizations for all three entities until September 30, 2028, and impose a new sun-

set clause of September 30, 2030, for AFG and SAFER.

This legislation, which passed the Senate on April 20, 2023, by an overwhelming vote of 95–2, has been pending in the House. I am pleased we will soon vote on the motion to concur with the House bill as amended and finally reauthorize these critical programs.

Firefighters across Maine and the country courageously and selflessly put their lives on the line to serve their towns and cities. Recognizing this, in 2000 and 2003, I helped create FEMA's firefighter grant programs as part of a bipartisan effort to ensure firefighters have the adequate staffing, equipment, and training to do their important jobs as effectively and safely as possible.

The Fire Grants and Safety Act would reauthorize three important firefighting and emergency services programs: the U.S. Fire Administration, which provides training and data to State and local departments, as well as education and awareness for the public; the Assistance for Firefighters Grant program, known as AFG, which helps equip and train firefighters and emergency personnel who work to keep us safe; and the Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response program, known as SAFER, which helps local fire departments recruit, hire, and retain additional firefighters.

Fire chiefs across Maine tell me about the importance of these programs in helping their local fire departments keep their communities safe. Since October 2020, fire departments across Maine received just under \$12 million from the AFG and SAFER grant programs. These critical investments in local, rural fire departments supported replacements of decades old fire engines, obsolete self-contained breathing apparatuses, hiring of additional firefighters, and allowed fire departments to provide free health screenings to firefighters.

In 2023, an AFG grant enabled the town of Allagash in rural Aroostook County, ME, to replace its nearly 50-year old GMC firetruck with a newer model with double the water pumping capacity. To put this into perspective, the town was operating a firetruck built the same year the Vietnam war ended, to respond to fires in its 134-square-mile response area—or as the Allagash fire chief put it, an area roughly equal to the size of Atlanta.

In Portland, ME, an AFG grant enabled Portland Fire Department's marine division to cover the cost of lung cancer screenings for its firefighters. If it hadn't been for these screenings, doctors may not have detected a precancerous spot on Lieutenant Dave Crowley's lung until it was too late.

These examples underscore how important these grant programs are for fire departments across the Nation to safely provide lifesaving services and keep our communities safe. Failure to reauthorize these programs would have devastating impacts to the safety of

Americans across the country. I urge my colleagues to support this bill's swift passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, soon, the Senate will have an opportunity to ensure that essential Federal resources remain available to fire departments all across our country.

Every day, firefighters risk their health and safety to protect our communities. They don't just respond to fire emergencies; they also help keep us safe from threats like chemical hazards, terrorist attacks, and even active shooters.

The Fire Grants and Safety Act gives our firefighters the support they deserve. This bipartisan legislation reauthorizes two vital grant programs administered by FEMA. These programs help fire departments purchase safety equipment, address staffing needs, train their staff, and provide cancer screenings to first responders.

The bill also reauthorizes the U.S. Fire Administration, which represents firefighters at the Federal level. The USFA helps ensure that our local fire departments get the proper support, and it takes the lead on data collection, research, education, and training for the fire service.

Federal programs like these enable fire departments to do their jobs safely and effectively, and I have seen it first-hand while visiting local departments across my home State of Michigan. Without these programs, many fire departments would simply not have the resources and equipment they need to stay safe in the line of duty. Every day, firefighters have our backs, and now we can do the same for them.

I would like to thank Ranking Member PAUL, Senator CARPER, Senator MURKOWSKI, and Senator COLLINS for their help in advancing this legislation. I would also like to acknowledge Chairman FRANK LUCAS and Ranking Member ZOE LOFGREN of the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology for their work to get this bill passed out of the House of Representatives.

Now it is time to finish the job. Let's finish the job and send this bipartisan legislation to the President and help firefighters everywhere keep our communities safe.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first, let me thank Senator PETERS, Senator WHITEHOUSE, and so many others for their great work on this.

Today, the Senate does a great thing for our firefighters in New York and across America by passing the bipartisan Fire Grants and Safety Act. The Fire Grants and Safety Act reauthorizes several expiring funding programs that help firefighters with the basics, from staffing to equipment, to training, and more. I was very proud to help create these programs a long time ago

with Senator Chris Dodd, but they would have expired in a few months had we not acted today. Today's bill keeps our firefighters whole.

This helps two kinds of firefighters. It helps our paid firefighters in larger cities by giving the ability of those communities to hire more firefighters, but it also particularly helps our volunteer firefighters. These are people who volunteer, who rush to danger in suburban and rural communities. They are particularly strong on Long Island, which I represent. Yet they can't afford and their communities can't afford the equipment that is so desperately needed. They are rushing to danger, risking their lives. They ought to have the best equipment, and these grants allow that to happen. It is so important to our volunteer firefighters in New York, particularly on Long Island, and for our paid departments in New York City, Albany, Buffalo, and across New York State. The ability to get more firefighters to help them so they are not overstretched and help communities pay for them is so important.

I am also glad that today's bill includes the ADVANCE Act, which secures America's leadership in the next generation of clean, safe, and affordable nuclear energy. Chairman CARPER, Ranking Member CAPITO, and SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, who sponsored the legislation, have done a great job. It is going to support job growth, clean energy, and American leadership, while preserving the NRC's fundamental mission of safety.

This is a great bill. I am sorry it took so long. The House dithered after we passed it. But now our firefighters, both paid and volunteer, can breathe a sigh of relief. This is going to happen very, very soon, and it will go to the White House and be signed into law.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON MOTION TO CONCUR

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

Mr. SCHUMER. 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. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), and the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE).

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

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 2, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 200 Leg.]

YEAS—88

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

NAYS—2

Markey	Sanders
--------	---------

NOT VOTING—10

Braun	Hoover	Sullivan
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Durbin	Menendez	
Fetterman	Sinema	

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table.

The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume executive session and resume consideration of the Maldonado nomination.

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

The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Nancy L. Maldonado, of Illinois, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit.

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

BUMP STOCKS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, we don't have to fight over everything here. It is OK if, occasionally, we find consensus around commonsense things that we could do together to keep our country safe.

I kind of thought we had consensus on at least the idea that civilians shouldn't be able to get their hands on machineguns.

I understand there are differences between Republicans and Democrats on AR-15s, that maybe not all of my Republican colleagues think that everybody should go through a background

check before they buy a gun. But I thought—I thought—we were all in agreement that fully automatic weapons were too dangerous to be in the hands of civilians; that these are unquestionably weapons of war. They are designed—designed—for mass slaughter, and you just do not need a weapon that allows you to fire hundreds of rounds per minute in order to hunt, in order to protect your home, in order to shoot for sport.

But, apparently, we do not have consensus on the question of whether Americans should have access to machinegun technology because, earlier today, Senator HEINRICH—a gun owner, somebody who knows a lot about weapons—came to the floor to ask for consent that we make sure that civilians can't get their hands on a device called a bump stock that allows you to convert a semiautomatic weapon into a machinegun. That is, effectively, what a bump stock does. It allows you to change a semiautomatic weapon, which you have to pull the trigger in order to fire each round, into an automatic weapon in which one physical pull of the finger allows you to fire multiple rounds. It effectively gives you access to an automatic weapon.

I thought we all agreed that automatic weapons, machineguns, should be in the hands of the military. I especially thought we all agreed on that after what happened in Las Vegas.

On October 1, 2017, a gunman opened fire on a concert from the 32nd floor of the Mandalay Bay Hotel. There were 500 yards between that gunman on the 32nd floor and those innocent concertgoers. That gunman fired about 1,100 rounds, killing 58 people—58 people—and wounding 500.

When we think about the Las Vegas tragedy, we focus on that number, 58 people. That is a stunning number of people to die in an instant. We don't talk about the 500 people who were injured, many of them with injuries that changed their lives forever—everyone, whether they were injured or not, dealing with trauma that impacted their lives forever.

There were 1,100 rounds fired from the 32nd floor of the Mandalay Bay Hotel. Do you know how long it took him to get off 1,100 rounds? Eleven minutes. Eleven minutes. That gunman was able to fire around 90 shots every 10 seconds. Why? Because he had taken a bump stock and converted a semiautomatic weapon, turning it, effectively, into an automatic weapon.

Even Donald Trump, the biggest backer of the NRA and the gun lobby that has ever been in the White House, knew that something had to change. He put forward a regulation to ban bump stocks, and most of my Republican colleagues celebrated that change. I don't remember many of them opposing it.

But this month, the Supreme Court, packed with pro-gun lobby Justices, most of whom were selected by Donald Trump, ruled that that regulation was

unconstitutional. I think they got it wrong. I think they absolutely got it wrong. I think if you look at the plain reading of the statute, bump stocks are illegal, and the regulation proffered by the Trump administration should have been ruled as unconstitutional. But Trump's appointees thought otherwise. They bought the argument of the gun lobby, and they ruled that bump stocks could, once again, be sold commercially in this country.

So we thought that it would be an easy case to make to our colleagues that having seen the regulation proffered by the Trump administration to be ruled unconstitutional, having been offered by the Supreme Court the chance to fix that statutorily, that we could get to that business this week, but we are not because Republicans objected to our efforts to try to pass into law a ban on bump stocks, to try and take away from psychopaths and madmen the technology that allows them to turn an automatic weapon on crowds of concertgoers and get off 1,000-plus rounds in a 10-minute period of time.

What Republicans in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives are doing on a regular basis is facilitating the mass slaughter of Americans, handing to individuals whose brains are breaking the tools of mass slaughter, refusing to do the easy, popular, commonsense things to just make it a little bit harder for 58 people to be gunned down, 500 people to be injured in a 10-minute period of time.

No law that we pass will end gun homicides in this country. No law that we pass will completely eliminate mass shootings. But there simply are technologies like the bump stock that turn a mass shooting in which 5 or 10 people might have died into a 58-person slaughter.

It is just true that when you have a weapon like an AR-15 or you have a converted semiautomatic weapon with a bump stock, the slaughter is worse, that more people die. Why on Earth would we choose to hand to these killers weapons that are designed for one purpose and one purpose only, mass slaughter?

You do not need a bump stock in order to protect your home. You do not need a machinegun in order to hunt for sport. The only reason you need a bump stock is to engage in mass murder.

I take this personally because I have lived through an experience of mass slaughter, as has the Presiding Officer. I did not lose a loved one, but I have come to know those families from Sandy Hook like they are family. And I know there is never ever getting over losing a loved one, frankly, whether it be to a gun death by suicide or by mass slaughter. But it makes it harder to deal with the loss of a loved one in a mass killing when you know the people that you elect to positions of high office have the power to prevent the slaughter or at least prevent it from being as bad as it was, and they chose to do nothing.

Republicans complain that this was a political stunt. What about everything that Joe Biden has said and done, what about the efforts that Senate Democrats have undertaken would suggest that we aren't sincere in our desire to prevent unnecessary gun deaths?

We have, over and over again, acted in good faith to try to find bipartisan compromise around changing the gun laws of this Nation. Joe Biden has shown absolute sincerity in his desire to try to keep more people alive. This is not a "gotcha" unanimous consent request; this is a real attempt to effectuate what we thought was a consensus that people shouldn't have access to machinegun technology in this country.

Senate Republicans could have agreed to work with us. They could make an offer today to expedite consideration of this bill next week. So the only political decision that is being made here is by Republicans who are opposing a bill that is undoubtedly supported by the mass majority of Americans.

So if this wasn't the way the Republicans wanted to do this, then I am open to other offers because we have passed bipartisan legislation to save lives. There are Republicans who have joined us, most recently, on the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act.

What we know is that when we do come together and pass laws that make it harder for dangerous people to get their hands on dangerous weapons, we save lives.

Urban gun deaths are down by 20 percent in this country. From 2022 to 2023, we saw the sharpest decline in gun murders in the history of this country. In 2024, mass shootings are down over—well, around 30 percent compared to the same time period in 2023.

We are seeing a precipitous decline in gun violence in this country, whether it be urban homicides or mass shootings, and I am not suggesting that the entire reason for that is the 2022 Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, but you had better believe that is a big part of the reason. You had better believe that when we pass laws that make it harder for dangerous people to get their hands on dangerous weapons, we save lives. And what matters in this country more than protecting the physical safety of your loved ones? What matters more? Nothing. Think about it. You would give anything—anything—to protect your son or daughter from physical harm. You would trade away your career, your savings. You might even give up your own life.

We have an easy opportunity—we had an easy opportunity—Republicans had an easy opportunity earlier today to just make it a little bit harder for the small subset of individuals in this country whose brains have collapsed and believe that the only way to deal with their demons is to turn a gun on others—we had a chance to make it less likely that that subset of individuals would be able to kill 58 people like

what happened in Las Vegas, and we couldn't even come to that consensus.

We are open for business. If this wasn't the way today, show us the way. Tell us how we can answer Republican concerns so that we can get these weapons of war, these facilitators of mass murder, these bump stocks, off the streets.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 671 through 699 and all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to any of the nominations; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's actions.

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

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE NAVY

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

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Luke A. Frost

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

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Dennis E. Collins

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

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Gregory K. Emery

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Navy Reserve to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Bradley D. Dunham

Rear Adm. (lh) Scott W. Ruston

Rear Adm. (lh) Douglas W. Sasse, III

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Troy S. Pugh

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Michael L. Freidberg

Capt. Ryan K. Mahelona

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Shawn G. Denihan

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Benjamin E. Baran

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

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. David N. Barnes

Capt. Reginald H. Hendrix

Capt. Marcus J. Lockard, Jr.

Capt. Jason M. Naidyhorski

Capt. Katie F. Sheldon

IN THE AIR FORCE

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

To be lieutenant general

Brig. Gen. Michael E. Conley

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

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. David H. Tabor

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

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Thomas K. Hensley

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

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Tony D. Bauerfeind

IN THE ARMY

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

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Sean C. Bernabe

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment as Judge Advocate General of the Navy and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 8088:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Christopher C. French

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

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Scott W. Pappano

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

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Jeffrey T. Anderson

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Navy Reserve and appointment in the Navy Reserve to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 7037:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Shawn G. Denihan

tance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601 and 8083:

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Nancy S. Lacore

IN THE ARMY

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Jorge M. Fonseca

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Nicole M. Balliet

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

To be brigadier general

Col. Cindy M. Saladin-Muhammed

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Thomas C. Friloux

IN THE AIR FORCE

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

To be brigadier general

Col. Gordon R. Meyer

IN THE ARMY

The following named Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Carrie L. Perez

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

To be brigadier general

Col. Adam K. Ake

Col. Andrew D. Cecil

Col. John M. Dunn

The following named officer for appointment as Judge Advocate General, United States Army, and appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601, 7037, and 7064:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Joseph B. Berger, III

The following named officer for appointment as Deputy Judge Advocate General, United States Army, and appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 7037 and 7064:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Robert A. Borcherding

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Marine Corps to

the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Melvin G. Carter

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

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Benjamin T. Watson

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN1767 AIR FORCE nomination of Christopher J. Rollins, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1768 AIR FORCE nomination of Nyree Y. Watts, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

IN THE ARMY

PN1601— ARMY nominations (190) beginning ANTHONY B. ABRAHAM, and ending BRIAN K. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record April 9, 2024.

PN1644 ARMY nominations (9) beginning KRISTIN E. AGRESTA, and ending EMILEE C. VENN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 18, 2024.

PN1645 ARMY nominations (9) beginning BARBARA K. BUJAK, and ending JOSHUA D. WALTERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 18, 2024.

PN1646 ARMY nominations (46) beginning LOVIE L. ABRAHAM, and ending MICHAEL T. WALKINGSTICK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 18, 2024.

PN1647 ARMY nominations (30) beginning MARLENE ARIASREYNOSO, and ending 0002516194, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 18, 2024.

PN1713 ARMY nominations (16) beginning MICHAEL J. BROWNING, and ending 0002686492, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1714 ARMY nominations (85) beginning TODD M. ANTON, and ending 0002951212, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1720 ARMY nominations (38) beginning RYAN H. ALLRED, and ending BRANDON J. WOLF, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1725 ARMY nominations (135) beginning CHAD C. ADAMS, and ending 0002374957, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1769 ARMY nomination of Edward Y. Park, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1770 ARMY nomination of Bridgette R. Bell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1771 ARMY nomination of Jamal D. Snell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1772 ARMY nomination of Terence W. Phillips, II, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1773 ARMY nomination of Zachary T. Goehler, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1774 ARMY nomination of Keith M. Sanders, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1775 ARMY nomination of Chelsea M. Truax, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PN1776 MARINE CORPS nomination of Taylor B. Evans, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1777 MARINE CORPS nomination of Jacob C. Pipping, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1778 MARINE CORPS nomination of Shawn R. Loughman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

IN THE NAVY

PN1673 NAVY nominations (13) beginning ALBERT E. ARNOLD, IV, and ending JUSTIN R. WIESEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1674 NAVY nominations (13) beginning GINA M. D. BECKER, and ending ANNE L. ZACK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1675 NAVY nominations (251) beginning ALLEN M. AGOR, and ending STEVEN ZIELECHOWSKI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1676 NAVY nominations (4) beginning BRIAN C. EARP, and ending CHAD A. REDMER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1677 NAVY nominations (21) beginning TRAVIS J. ANDERSON, and ending JEREMY R. WOODY, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1678 NAVY nominations (12) beginning KITAN BAE, and ending DAVID T. SPALDING, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1679 NAVY nominations (4) beginning MATTHEW S. CUSHANICK, and ending JEFFREY R. PORTELL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1680 NAVY nominations (10) beginning MATTHEW P. ALLAN, and ending CHRISTINA J. WONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1681 NAVY nominations (3) beginning ANTHONY J. FALVO, IV, and ending HAYLEY C. SIMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1682 NAVY nominations (7) beginning MICHAEL A. FREAS, and ending NICHOIAS T. WALKER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1683 NAVY nominations (4) beginning FRANK T. BORREGO, and ending GREGORY L. TINER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1684 NAVY nominations (14) beginning KENT L. DAVIS, and ending TRAVIS L. SCOTT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1685 NAVY nominations (4) beginning ZACHARY D. HARRY, and ending GREG-

ORY B. PRICE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1686 NAVY nominations (6) beginning ADAM G. BORMAN, and ending DENNIS L. RICHARDSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1687 NAVY nomination of Nathaniel D. Rightsell, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1688 NAVY nominations (14) beginning JUSTIN K. CONROY, and ending EMMANUEL M. THOMANN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1689 NAVY nominations (11) beginning JONATHAN R. ALSTON, and ending JONATHAN D. TIGHE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 30, 2024.

PN1726 NAVY nominations (2) beginning SCOTT F. ALDRIDGE, and ending MICHAEL P. SMITH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1727 NAVY nominations (11) beginning KYLE L. ANDERSON, and ending CRAIG A. ZECCHIN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1728 NAVY nominations (3) beginning DANIEL W. BERGER, and ending JARED M. STIMSON, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1729 NAVY nominations (14) beginning MICHAEL R. BASSO, and ending AARON D. PICKETT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1730 NAVY nomination of Catherine E. Williams, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1731 NAVY nominations (2) beginning SUNGHWAN T. CHOE, and ending MELANIE A. DRIVER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1732 NAVY nominations (60) beginning WILLIAM L. ADKINS, and ending DAVID J. WILLARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1733 NAVY nominations (15) beginning ROBERT A. BOGAN, and ending ROBERT D. WOODWARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1734 NAVY nominations (6) beginning RONALD L. JAMES, and ending DANIEL J. WOODARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1735 NAVY nominations (4) beginning MICHAEL A. CHINN, and ending SHANE D. UHLIR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1736 NAVY nomination of Ryan T. Bangham, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1737 NAVY nominations (3) beginning AARON J. BEDY, and ending NICOLAS A. MELENDEZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1738 NAVY nominations (4) beginning VINCENT DEUSANIO, JR., and ending STEFAN C. YESKO, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1739 NAVY nominations (2) beginning ROBERT J. FLEMING, and ending JOSEPH J. STEWART, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1740 NAVY nominations (2) beginning NOREEN P. KIRBY, and ending PATRICK D. TACKITT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1741 NAVY nomination of Bryon M. Lee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 7, 2024.

PN1779 NAVY nomination of Hana Lee, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1780 NAVY nomination of Timothy P. Fletcher, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1781 NAVY nominations (5) beginning MARK K. ANDERSON, and ending GERALD V. WEERS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1782 NAVY nominations (21) beginning ANASTASIA S. ABID, and ending ASHLEY L. WARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1783 NAVY nominations (37) beginning ADAM D. AHLSTROM, and ending JEREMIAH J. ZAMORA, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 20, 2024.

PN1795 NAVY nominations (26) beginning WARREN K. BLACKBURN, and ending JAMES L. VENCKUS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2024.

PN1796 NAVY nominations (15) beginning JOHN D. AULT, and ending TIMOTHY A. SPRINGER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2024.

PN1797 NAVY nominations (16) beginning AARON T. ALLISON, and ending KRISTIN B. WHITEHOUSE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2024.

PN1798 NAVY nominations (22) beginning COLLEEN C. BLOSSER, and ending DAMIAN M. STORZ, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2024.

PN1799 NAVY nominations (15) beginning MICHAEL W. BLOOMROSE, and ending MATTHEW J. WOOTEN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2024.

PN1800 NAVY nominations (33) beginning GARTH W. ALDRICH, and ending EMILY L. ZYWICKE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2024.

PN1801 NAVY nominations (23) beginning RICARDO M. ABAKAH, and ending YU ZHENG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2024.

PN1802 NAVY nominations (77) beginning THOMAS B. ABLEMAN, and ending JERRY YUAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of May 23, 2024.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

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

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 198, motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Katherine E. Oler to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted yea.

I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 199, confirmation of the nomination of Katherine E. Oler to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted yea.

I was necessarily absent for rollcall vote No. 200, on the motion to concur in the House amendments to S. 870, Fire Grants and Safety Act. Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted yea.●

RECOGNIZING THE BEREA CITIZEN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the Berea Citizen, a long-standing community institution and one of only a few locally owned, operated, and printed newspapers in the entire Commonwealth. This year, I am proud to join my home State in celebrating this native Kentucky newspaper as it marks 125 years of journalistic success.

Founded in 1899, the Berea Citizen came into existence on the campus of Berea College, nestled between the foothills of the Cumberland Mountains and the Bluegrass plains. The late Berea College president William G. Frost, a renowned abolitionist and scholar, led the charge in creating the school newspaper with the mission of providing this burgeoning region with informative, balanced local news. Service soon began along the dirt road of Chestnut Street in Berea's town center, where it continued for nearly a century. The Berea Citizen maintained its ties to the college up until 1984, by then transitioning into a private, locally owned newspaper.

Since the turn of the 20th century, the Berea Citizen has remained a fixture within the Madison County community. It has continued to provide local news without interruption through some of our Nation's most turbulent times, surviving the Great Depression, two World Wars, and, most recently, a global pandemic. Through the years, the newspaper and its team have adapted to the ever-evolving landscape of news, expanding print operations to include online coverage while always remaining faithful to its Kentucky focus. Today, the Berea Citizen boasts a readership of over 10,000 Kentuckians and remains a leading voice for local news in Madison County.

As the Berea Citizen marks this impressive milestone, I would like to ex-

tend my best wishes to the reporters, editors, and staff who have made the newspaper a vital resource to Central Kentuckians. It is a privilege to congratulate the Berea Citizen on 125 years of quality journalism. I hope my Senate colleagues join me in recognizing this longstanding fixture of Madison County and its many accomplishments.

ARMS SALES NOTIFICATIONS

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. 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. 24-52, concerning the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the Netherlands for defense articles and services estimated to cost \$678 million. 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. 24-52

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 the Netherlands.

(ii) Total Estimated Value:
Major Defense Equipment* \$607 million.
Other \$71 million.

Total \$678 million.

(iii) Description and Quantity or Quantities of Articles or Services under Consideration for Purchase:
Major Defense Equipment (MDE):

One hundred seventy-four (174) Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles-Extended Range (AMRAAM-ER).

Four (4) AMRAAM-C8 guidance sections.

Non-MDE: Also included is the following non-MDE: AMRAAM containers, load trainers, control section spares and support equipment; KGV-135A cryptographic devices; Common Munition Built-in-Test (BIT)/Re-programming Equipment (CMBRE); ADU-891

Adaptor Group Test Sets; integration and test support and equipment; munitions support and support equipment; spare parts, consumables, and accessories, and repair and return support; classified software delivery and support; classified and unclassified publications, and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; studies and surveys; Contractor Logistics Support (CLS); 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 (NE-D-YAJ).

(v) Prior Related Cases, if any: None.

(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 13, 2024.

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

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

The Netherlands—Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles-Extended Range

The Government of the Netherlands has requested to buy one-hundred seventy-four (174) Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles-Extended Range (AMRAAM-ER) and four AMRAAM-C8 guidance sections. Also included is the following non-MDE: AMRAAM containers, load trainers, control section spares and support equipment; KGV-135A cryptographic devices; Common Munition Built-in-Test (BIT)/Reprogramming Equipment(CMBRE); ADU-891 Adaptor Group Test Sets; integration and test support and equipment; munitions support and support equipment; spare parts, consumables, and accessories, and repair and return support; classified software delivery and support; classified and unclassified publications, and technical documentation; personnel training and training equipment; studies and surveys; Contractor Logistics Support (CLS); 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 \$678 million.

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 the Netherlands' capability to meet current and future threats by providing advanced air defense missiles as part of an upgraded Medium Range Air Defense (MRAD) system and thereby enhancing its air defense capability. This enhanced capability will protect the Netherlands and local allied forces, and will significantly improve the Netherlands' contribution to NATO Integrated Air and Missile Defense. The Netherlands will have no difficulty absorbing these articles and services into its armed forces.

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 Camden, AR. The purchaser typically requires 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 the Netherlands.

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

TRANSMITTAL NO. 24-52

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

2. The Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missile-Extended Range (AMRAAM-ER) is a surface-launched missile that utilizes an AIM-120C-7 or C-8 seeker and warhead. It is joined with a separate control section and rocket motor for surface launch, making it different from the traditional air-launched AMRAAM. This provides extended range and altitude as well as higher speed and maneuverability.

3. The KGV-135A is a high-speed, general purpose encryptor/decryptor module used for wideband data encryption.

4. The Common Munitions Built-In-Test (BIT)/Reprogramming Equipment (CMBRE) is support equipment used to interface with weapon systems to initiate and report BIT results, and upload and download flight software. CMBRE supports multiple munitions platforms with a range of applications that perform preflight checks, periodic maintenance checks, loading of Operational Flight Program (OFP) data, loading of munitions mission planning data, loading of Global Positioning System (GPS) cryptographic keys, and declassification of munitions memory.

5. The ADU-891 Adapter Group Test Set provides the physical and electrical interface between the CMBRE and the missile.

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

7. 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.

8. A determination has been made that the Netherlands 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.

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

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL APPOINTMENT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following statement on the appointment of the Architect of the Capitol be printed in the Congressional Record:

In accordance with the Architect of the Capitol Appointment Act of 2023, the Architect of the Capitol Congressional Commission, consisting of Representative Mike Johnson, Speaker of the House; Senator Charles E. Schumer, Senate Majority Lead-

er; Representative Hakeem S. Jeffries, House Democratic Leader; Senator Mitch McConnell, Senate Republican Leader; Representatives Tom Cole and Rosa L. DeLauro, Chairman and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Appropriations; Senators Patty Murray and Susan Collins, Chair and Vice Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee; Representatives Bryan Steil and Joseph D. Morelle, Chair and Ranking Member of the House Committee on Administration; and Senators Amy Klobuchar and Deb Fischer, Chair and Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration; appoints Thomas E. Austin to be the thirteenth Architect of the Capitol for a term of ten years, effective June 24, 2024.

TRIBUTE TO MARGARET BASS BAINES AND ANTONIO RODOLFO BAINES

Mr. REED. Mr. President, it is my honor to pay tribute to a remarkable team upon their retirement from the Department of the Army. The combined service of Mrs. Margaret "Peggy" Bass Baines and Mr. Antonio Rodolfo Baines spans an astounding 80 years, a testament to their unwavering commitment to our Nation.

Each beginning their careers in the 1980s, Peggy and Antonio ultimately completed 20 years of Active military duty in the U.S. Army. Both then transitioned seamlessly into civilian roles within the Department of the Army and continued to serve with dedication. Remarkably, they each added two more decades of devoted service to the Army and the Nation.

Lieutenant Colonel (Retired) Margaret Baines exemplified excellence during her tenure as both a signal corps officer and a judge advocate. Her service was marked by integrity, legal acumen, and a steadfast commitment to the Army's mission. Following her retirement from Active Duty, Peggy continued her invaluable contributions as the deputy legal advisor (Counsel) within the Army Office of the Inspector General. Subsequently, she assumed the role of Associate Deputy General Counsel for Ethics in the office of the Army General Counsel, further enhancing the legal framework that underpins the Army's operations. Peggy ensured Army leaders received thoughtful and purpose-built legal advice that facilitated effective management of critical Army programs and decisions.

Lieutenant Colonel (Retired) Antonio Baines left an indelible mark on the Army. As an Active-Duty signal corps officer and force management expert, he demonstrated exceptional leadership and technical expertise. Upon transitioning to civil service, Antonio directly contributed to congressional support for critical Army modernization priorities during his 20 years with the Office of the Chief of Legislative Liaison. As the Army's senior liaison for intelligence, modernization, and equipping, he played a pivotal role advising senior Army leaders and shaping legislative outcomes that directly impacted Army programs. Antonio's

mentorship of military officers assigned to the Army's Congressional Liaison Office not only improved the Army's ability to interact effectively with Congress, but also solidified his legacy within the Department of Defense's congressional liaison community.

It is also important to note and thank those who supported Mrs. and Mr. Baines throughout their careers, all of whom can be justifiably proud of the accomplishments of these two. This includes Peggy's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Alden and Doris Bass of Fort Wayne, IN, and Antonio's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Albert and Yolanda Baines of Jonesboro, GA. Additionally, Courtney Baines of Charlotte, NC, and Joshua Baines of Cambridge, MA, stand as living testaments to their parents' legacy. I honor the commitment and service of Peggy and Antonio, and I wish them the peaceful and joyful retirement they have earned. Well done.

TRIBUTE TO SANDRA E. LATTA

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to honor Ms. Sandra E. Latta, who is retiring from the Department of the Navy after more than 35 years of faithful civilian service to our Nation, culminating as the Deputy Chief of Legislative Affairs for Strategy and Assessment, Office of Legislative Affairs, U.S. Department of the Navy.

Ms. Latta's contributions to the Department of the Navy have been numerous. Her responsibilities include directing the Department's legislative strategy and directly supporting the President's budget submission and subsequent congressional action on the annual National Defense Authorization Act. As one of two deputies in the Office of Legislative Affairs, and the only civilian to serve in that capacity, Ms. Latta established and executed the overall legislative direction for the Department of the Navy. During her tenure, Ms. Latta provided expert congressional advice to six Secretaries of the Navy and seven Chiefs of Naval Operations as they met with congressional leaders and staff to advance the priorities of the Department of the Navy.

Ms. Latta began her Washington career on the staff of U.S. Representative Bill Hefner of North Carolina, who was a senior member of the House Appropriations Committee. During her 14-year tenure with Representative Hefner, Ms. Latta advised the Congressman on a range of policy issues and for 8 of those years served as his press secretary. Prior to her tenure with the Department of the Navy, Ms. Latta worked for 5 years in the private sector, where she established and led a team that advised the Navy on congressional activities affecting defense policy and budgets. She then brought her significant experience and leadership to the Department of the Navy in 2003, to serve as the first civilian Deputy Chief of Legislative Affairs.

Ms. Latta is a native of Mocksville, NC. She received a B.A. in political

science from North Carolina State University and currently serves on the advisory council for the School of Public and International Affairs.

Throughout her career, Ms. Latta's leadership and performance has been recognized by numerous awards including the Department of the Navy's Distinguished Civilian Service Award and the Department of Defense's Spirit of Service Award.

I am proud to recognize Ms. Latta, and I thank her and her family for her honorable service to our nation. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Ms. Sandra Latta "fair winds and following seas" as she concludes a distinguished career of public service.

150TH ANNIVERSARY OF A.O. SMITH

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate A.O. Smith Corporation on the occasion of their 150th anniversary.

In 1874, A.O. Smith began in Milwaukee, WI, as a small family business. Over the past century and a half, they have grown from their humble roots. They began by specializing in the fabrication of metal hardware specialties and have emerged today as an industry leading global water technology manufacturer producing residential and commercial water heaters, boilers, and water purification equipment. Today, they employ more than 12,000 people across the world and conduct business in over 60 countries.

The company was instrumental in helping to usher in the automobile revolution, developing a new, lightweight steel car frame—a development that caught the interest of major car companies including Peerless, Cadillac, Packard, Oldsmobile, and Ford. Ford's initial order of 10,000 frames led A.O. Smith to develop the world's first mass production process for assembling frames, later introducing the world's first automated frame production line. This first fully automated frame assembly plant came to be known as the Mechanical Marvel due to the line's ability to make a frame every 8 seconds—10,000 frames a day. A.O. Smith was also a large component manufacturer that supplied parts to another early Wisconsin pioneering manufacturer, Harley-Davidson.

A.O. Smith engineers discovered an improved method for welding, allowing for the production of a wide range of steel products. This included the pressure vessel for oil refining and large diameter steel pipe, important components in the oil and natural gas industries.

One of the company's most important and enduring innovations was the process of fusing glass to steel. By perfecting this process, the company developed a range of new products, including glass-lined beer kegs, glass-lined brewery tanks, and glass-lined residential water heaters. Glass-lined water heaters rapidly became an indus-

try standard that endures today and led to A.O. Smith's growth as a global leader in water heating products. These products now include industry leading models that are consistently among the most efficient in the market according to the ENERGY STAR program.

In recent years, A.O. Smith has emerged as an industry leader in developing technologies that address drinking water quality challenges. A co-founding member of the Water Council, A.O. Smith has helped ensure Milwaukee's place as a global water technology hub, while supporting economic development in Wisconsin. The Water Council helped bring about the creation of the Global Water Center, which houses water-related business accelerators and research facilities where engineers conduct controlled testing on water purification products sold around the world. Bringing together their work has helped transform Milwaukee into a world hub for water research, education, and economic development.

I am proud to recognize A.O. Smith as an industry leader, and I share my best wishes with the company and their employees for their continued success.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO RUBY MAE PRICE WOMACK

• Mrs. BRITT. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Mrs. Ruby Mae Price Womack of Greenville, AL, ahead of her 100th birthday.

The daughter of Nobie Davis and Foster Price, Ruby was born on July 17, 1924, in Greenville. She is the proud mother of three sons Anthony, Chris, and Vince; grandmother to six; and great-grandmother to four.

Ruby attended school in Butler County before graduating with her undergraduate degree from Alabama A&M University and her master's degree from Alabama State University. She became an educator herself, teaching in the Butler County school system for over 40 years.

Ruby is also dedicated member of St. Paul Missionary Baptist Church, where she has been playing piano since the age of 8. Incredibly, Ruby never received formal lessons and learned to play by ear. She continues to serve as an active member of the Greenville civic community to this day.

On behalf of the people of Alabama, I want to extend my heartfelt congratulations and sincere well wishes to Ruby. I wish her a very happy birthday, surrounded by friends and family, and many more celebrations to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. VALERIE MONTGOMERY RICE

• Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I rise to commend Dr. Valerie Montgomery

Rice for her commitment to fighting for equity in healthcare and for 10 years of service as president of Morehouse School of Medicine.

Born and raised in Georgia, Dr. Montgomery Rice holds a bachelor's degree in chemistry from the Georgia Institute of Technology and completed her residency in obstetrics and gynecology at Emory University School of Medicine.

Dr. Montgomery Rice is the sixth president of Morehouse School of Medicine (MSM) and the first woman to lead the freestanding medical institution.

She was named to the Horatio Alger Association of Distinguished Americans and received the 2017 Horatio Alger Award. For three consecutive years, 2016–2018, the Georgia Trend Magazine selected Dr. Montgomery Rice as one of the 100 Most Influential Georgians.

As Dr. Montgomery Rice celebrates 10 years of service and leadership as President of Morehouse School of Medicine, as Georgia's U.S. Senator, I commend her for her commitment to expanding and diversifying the healthcare workforce and improving healthcare outcomes for all.●

TRIBUTE TO JIM WALLACE

• Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I rise to commend Jim Wallace for his decades of journalism and service to the people of southwest Georgia.

Born and raised in north Georgia, Mr. Wallace attended Towers High School and graduated from the University of Georgia in 1976 with a degree in broadcast journalism.

In November 1976, Mr. Wallace joined WALB News 10 in the news and sports departments; and he has worked there ever since, keeping southwest Georgia families informed and holding the powerful accountable.

Throughout his nearly 50-year journalism career, Mr. Wallace has worked as a weekend sports anchor and reporter, sports director, and evening news anchor.

Mr. Wallace has won numerous accolades, including twice being named the Georgia AP Sports Reporter of the Year award, Georgia AP Sportscaster of the Year, Georgia AP Sports Photographer of Year, and winning multiple UPI Sportscasting Awards.

Outside of the newsroom, Mr. Wallace is also a Sunday School teacher and youth volunteer at First United Methodist Church, and he and his wife Tracy have two children Jake and Shelly.

As Mr. Jim Wallace leaves WALB News 10 for a well-deserved retirement, as Georgia's U.S. Senator, I commend and congratulate him on his incredible career and wish him and his family the best in their future endeavors.●

90TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE GEORGIA ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS

• Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the

90th anniversary of the Georgia Association of Broadcasters, an organization that has been at the forefront of fostering excellence in broadcasting throughout our great State of Georgia.

The Georgia Association of Broadcasters was founded in Savannah, GA, in July 1934, becoming the first ever trade association to represent the interests of over-the-air radio and TV licensees.

Since its founding, the Georgia Association of Broadcasters has played a pivotal role in advocating for the interests and rights of broadcasters, ensuring that the people of Georgia receive high-quality news, information, and entertainment.

The Georgia Association of Broadcasters is currently led by Bob Houghton, who has served as its president since 2012 and has worked in the media industry for decades. Its executive board includes media executives and leaders from all across the State of Georgia, from Atlanta and Savannah, to Gainesville and Columbus.

The Georgia Association of Broadcasters has been instrumental in advancing the professional development of its members through comprehensive training programs, workshops, and seminars. They have been a strong advocate for technological advancements in broadcasting, ensuring that Georgia remains at the cutting edge of industry innovations.

From the early days of radio to the digital age of television and online streaming, the Georgia Association of Broadcasters have guided its members through the ever-evolving landscape of media and communication, helping ensure they can deliver quality, reliable news to keep communities informed, safe, and connected, oftentimes as the first to deliver vital information during emergencies.

As Georgia's U.S. Senator, I commend the Georgia Association of Broadcasters on its 90th anniversary and thank them and their members for their work to keep the public informed.●

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.)

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

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

S. 4554. A bill to express support for protecting access to reproductive health care after the Dobbs v. Jackson decision on June 24, 2022.

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-5040. A communication from the Director of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "General Services Administration Acquisition Regulation (GSAR); GSAR Case 2021-G527, Immediate and Highest Level Owner for High-Security Leased Space" (RIN3090-AK44) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5041. A communication from the Director of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "FAR Case 2023-010, Prohibition on a ByteDance Covered Application. Note: GSA previously submitted this rule to the President of the Senate: on 6/5/2023 consistent with the procedures set forth in 5 U.S.C. 801(a), but this receipt in the Senate does not appear to have been recorded in the Congressional Record. GSA is resubmitting to facilitate its proper recording in the Congressional Record." (RIN9000-AO58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5042. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5043. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5044. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5045. A communication from the Chairman, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, Amtrak, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Inspector General's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period from October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5046. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Semiannual Reports from the Inspector General and Inspector General for Tax Administration for the period from October 1, 2023, through March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5047. A communication from the Chief Executive Officer, Agency for Global Media,

transmitting, pursuant to law, the Bureau's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act) received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5048. A communication from the Board Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and the Semiannual Management Report on the Status of Audits for the period from October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024 received in the Office of the President pro tempore; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5049. A communication from the Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Officer, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2023 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act); to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5050. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5051. A communication from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Commission's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General and a Management Report for the period from October 1, 2023 through March 31, 2024; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5052. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-484, "Certified Business Enterprise Program Compliance and Enforcement Support Temporary Amendment Act of 2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5053. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-485, "Special Education for Young Adults in the Custody of the Department of Corrections Temporary Amendment Act of 2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5054. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-480, "Downtown Arena Financing Partnership and Revised Budget Temporary Amendment Act of 2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5055. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-481, "Medical Cannabis Patient Card Extension and 4/20 Medical Cannabis Sales Tax Holiday Week Temporary Amendment Act of 2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5056. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-482, "Virtual Open Meetings Authority Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5057. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-483, "Association Meeting Flexibility Temporary Amendment Act of

2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5058. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-486, "Relief for River East at Grandview Condominium Owners Temporary Amendment Act of 2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5059. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-487, "Local Rent Supplement Program Eligibility Temporary Amendment Act of 2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5060. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-488, "Healthy Homes and Residential Electrification Amendment Act of 2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5061. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-477, "Vulnerable Youth Guardianship Protection Amendment Act of 2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5062. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-478, "Open Movie Captioning Requirement Amendment Act of 2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5063. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 25-479, "Health Occupations Revision General Amendment Act of 2024"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-5064. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treatment of certain relief payments made to individuals affected by the East Palestine, Ohio train derailment" (Notice 2024-46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2024; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5065. A communication from the Chair, Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "June 2024 Report to Congress on Medicaid and CHIP"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-5066. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Mattoon, Illinois)" (MB Docket No. 24-83) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5067. A communication from the Director of the Office of National Marine Sanctuaries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Lake Ontario National Marine Sanctuary: Final Regulations" (RIN0648-BJ62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5068. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions of the Section 232 Steel and Aluminum Tariff

Exclusions Process" (RIN0694-AJ27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5069. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4114" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31547)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5070. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4116" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31547)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5071. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4116" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31547)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5072. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Turlock Municipal Airport, Turlock, CA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0163)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5073. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Reidsville, NC" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0319)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5074. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class E Airspace; Mammoth Lakes Airport, Mammoth Lakes, CA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2022-1548)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5075. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greenville and Vandalia, IL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0272)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5076. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class E Airspace; Hollister Municipal Airport, Hollister, CA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1852)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5077. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Class E Airspace; Edward G. Pitka Sr. Airport, Galena, AK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2482)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5078. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of VOR Federal Airways V-44, V-128, and V-493, and United States Area Navigation Routes T-315 and T-323 in the Vicinity of York, KY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1737)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5079. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class C Airspace and Class D Airspace; Harrisburg International Airport, PA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1021)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5080. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Lewisburg, WV" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2275)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5081. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Updates to Marine Engineering Standards" ((RIN1625-AC72) (Docket No. USCG-2020-0634)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5082. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; De Havilland Aircraft of Canada Limited (Type Certificate Previously Held by Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22737" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2137)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5083. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22749" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-

2024-1302)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5084. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes; Amendment 39-22745" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-1298)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5085. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Leonardo S.p.a. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22744" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-1295)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5086. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22748" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1997)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5087. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bell Textron Canada Limited Helicopters; Amendment 39-22752" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-1466)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5088. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Engines; Amendment 39-22751" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1652)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5089. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22762" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0221)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5090. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4113" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31546)) re-

ceived in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5091. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Revolution Wind Farm Project Area, Outer Continental Shelf, Lease OCS-A 0486, Offshore Rhode Island, Atlantic Ocean" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0134)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5092. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Thames River, Groton, CT" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0303)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5093. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Saginaw Memorial Cup Fireworks, Saginaw River; Saginaw, MI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0372)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5094. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Coast Guard Sector Key West, Trumbo Point Annex, Key West Harbor, Key West, FL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2023-0803)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5095. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Red River, Shreveport, LA" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0177)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5096. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Sloop Channel, Nassau County, NY" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2023-0532)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5097. A communication from the Director of Rulemaking Operations, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Corporate Average Fuel Economy Standards for Passenger Cars and Light Trucks for Model Years 2027 and Beyond and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Heavy-Duty Pickup Trucks and Vans for Model Years 2030 and Beyond" ((RIN2127-AM55)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 11, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-5098. A communication from the Administrative Specialist, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "American Indian Probate Regulations; Corrections" ((RIN1094-AA55)) received

during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 10, 2024; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-5099. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Changes in Rates VA Pays for Special Modes of Transportation; Delay of Effective Date” (RIN2900-AS03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 12, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 1254. A bill to designate and expand wilderness areas in Olympic National Forest in the State of Washington, and to designate certain rivers in Olympic National Forest and Olympic National Park as wild and scenic rivers, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 118-184).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1348. A bill to redesignate land within certain wilderness study areas in the State of Wyoming, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 118-185).

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3679. A bill to reauthorize the Dr. Lorna Breen Health Care Provider Protection Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3757. A bill to reauthorize the congenital heart disease research, surveillance, and awareness program of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. 3765. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the Emergency Medical Services for Children program.

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3775. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the BOLD Infrastructure for Alzheimer’s Act, and for other purposes.

S. 4045. A bill to require a study on public health impacts as a consequence of the February 3, 2023, train derailment in East Palestine, Ohio.

By Mr. COONS (for Mr. DURBIN), from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 4199. A bill to authorize additional district judges for the district courts and convert temporary judgeships.

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, without amendment:

S. 4325. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program relating to lifespan respite care, and for other purposes.

S. 4351. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize certain poison control programs.

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

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

S. 4563. A bill to improve defense cooperation between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

S. 4564. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 50 East Derry Road in East Derry, New Hampshire, as the “Chief Edward B. Garone Post Office”; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. YOUNG):

S. 4565. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for institutional ineligibility based on low cohort repayment rates and to require risk-sharing payments of institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 4566. A bill to require the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Secretary of the Army to carry out a pilot program on producing parts through reverse engineering, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

S. 4567. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act regarding reentry employment opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TUBERVILLE (for himself, Mr. LEE, and Mr. RICKETTS):

S. 4568. A bill to repeal certain provisions of the CHIPS Act of 2022 and the Research and Development, Competition, and Innovation Act, to limit Federal mandates imposed on entities seeking Federal funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. LUMMIS, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. BUDD, Ms. BUTLER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 4569. A bill to require covered platforms to remove nonconsensual intimate visual depictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. DAINES, Mr. TILLIS, and Mrs. BRITT):

S. 4570. A bill to require the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to study the impacts of the proposed rule on debit card interchange fees and routing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4571. A bill to define “obscenity” for purposes of the Communications Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 4572. A bill to direct the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information, to conduct a study of the national security risks posed by consumer routers, modems, and devices that combine a modem and router, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4573. A bill to extend the obligation deadline of funds made available to recipients under the American Rescue Plan Act for the purposes of supporting homeless children and youth; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 4574. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to allow States, tribal organizations, and organizations serving Native Hawaiians flexibility to use certain funds for innovative nutrition services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 4575. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require the Assistant Secretary for Aging to make available to States, area agencies on aging, and service providers information and technical assistance to support the provision of evidence-informed practices that are likely to improve health outcomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. BENNET, and Ms. LUMMIS):

S. 4576. A bill to amend the Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015, to reauthorize the Colorado River System conservation pilot program; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRAUN:

S. 4577. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require the Assistant Secretary for Aging to publish on an online portal information on national resource centers authorized or supported under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 4578. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to require reports to Congress on State Long-Term Care Ombudsman Programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 4579. A bill to reauthorize the Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Initiative Act to promote the protection of the resources of the Northwest Straits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 4580. A bill to establish, improve, or expand high-quality workforce development programs at community colleges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 4581. A bill to require the Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and such other heads of departments and agencies as the Secretary of State considers appropriate, to formulate a strategy for the Federal Government to secure support from foreign countries, multilateral organizations, and other appropriate entities to facilitate the development and commercialization of qualified pandemic or epidemic products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. FETTERMAN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WYDEN):

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

S. 4582. A bill to reauthorize the trade adjustment assistance program; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BROWN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 4583. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to extend the authority of the Secretary of Health and Human Services to issue priority review vouchers to encourage treatments for rare pediatric diseases; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. TESTER, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 4584. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a business credit for gain from the sale of real property for use as a manufactured home community, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 4585. A bill to prohibit covered entities that receive financial assistance relating to semiconductors from purchasing certain semiconductor manufacturing equipment from foreign entities of concern or subsidiaries of foreign entities of concern, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 4586. A bill to prevent the funding of malign activities of the Chinese Communist Party through the sale of "A-Shares" on certain securities exchanges controlled by the Chinese Communist Party by prohibiting the purchase, sale, and ownership of such securities by United States investors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS:

S. 4587. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to include rural emergency hospitals in the definition of a covered entity for purposes of the drug discount program under section 340B of such Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROMNEY, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. 4588. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to develop and implement a process for sharing military service data with States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida:

S. 4589. A bill to prohibit index funds and registered investment companies from investing in Chinese companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 4590. A bill to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit national securities exchanges from listing securities issued by certain entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. Kaine, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 4591. A bill to permanently authorize the exemption of aliens working as fish processors from the numerical limitation on H-2B nonimmigrant visas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. GILLIBRAND (for herself, Ms. BUTLER, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 4592. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Minority Health, to award grants to faith- or community-based organizations to address persistent health inequities and chronic disease challenges; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. TILLIS (for himself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. LEE):

S. 4593. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to authorize removal of a civil action or criminal prosecution against a President, Vice President, former President, or former Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 4594. A bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from promulgating or enforcing rules regarding disclosure of AI-generated content in political advertisements; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. LUMMIS (for herself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S.J. Res. 98. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Agriculture relating to "Use of Electronic Identification Eartags as Official Identification in Cattle and Bison"; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. MANCHIN (for himself, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. LEE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. BRITT, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. TILLIS, and Mr. CRUZ):

S.J. Res. 99. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Council on Environmental Quality relating to "National Environmental Policy Act Implementing Regulations Revisions Phase 2"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. Res. 738. A resolution expressing support for the designation of June 19, 2024, as "World Sickle Cell Awareness Day" in order to increase public awareness across the United States and global community about sickle cell disease and the continued need for empirical research, early detection screenings, novel effective treatments leading to a cure, and preventative care programs with respect to complications from sickle cell anemia and conditions relating to sickle cell disease; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BUDD, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. HAWLEY, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. Res. 739. A resolution celebrating the historic anniversary of the June 24, 2022, decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BENNET,

Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. WANNER):

S. Res. 740. A resolution acknowledging and apologizing for the mistreatment of, and discrimination against, lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals who served the United States in the uniformed services, the Foreign Services, and the Federal civil service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. Res. 741. A resolution condemning the illegitimate regime of Nicolas Maduro in the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 618

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

S. 639

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 639, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve the historic rehabilitation tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 711

At the request of Mr. BUDD, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 711, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the invaluable service that working dogs provide to society.

S. 870

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 870, a bill to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration and firefighter assistance grant programs, to advance the benefits of nuclear energy, and for other purposes.

S. 1183

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1183, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of mental or physical disability in cases of organ transplants.

S. 1300

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1300, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in recognition of the late Prime Minister Golda Meir and the 75th anniversary of the United States-Israel relationship.

S. 1330

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1330, a bill to amend title

38, United States Code, to provide a burial and funeral allowance for certain veterans who die at home or in other settings while in receipt of hospice care furnished by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1558

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1558, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the brave women who served in World War II as members of the U.S. Army Nurse Corps and U.S. Navy Nurse Corps.

S. 1631

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1631, a bill to enhance the authority granted to the Department of Homeland Security and Department of Justice with respect to unmanned aircraft systems and unmanned aircraft, and for other purposes.

S. 1909

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1909, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the illegal modification of firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 2435

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2435, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to repeal the particular work requirement that disqualifies able-bodied adults for eligibility to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, and for other purposes.

S. 2790

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2790, a bill to reform rural housing programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2827

At the request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2827, a bill to require the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to establish minimum inter-regional transfer capabilities, and for other purposes.

S. 2862

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2862, a bill to amend the Food for Peace Act to restore the original intent of commodity transfers, and for other purposes.

S. 3047

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms.

SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3047, a bill to award payments to employees of Air America who provided support to the United States from 1950 to 1976, and for other purposes.

S. 3125

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3125, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3369

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3369, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to restrict the possession of certain firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 3459

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an above-the-line deduction for attorney fees and costs in connection with consumer claim awards.

S. 3467

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3467, a bill to require a certain percentage of natural gas and crude oil exports be transported on United States-built and United States-flag vessels, and for other purposes.

S. 3530

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) 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. 3546

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3546, a bill to require a study on the quality of care difference between mental health and addiction therapy care provided by health care providers of the Department of Veterans Affairs compared to non-Department providers, and for other purposes.

S. 3619

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3619, a bill to amend chapter 25 of title 14, United States Code, to prohibit the use of Coast Guard funds and facilities to perform abortions and to prohibit the provision of travel and transportation allowances to obtain abortions.

S. 3770

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3770, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize grants to support schools of nursing in

increasing the number of nursing students and faculty and in program enhancement and infrastructure modernization, and for other purposes.

S. 3818

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3818, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to include fuel for ocean-going vessels as additional renewable fuel for which credits may be generated under the renewable fuel program.

S. 3876

At the request of Mr. Kaine, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3876, a bill to direct the Secretary of State to establish a national registry of Korean American divided families, and for other purposes.

S. 3956

At the request of Mr. TILLIS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3956, a bill to include phosphate and potash on the final list of critical minerals of the Department of the Interior.

S. 4075

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors 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. 4199

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 4199, a bill to authorize additional district judges for the district courts and convert temporary judgeships.

S. 4231

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4231, a bill to provide for the establishment of Medicare part E public health plans, and for other purposes.

S. 4241

At the request of Ms. ROSEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4241, a bill to require the Secretary of Defense to appropriately consider Taiwan for enhanced defense industrial base cooperation activities, and for other purposes.

S. 4387

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

S. 4521

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) were added as cosponsors 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 Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) 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. 4554

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4554, a bill to express support for protecting access to reproductive health care after the Dobbs v. Jackson decision on June 24, 2022.

S.J. RES. 33

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) were added as cosponsors 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.J. RES. 95

At the request of Mr. MULLIN, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 95, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to “Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals From Electric Utilities; Legacy CCR Surface Impoundments”.

S. RES. 540

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 540, a resolution requesting information on Azerbaijan’s human rights practices pursuant to section 502B(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

S. RES. 684

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) 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”).

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 738—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF JUNE 19, 2024, AS “WORLD SICKLE CELL AWARENESS DAY” IN ORDER TO INCREASE PUBLIC AWARENESS ACROSS THE UNITED STATES AND GLOBAL COMMUNITY ABOUT SICKLE CELL DISEASE AND THE CONTINUED NEED FOR EMPIRICAL RESEARCH, EARLY DETECTION SCREENINGS, NOVEL EFFECTIVE TREATMENTS LEADING TO A CURE, AND PREVENTATIVE CARE PROGRAMS WITH RESPECT TO COMPLICATIONS FROM SICKLE CELL ANEMIA AND CONDITIONS RELATING TO SICKLE CELL DISEASE

Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 738

Whereas sickle cell disease (referred to in this preamble as “SCD”) is a group of inherited red blood cell disorders, a genetic condition present at birth, and a major health problem in the United States and worldwide;

Whereas the 2024 theme of World Sickle Cell Awareness Day, “Hope Through Progress: Advancing Sickle Cell Care Globally”, is an immediate call to bring voices together to improve the health and quality of life for individuals living with SCD and their families;

Whereas, in 1972, Dr. Charles Whitten co-founded the Sickle Cell Disease Association of America to improve research, education, and health care for SCD patients and which is now headquartered in Hanover, Maryland;

Whereas, in 1972, Congress passed the National Sickle Cell Anemia Control Act (Public Law 92-294; 86 Stat. 136), which, for the first time, provided authority to establish education, information, screening, testing, counseling, research, and treatment programs for SCD;

Whereas sickle cell trait (referred to in this preamble as “SCT”) is a gene mutation that causes a single misspelling in the DNA instructions for hemoglobin, a protein that aids in carrying oxygen in the blood, and can result in chronic complications, including anemia, stroke, infections, organ failure, tissue damage, intense periods of pain referred to as vaso-occlusive crises, and even premature death in individuals living with SCD;

Whereas SCT occurs when an individual inherits 1 copy of the sickle cell gene from 1 parent, and, although most individuals who have SCT live normal lives, when both parents have SCT, there is a 25 percent chance that any of their children will have SCD;

Whereas there are an estimated 1,000,000 to 3,000,000 individuals with SCT in the United States, with many unaware of their status;

Whereas an estimated 100,000 individuals have SCD in the United States, with 1 out of every 365 African-American births and 1 out of every 16,300 Hispanic-American births resulting in SCD, and nearly 1 out of 13 African-American babies are born with SCT;

Whereas SCD affects millions of individuals throughout the world, especially individuals of genetic descent from certain countries in sub-Saharan Africa, South and Central America, the Caribbean, South Asia, the Middle East, and the Mediterranean basin;

Whereas the variance relating to the prevalence of SCT ranges greatly by region and demography, with overall rates as high as 40 percent in parts of sub-Saharan Africa and among newborns in parts of India;

Whereas, in many countries that are poor in resources, 90 percent of children with SCD do not live to see adulthood;

Whereas approximately 1,000 children in Africa are born with SCD each day, more than $\frac{1}{2}$ of whom will die before their fifth birthday;

Whereas the high prevalence of SCD in the central and western regions of India results in approximately 20 percent of babies diagnosed with SCD in parts of the western region dying before the age of 2;

Whereas, in 2006, the World Health Assembly passed a resolution, adopted by the United Nations in 2009, recognizing SCD as a public health priority with a call to action for each country to implement measures to tackle the disease, and in 2010, the World Health Assembly passed a resolution relating to preventing and managing birth defects, including SCD;

Whereas screening newborns for SCD is a crucial first step for families to obtain a timely diagnosis, to obtain comprehensive care, and to decrease the mortality rate for children with respect to SCD;

Whereas approved treatments for SCD are limited, with the Food and Drug Administration approving only 4 SCD therapies since 2017, but, as of the date of adoption of this resolution, there are more than 40 SCD therapies in development;

Whereas there is an immediate need for lifesaving therapeutics that can improve the duration and quality of life for individuals with SCD;

Whereas, in 2020, the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine developed a comprehensive strategic plan and blueprint for action to address SCD, which highlights the need to develop new innovative therapies and to address barriers to the equitable access of approved treatments;

Whereas, in 2020, the Department of Health and Human Services, in partnership with the American Society of Hematology and the SickleInAfrica Consortium, and in collaboration with the World Health Organization, hosted a webinar for a joint effort to strengthen efforts to combat SCD during the COVID-19 pandemic and beyond;

Whereas the late Kwaku Ohene-Frempong, M.D., Professor Emeritus of Pediatrics at the Perelman School of Medicine at the University of Pennsylvania, an American Society of Hematology member who founded and served as a member of the Global Sickle Cell Disease Network, was a leader in advancing the body of knowledge in SCD research, public health, and medicine and is recognized as immeasurably benefitting thousands of children worldwide;

Whereas there are emerging genetic therapy technologies, including 2 therapies approved by the Food and Drug Administration

in December of 2023, that can modify a patient's own hematopoietic stem cells to enable them to generate healthy red blood cells to prevent sickle cell crises;

Whereas hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (commonly known as "HSCT") is currently the only cure for SCD, and while advancements in treatment for complications associated with SCD have been made, more research is needed to find widely available and accessible treatments and cures to help individuals with SCD; and

Whereas, although June 19, 2024, has been designated as "World Sickle Cell Awareness Day" to increase public awareness across the United States and global community about SCD, there remains a continued need for empirical research, early detection screenings, novel effective treatments leading to a cure, and preventative care programs with respect to complications from sickle cell anemia and conditions relating to SCD: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of World Sickle Cell Awareness Day;

(2) commits to ensuring equitable access to new sickle cell disease (referred to in this resolution as "SCD") treatments by shining the light among all economic, racial, and ethnic groups to improve health outcomes for individuals living with SCD;

(3) calls on the Department of Health and Human Services to create global policy solutions aimed at providing support for the global community with respect to SCD and, in partnership with local governments, the domestic resources needed to provide access to newborn screening programs, therapeutic interventions, and support services with respect to SCD;

(4) supports eliminating barriers to equitable access to innovative SCD therapies, including cell, gene, and gene-editing therapies in the Medicare and Medicaid systems for the most vulnerable patients;

(5) encourages the people of the United States and the world to hold appropriate programs, events, and activities on World Sickle Cell Awareness Day to raise public awareness of SCD traits, preventative-care programs, treatments, and other patient services for those suffering from SCD, complications from SCD, and conditions relating to SCD;

(6) encourages the President to form a Sickle Cell Disease Interagency Group, which should include the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Veterans Affairs, the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, to work toward policies that will support equitable and appropriate access to innovative SCD therapies; and

(7) with respect to the policies described in paragraph (6), urges the interagency group described in that paragraph to consider options that not only address access to potential future curative treatments for SCD, but also address the bias that the population most affected by SCD continues to face within the United States and global healthcare systems.

SENATE RESOLUTION 739—CELEBRATING THE HISTORIC ANNIVERSARY OF THE JUNE 24, 2022, DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES IN DOBBS V. JACKSON WOMEN'S HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. RUBIO (for himself, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. BUDD, Mr. WICKER, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr.

MULLIN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. HAWLEY, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. BARRASSO, and Mr. MARSHALL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 739

Whereas the Declaration of Independence announces the self-evident truth that "all men are created equal" and "are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights";

Whereas the first of those unalienable rights is the right to life;

Whereas modern science has illuminated our understanding of the humanity of unborn life;

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States committed a grave injustice in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973) (referred to in this preamble as "Roe"), by inventing a constitutional right to abortion, thereby denying a class of innocent people their right to life;

Whereas more than 63,000,000 unborn lives were lost to abortion under Roe;

Whereas, on June 24, 2022, the Supreme Court of the United States, in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, 142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022) (referred to in this preamble as "Dobbs"), corrected the grave injustice committed in Roe, by holding that "the Constitution does not confer a right to abortion" and that "*Roe* and *Casey* must be overruled, and the authority to regulate abortion must be returned to the people and their elected representatives";

Whereas many States have taken historic steps to protect unborn life since the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States in Dobbs; and

Whereas many millions of people in the United States continue to press to protect unborn life and strengthen support for families charged with protecting that life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates 2 years since the ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, 142 S. Ct. 2228 (2022) (referred to in this resolution as "Dobbs");

(2) celebrates the millions of lives that will be saved as a result of the ruling in Dobbs;

(3) commits to protecting the unalienable right to life and guarding unborn lives against lethal violence;

(4) commits to supporting families, including new and expectant mothers and their children; and

(5) commits to proclaiming the humanity of the unborn, consistent with the findings of modern science and the unwavering demands of justice.

SENATE RESOLUTION 740—ACKNOWLEDGING AND APOLOGIZING FOR THE MISTREATMENT OF, AND DISCRIMINATION AGAINST, LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL, AND TRANSGENDER INDIVIDUALS WHO SERVED THE UNITED STATES IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES, THE FOREIGN SERVICES, AND THE FEDERAL CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. Kaine (for himself, Ms. Baldwin, Mr. Coons, Mr. Merkley, Mr. Fetterman, Mrs. Murray, Mr. Schatz, Mrs. Shaheen, Mr. Casey, Mr. Durbin, Mr. Markey, Mr. Blumenthal, Mr. Cardin, Mr. Whitehouse, Mrs. Gillibrand, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Wyden, Mr.

Brown, and Mr. Warner) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

S. RES. 740

Whereas the Federal Government discriminated against and terminated hundreds of thousands of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (referred to in this preamble as "LGBT") individuals who served the United States in the uniformed services, the Foreign Service, and the Federal civil service (referred to in this preamble as "civilian employees") for decades, causing untold harm to those individuals professionally, financially, socially, and medically, among other harms;

Whereas Congress enacted legislation, led oversight hearings, and issued reports and public pronouncements against LGBT military service members, Foreign Service members, and civilian employees;

Whereas the policy that led to the discharge and systematic screening of gay, lesbian, and bisexual military service members was codified in a 1949 decree by the newly consolidated Department of Defense, which mandated that "homosexual personnel, irrespective of sex, should not be permitted to serve in any branch of the Armed Forces in any capacity and prompt separation of known homosexuals from the Armed Forces is mandatory";

Whereas the Federal Government maintained policies to drive hundreds of thousands of LGBT military service members, who honorably served the United States in uniform, including many who were fighting in wars around the world, from its military ranks;

Whereas, in 1993, Congress enacted the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1994 (Public Law 103-160; 107 Stat. 1547), which contained the so-called "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy that prohibited lesbian, gay, and bisexual military service members from disclosing their sexual orientation while they served in the Armed Forces;

Whereas, despite the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, LGBT military service members continued to be investigated and discharged solely on the basis of the sexual orientation of those military service members;

Whereas historians have estimated that at least 100,000 military service members were forced out of the uniformed services between World War II and 2011 simply for being LGBT, while countless others were forced to hide their identities and live in fear while serving, with many being denied access to the benefits granted to honorably discharged veterans;

Whereas, although the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy was intended to allow qualified citizens to serve in the Armed Forces regardless of their sexual orientation, the policy was inherently discriminatory against LGBT military service members because it prohibited those service members from disclosing their sexual orientation;

Whereas, with the enactment of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (10 U.S.C. 654 note; Public Law 111-321), Congress joined military leaders in acknowledging that lesbian, gay, and bisexual military service members serve the United States just as bravely and well as other military service members;

Whereas the Don't Ask, Don't Tell Repeal Act of 2010 (10 U.S.C. 654 note; Public Law 111-321) and the 2016 policy shift of the Department of Defense, which permitted transgender individuals to enlist and openly serve in the Armed Forces, have made the Armed Forces stronger and more effective;

Whereas, in 2023, 12 years after the repeal of the "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" policy, the

Department of Defense announced a proactive review initiative to identify veterans discharged due to their sexual orientation and assess whether an upgrade in discharge is warranted;

Whereas military leaders have likewise acknowledged that, in addition to lesbian, gay, and bisexual military service members, transgender service members also serve the United States just as bravely and well as other service members;

Whereas, under the pressures of the Cold War, and at the instigation and lead of Congress, the Federal Government also pursued anti-LGBT policies, which resulted in tens of thousands of LGBT civilian employees being terminated;

Whereas the Department of State began investigations into employees for alleged homosexual activity as early as the 1940s;

Whereas following the targeting of gay employees in the Department of State by Senator Joseph McCarthy in 1950, the Senate held hearings on “The Employment of Homosexuals and other Sex Perverts in the Government”, which—

(1) led to the issuance of a widely read report that falsely asserted that gay people posed a security risk because they could be easily blackmailed; and

(2) found that gay people were unsuitable employees because “one homosexual can pollute a Government office”;

Whereas, in response to allegations against gay people made by Senator McCarthy, the Department of State increased its persecution of lesbian, gay, and bisexual employees;

Whereas more than 1,000 Department of State employees were dismissed due to their sexual orientation, and many more individuals were prevented from joining the Department of State due to discriminatory hiring practices;

Whereas thousands of lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals served honorably in the Department of State as Foreign Service officers, Foreign Service specialists, civil servants, and contractors, upholding the values, and advancing the interests, of the United States even as the country discriminated against them;

Whereas the effort to purge gay and lesbian employees from the Federal Government was codified in 1953 when President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued Executive Order 10450 (18 Fed. Reg. 2489; relating to security requirements for Government employment), which—

(1) defined “perversion” as a security threat; and

(2) mandated that every civilian employee and contractor pass a security clearance;

Whereas, over many decades, the Federal Government, led by security officials in the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Civil Service Commission (referred to in this preamble as the “CSC”), and nearly every other agency of the Federal Government, investigated, harassed, interrogated, and terminated thousands of lesbian, gay, and bisexual civilian employees for no other reason than the sexual orientation of those employees;

Whereas these discriminatory policies by the Federal Government, the largest employer in the United States, encouraged similar efforts at the State and local level, particularly in higher education and the private sector;

Whereas, in 1969, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit ruled in *Norton v. Macy*, 417 F.2d 1161 (1969) that—

(1) “homosexual conduct” may never be the sole cause for dismissal of a protected civilian employee; and

(2) the potential embarrassment stemming from the private conduct of a civilian employee may not affect the efficiency of the Federal civil service;

Whereas, despite the decision in *Norton v. Macy*, the CSC continued its efforts to rid the Federal Government of gay, lesbian, and bisexual employees until 1973, when the United States District Court for the Northern District of California ruled in *Society for Individual Rights, Inc. v. Hampton*, 63 F.R.D. 399 (1973) that the exclusion or discharge from Federal civil service of any lesbian, gay, or bisexual person because of prejudice was prohibited;

Whereas many Federal Government agencies, including the National Security Agency, the Central Intelligence Agency, and the Department of State, none of which were subject to the rules of the CSC, continued to harass and seek to exclude lesbian, gay, and bisexual individuals from their ranks until 1995, when President Bill Clinton issued Executive Order 12968 (50 U.S.C. 3161 note; relating to access to classified information), which barred the practice of denying a Federal Government security clearance solely on the basis of sexual orientation;

Whereas transgender military service members, Foreign Service members, and civilian employees continued to be harassed and excluded from Federal civil service until 2014, when President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13672 (79 Fed. Reg. 42971; relating to further amendments to Executive Order 11478, Equal Employment Opportunity in the Federal Government, and Executive Order 11246, Equal Employment Opportunity), which prohibited the Federal Government and Federal contractors from discriminating on the basis of sexual orientation or gender identity;

Whereas, on January 9, 2017, Secretary of State John Kerry issued a formal apology for the pattern of discrimination against LGBT Foreign Service members and civilian employees at the Department of State;

Whereas, despite persecution and systematic mistreatment by the Federal Government beginning in the early 1940s through the 1990s, including what historians have labeled as the “Lavender Scare”, LGBT individuals have never stopped honorably serving the United States;

Whereas LGBT individuals continued to make significant contributions to the United States through their work as clerks and lawyers, surgeons and nurses, Purple Heart recipients and Navy Seals, translators and air traffic controllers, engineers and astronomers, teachers and diplomats, rangers and Postal Service workers, and advisors and policy makers;

Whereas other countries throughout the world, including some of the closest allies of the United States, have apologized for similarly discriminating against LGBT military service members, Foreign Service members, and civilian employees; and

Whereas, in order for the United States to heal and move forward, the Federal Government must accord all LGBT individuals who were discriminated against by, wrongfully terminated by, and excluded from serving in the uniformed services, the Foreign Service, and the Federal civil service the same acknowledgment and apology: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

The Senate—

(1) acknowledges and condemns the discrimination against, wrongful termination of, and exclusion from the Federal civil service, the Foreign Service, and the uniformed services of the thousands of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (referred to in this section as “LGBT”) individuals who were affected by the anti-LGBT policies of the Federal Government;

(2) on behalf of the United States, apologizes to—

(A) the affected LGBT military service members, Foreign Service members, veterans, and Federal civil service employees; and

(B) the families of those service members, veterans, and Federal civil service employees; and

(3) reaffirms the commitment of the Federal Government to treat all military service members, Foreign Service members, veterans, and Federal civil service employees and retirees, including LGBT individuals, with equal respect and fairness.

SEC. 2. DISCLAIMER.

Nothing in this resolution—

(1) authorizes or supports any claim against the United States; or

(2) serves as a settlement of any claim against the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 741—CONDEMNING THE ILLEGITIMATE REGIME OF NICOLAS MADURO IN THE BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF VENEZUELA

Mr. GRAHAM (for himself and Mr. RUBIO) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 741

Whereas, since 2005, the United States has imposed targeted sanctions on individuals and entities of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela that have engaged in criminal, anti-democratic, unconstitutional, or corrupt acts and violated basic human rights;

Whereas, since 2006, the Secretary of State has determined that Venezuela is not “co-operating fully with United States anti-terrorist efforts” as outlined in section 40A of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2781);

Whereas, since coming to power in 2013, Nicolás Maduro and his illegitimate regime have committed numerous criminal, anti-democratic, unconstitutional, and corrupt acts and violated basic human rights, including—

(1) embezzling billions of dollars from the Venezuelan people, including through the illicit removal of gold from the Central Bank of Venezuela;

(2) declaring approximately 12 percent of the country to be a part of an “Orinoco Mining Arc” and using his position to oversee the exploitation of vital resources for personal gain; and

(3) establishing the Special Action Force of the National Police (FAES) in 2017, and utilizing them to execute illegal raids and extrajudicial killings;

Whereas, on January 5, 2019, the people of Venezuela responded to years of suffering and suppression under Nicolás Maduro by electing Juan Guaidó as President of the National Assembly of Venezuela, the only remaining democratically elected and legitimate institution in the country;

Whereas, upon being elected President of the National Assembly of Venezuela, Juan Guaidó invoked relevant articles of the Venezuelan constitution and became the Interim President of Venezuela;

Whereas, on January 10, 2019, Nicolás Maduro unlawfully reassumed the presidency of Venezuela, and his rule was deemed illegitimate by many Venezuelans and more than 50 countries, including most of the neighboring countries of Venezuela, the United States, and the majority of the European Union;

Whereas, since unlawfully reassuming the presidency in 2019, Nicolás Maduro has exacerbated ongoing economic and humanitarian crises, and forced more than 7,700,000 people to flee Venezuela;

Whereas Nicolás Maduro has provided diplomatic support to, and engaged with, countries that have been designated as state sponsors of terrorism under United States law, including by—

(1) allowing the Republic of Cuba to restructure the Venezuelan military, train armed forces in Venezuela, train Venezuelan intelligence agents in Cuba, and stating that Venezuela is “grateful to Cuba’s revolutionary armed forces” and “salute them and will always welcome them”;

(2) awarding a \$490,000,000 contract to the state-owned National Iranian Oil Refining and Distribution Company to revamp the Paraguana Refining Center, the largest refining complex in Venezuela; and

(3) establishing a diplomatic mission and embassy in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (commonly known as “North Korea”) and allowing North Korea to similarly establish a mission and embassy in Venezuela;

Whereas, in response to the numerous criminal, anti-democratic, unconstitutional, and corrupt acts and basic human rights violations committed by Nicolás Maduro and persons serving in his illegitimate regime, the United States has imposed a number of sanctions on him and his enablers, including—

(1) on March 8, 2015, when President Barack Obama issued Executive Order 13692 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property and suspending entry of certain persons contributing to the situation in Venezuela) to sanction persons engaged in public corruption activities and involved in human rights violations, the persecution of political opponents, the curtailment of press freedoms, and the arbitrary arrest and detention of anti-government protestors;

(2) on August 24, 2017, when President Donald Trump issued Executive Order 13808 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to imposing additional sanctions with respect to the situation in Venezuela), which prohibited the Government of Venezuela from accessing financial markets of the United States;

(3) on March 19, 2018, when President Donald Trump issued Executive Order 13827 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to taking additional steps to address the situation in Venezuela) to prohibit any transaction involving the issuance of any Venezuelan digital currency;

(4) on May 21, 2018, when President Donald Trump issued Executive Order 13885 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to prohibiting certain additional transactions with respect to Venezuela) to prohibit transactions related to purchasing Venezuelan debt;

(5) on August 5, 2019, when President Donald Trump issued Executive Order 13884 (50 U.S.C. 1701 note; relating to blocking property of the Government of Venezuela), freezing the assets of the Maduro government in the United States and blocking the property, imposing visa restrictions, and permitting financial sanctions on non-United States persons that assist the Maduro government; and

(6) under section 7031(c)(1)(A) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations and Related Appropriations Act of 2019 (Public Law 116-6; 133 Stat. 317) and section 7031(c)(1)(A) of the Department of State, Foreign Operations and Related Appropriations Act of 2020 (Public Law 116-94; 133 Stat. 2864);

Whereas, on October 17, 2023, the illegitimate Maduro regime signed the Partial Agreement on the Promotion of Political Rights and Electoral Guarantees for All (commonly known as the “Barbados Agreement”), which states that all parties, including the opposition party, shall be allowed to freely select their candidates for the presidential election;

Whereas the Biden Administration—

(1) on October 18, 2023, in response to the signing of the Barbados Agreement, issued General License No. 44 and suspended certain sanctions on Venezuela’s oil and gas sector; and

(2) allowed General License No. 44 to expire on April 18, 2024, in response the illegitimate Maduro regime preventing the democratic opposition from registering the candidate of their choice, harassing and intimidating political opponents, and unjustly detaining numerous political actors and members of civil society;

Whereas María Corina Machado—

(1) was elected by the people of Venezuela on October 26, 2023, as the opposition candidate to run against the illegitimate Maduro regime in the July 28, 2024, presidential election in Venezuela;

(2) was subsequently disqualified on January 26, 2024, by the Supreme Justice Tribunal, the highest court of Venezuela, from running in the election and was not provided the opportunity to respond to the disqualifying allegations in court; and

(3) has since endorsed Edmundo González Urrutia to run for President of Venezuela since her unwarranted disqualification, stating on the campaign trail, “We are united and strong”;

Whereas, on December 20, 2023, the Maduro regime finally released 6 wrongfully detained United States citizens in Venezuela only after the Biden Administration agreed to release Alex Saab, who was charged in Federal court in October 2021, for laundering the proceeds of violations of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (Public Law 95-213; 91 Stat. 1494) in connection with a scheme to pay bribes to take advantage of the exchange rate controlled by Venezuela;

Whereas the Department of State has described Saab as “one of the two most important money men in the Maduro government” and “the middle man” between Maduro’s narco-terrorist regime and the Islamic Republic of Iran;

Whereas, prior to his arrest, Saab established the illegal “Gold for Gas” scheme with Iran, allowing the country to avoid sanctions and be paid in Venezuelan gold in exchange for sham “humanitarian” deliveries of fuel to Venezuela;

Whereas, on January 15, 2024, Maduro proved to the world that he operates a criminal enterprise disguised as a country when he named Alex Saab as the head of Venezuela’s International Investment Center; and

Whereas the illegitimate Maduro regime has exhibited a clear pattern of corruption, ruling by force, and undermining stability and democracy in Venezuela: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) rejects the attempt by the illegitimate Maduro regime to hold sham elections and consolidate power through weaponizing institutions, especially the electoral committee and judicial system;

(2) demands that the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela hold free and fair elections on July 28, 2024, and allow all opposition candidates, including Edmundo González Urrutia, to register on the ballot and participate in the elections in compliance with the Partial Agreement on the Promotion of Political Rights and Electoral Guarantees for All (commonly known as the “Barbados Agreement”);

(3) denounces any attempt by the illegitimate Maduro regime to intimidate and repress the Venezuelan people and its democratic candidates through any kind of violence;

(4) condemns the illegitimate Maduro regime for the flagrant and repeated acts of corruption, desecrating the rule of law, and

engaging in anti-democratic and criminal acts; and

(5) encourages the Administration to condemn the results of the Venezuelan election on July 28, 2024, if fraud occurs, and to subsequently impose additional sanctions on Maduro and the coconspirators in his illegitimate regime to ensure they are unable to profit through their illegal and corrupt activities.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

MR. SCHUMER. Madam President, I have seven requests for committees to meet during today’s session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today’s session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 18, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 18, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 18, 2024, at 8:45 p.m., to hold a working coffee titled “Visit of His Excellency Jens Stoltenberg.”

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 18, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

The Committee on Rules and Administration is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 18, 2024, at 2:45 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 18, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 18, 2024, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

MR. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to grant floor privileges to my interns for the following days—these are the days that they are having their shadow day where they accompany me around the

Capitol—Mimi Papathanasopoulos on June 18, 2024; Liliana Hernandez Vazquez on July 9, 2024; Amelia Ulmer on July 11, 2024; Oscar Ponteri on July 24; Samantha Castaneda on July 25; Anna Whitworth on July 30; Catherine Bikales on August 1, 2024; and Timothy Withrow on September 11, 2024.

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

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2024

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 10 a.m. on Thursday, June 20; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the 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; that following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Maldonado nomination; further, that the cloture motion with respect to the Maldonado nomination ripen at 1:45 p.m.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 2024, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:22 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, June 20, 2024, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION

STANLEY H. RYAN, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE MILLENNIUM CHALLENGE CORPORATION FOR A TERM OF THREE YEARS, VICE ALEXANDER CRENshaw, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MARK ANGELSON, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF NORWAY.

ELIZABETH M. AUBIN, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CAMEROON.

STEPHANIE L. HALLETT, OF FLORIDA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF BAHRAIN.

BRIAN K. STIMMLER, OF NEBRASKA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC.

STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE

LEKRESHA R. MOULTRIE, OF DELAWARE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2024, VICE HERNAN D. VERA, TERM EXPIRED.

LAKRESHA R. MOULTRIE, OF DELAWARE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE STATE JUSTICE INSTITUTE FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 17, 2027. (REAPPOINTMENT)

PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD

J. TYLER MCGAUGHEY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT

BOARD FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE RICHARD E. DIZINNO, TERM EXPIRED.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*STEPHEN H. RAVAS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 18, 2024:

THE JUDICIARY

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.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) LUKE A. FROST

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) DENNIS E. COLLINS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) GREGORY K. EMERY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral

REAR ADM. (LH) BRADLEY D. DUNHAM

REAR ADM. (LH) SCOTT W. RUSTON

REAR ADM. (LH) DOUGLAS W. SASSE III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. TROY S. PUGH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. MICHAEL L. FREIDBERG

CAPT. RYAN K. MAHELONA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. SHAWN G. DENIHAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. BENJAMIN E. BARAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. DAVID N. BARNES

CAPT. REGINALD H. HENDRIX

CAPT. MARCUS J. LOCKARD, JR.

CAPT. JASON M. NAIDYHORSKI

CAPT. KATIE F. SHELDON

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

BRIG. GEN. MICHAEL E. CONLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. DAVID H. TABOR

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS K. HENSLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. TONY D. BAUERNFEIND

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

LT. GEN. SEAN C. BERNABE

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 8088:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. CHRISTOPHER C. FRENCH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. SCOTT W. PAPPANO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. JEFFREY T. ANDERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVY RESERVE AND APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 8088:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. NANCY S. LACORE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JORGE M. FONSECA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. NICOLE M. BALLIET

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. CINDY M. SALADIN-MUHAMMED

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. THOMAS C. FRILOUX

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. GORDON R. MEYER

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN

THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. CARRIE L. PEREZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. ADAM K. AKE
COL. ANDREW D. CECIL
COL. JOHN M. DUNN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601, 7037, AND 7064:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOSEPH B. BERGER III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS DEPUTY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY, AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 7037 AND 7064:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT A. BORCHERDING
IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. MELVIN G. CARTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. BENJAMIN T. WATSON
IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER J. ROLLINS, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF NYREE Y. WATTS, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY B. ABRAHAM AND ENDING WITH BRIAN K. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 9, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KRISTIN E. AGRESTA AND ENDING WITH EMILEE C. VENN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 18, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BARBARA K. BUJAK AND ENDING WITH JOSHUA D. WALTERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 18, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LOVIE L. ABRAHAM AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL T. WALKINGSTICK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 18, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARLENE ARIASREYNOSO AND ENDING WITH 0002516194, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 18, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL J. BROWNING AND ENDING WITH 0002686492, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TODD M. ANTON AND ENDING WITH 0002951212, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RYAN H. ALLRED AND ENDING WITH BRANDON J. WOLF, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CHAD C. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH 0002374957, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

ARMY NOMINATION OF EDWARD Y. PARK, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF BRIDGETTE R. BELL, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JAMAL D. SNELL, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF TERENCE W. PHILLIPS II, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ZACHARY T. GOEHLER, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF KEITH M. SANDERS, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF CHELSEA M. TRUAX, TO BE MAJOR.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF TAYLOR B. EVANS, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF JACOB C. PIPPING, TO BE MAJOR.

MARINE CORPS NOMINATION OF SHAWN R. LOUGHMAN, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ALBERT E. ARNOLD IV AND ENDING WITH JUSTIN R. WIESEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GINA M. D. BECKER AND ENDING WITH ANNE L. ZACK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH BRIAN C. EARP AND ENDING WITH CHAD A. REDMER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TRAVIS J. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH JEREMY R. WOODY, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KITAN BAE AND ENDING WITH DAVID T. SPALDING, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW S. CUSHANICK AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY R. PORTELL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MATTHEW P. ALLAN AND ENDING WITH CHRISTINA J. WONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANTHONY J. FALVO IV AND ENDING WITH HAYLEY C. SIMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL A. FREAS AND ENDING WITH NICHOLAS T. WALKER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH FRANK T. BORREGO AND ENDING WITH GREGORY L. TINER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KENT L. DAVIS AND ENDING WITH TRAVIS L. SCOTT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ZACHARY D. HARRY AND ENDING WITH GREGORY B. PRICE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADAM G. BORSMAN AND ENDING WITH DENNIS L. RICHARDSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NATHANIEL D. RIGHTSELL, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JUSTIN K. CONROY AND ENDING WITH EMMANUEL M. THOMANN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JONATHAN R. ALSTON AND ENDING WITH JONATHAN D. TIGHE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON APRIL 30, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SCOTT F. ALDRIDGE AND ENDING WITH MICHAEL P. SMITH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH KYLE L. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH CRAIG A. ZECCHIN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DANIEL W. BERGER AND ENDING WITH JARED M. STIMSON, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICARDO M. ABAKAH AND ENDING WITH YU ZHENG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS B. ABLEMAN AND ENDING WITH JERRY YUAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL R. BASSO AND ENDING WITH AARON D. PICKETT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATION OF CATHERINE E. WILLIAMS, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SUNGHWAN T. CHOE AND ENDING WITH MELANIE A. DRIVER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM L. ADKINS AND ENDING WITH DAVID J. WILLARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT A. BOGAN AND ENDING WITH ROBERT D. WOODWARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RONALD L. JAMES AND ENDING WITH DANIEL J. WOODARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL A. CHINN AND ENDING WITH SHANE D. UHLIR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATION OF RYAN T. BANGHAM, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AARON J. BEDY AND ENDING WITH NICOLAS A. MELENDEZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VINCENT DEUSANIO, JR. AND ENDING WITH STEFAN C. YESKO, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ROBERT J. FLEMING AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH J. STEWART, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NOREEN P. KIRBY AND ENDING WITH PATRICK D. TACKITT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 7, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATION OF BRYON M. LEE, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATION OF HANA LEE, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF TIMOTHY P. FLETCHER, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARK K. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH GERALD V. WEERS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 20, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANASTASIA S. ABID AND ENDING WITH ASHLEY L. WARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 20, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ADAM D. AHLSTROM AND ENDING WITH JEREMIAH J. ZAMORA, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 20, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WARREN K. BLACKBURN AND ENDING WITH JAMES L. VENKUS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JOHN D. AULT AND ENDING WITH TIMOTHY A. SPRINGER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH AARON T. ALLISON AND ENDING WITH KRISTIN B. WHITEHOUSE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH COLLEEN C. BLOSSER AND ENDING WITH DAMIAN M. STORZ, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MICHAEL W. BLOOMROSE AND ENDING WITH MATTHEW J. WOOTEN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2024.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GARTH W. ALDRICH AND ENDING WITH EMILY L. ZYWICKE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON MAY 23, 2024.