



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2024

No. 142

## 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.

Eternal God, our shelter in life's storms, Your Kingdom is above all earthly kingdoms. Today, empower the Members of this body with the wisdom, courage, and strength needed for our times. Infuse them with the passion to act in ways that honor Your Name.

Lord, preserve their health and strength by Your mercy and power. May they find Your grace sufficient for every need.

Bless also the citizens of this great land. Give them the wisdom to pray for our government and our leaders, so that all people may live quiet and peaceful lives in all goodness and holiness.

We pray in Your merciful 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, September 12, 2024.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,  
President pro tempore.

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

### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Laura Margarete Provinzino, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, now before the month is out, both parties in both Chambers must unite on the most important goal of this work period: keeping the government open with a temporary extension of Federal funding. A continuing resolution, as we all know, is not a substitute for the appropriations process, but, rather, a tool to give us more time for the appropriators

to do their work. And, fortunately—in this body at least—Democratic and Republican appropriators have a very good track record of working together.

In divided government, the only way Congress has been able to pass CRs is through bipartisan cooperation. We have seen that again and again and again these last 2 years.

Unfortunately, House Republicans have regrettably forgotten that lesson. About a week ago, they introduced a 6-month CR that, from the first, proved to be unserious, partisan, and insufficient. And given what has happened in the House in the last few days, it is becoming clearer and clearer that only a bipartisan solution will work. We have been saying this all along, but the events of the past few days even further confirm just how much it is true.

A real proposal for avoiding a shutdown would be the one that both sides write together, but House Republicans wrote their CR behind closed doors, without any input from the Democratic leader in the House, the President, myself, or any of the Democratic appropriators. A real proposal for avoiding a shutdown would avoid poison pills, but House Republicans wrote their CR with poison pills front and center. They know perfectly well this approach doesn't work.

A real proposal for avoiding a shutdown is one that doesn't hamstring our national defense, doesn't weaken our border security, and doesn't hurt our veterans and farmers and so many others. And instead of a short-term extension of the deadline, the House Republicans released a bill that kicks the can down the road for half a year.

That is no way to govern; particularly on military affairs, it is no way to govern. You can't run a military with a 6-month funding patch like House Republicans' leader proposed. It would slow down everything: insufficient resources for recruitment and troop pay increases and research. This 6-month CR would hurt the awarding of

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S6005

new military contracts and cause immediate and immense uncertainty and cost increases for the old ones.

So I urge Speaker Johnson to set aside this CR proposal and try again. We have already lost 1 week in this 3-week work period. We all know what we need to do if we want to ensure the government does not shut down: We need a bipartisan bill, a temporary extension. The Democratic leader in the House and I are ready and willing to work with the Speaker, as we have done before.

#### INFLATION

Mr. President, now on inflation, yesterday Americans got another piece of excellent news in the fight against inflation. According to the Department of Labor, the consumer price index was measured at 2.5 percent in August compared to a year ago. This floor chart illustrates just that: 2 years ago, 2 years after we passed the Inflation Reduction Act and Chips and Science, inflation has now slowed to a 3-year low. Here is what it was in 2022; here is what it is right now. It went from 8.3 percent when the Chips and Science Act and the Inflation Reduction Act were passed to 2.5 percent today. Let me repeat: 2 years after the Inflation Reduction Act and the Chips and Science Act, inflation has slowed to a 3-year low.

Republicans claimed investing in America would make inflation skyrocket and drive our economy into a recession. Instead, the United States has had the strongest post-COVID recovery in the world. Manufacturing, construction at an alltime high, nearly triple its peak during the past administration, and inflation continues to trend lower. And inflation has slowed, despite Senate Republicans trying to block and derail so many of the bills we have pushed in this Chamber to lower costs and make life easier for American families.

Remember, when Republicans had a chance to vote for lower prescription drug costs for seniors, they voted no. When Republicans had a chance to cap insulin at \$35 a month for Americans on Medicare, they voted no. When Republicans had the chance to dramatically expand the child tax credit and cut child poverty in this country in half, they voted no. And when Republicans had the chance to invest in rebuilding America and bringing advanced manufacturing jobs back to our shores and open new factories for EVs and solar and chips, many of them still voted no—though, then back home, they tried to take credit for these jobs. For 3 years, Republicans have proudly been the party of “no”: no solutions, no plans, no attempts to fix our country’s problems.

But today’s report shows that the Democratic agenda is working. This is dramatic. And despite Republicans’ best efforts to derail our country’s recovery, we have moved forward in a very positive way. We have a lot of work still to do. People still need a lot

of help to make ends meet and save for retirement and provide for their families, but we are on our way. We are on our way, as this chart shows.

#### PROJECT 2025

Mr. President, now on Project 2025, the more people learn about Donald Trump’s 2025 agenda, the more they realize how devastating it would be for our country. Later today, I will join with my Democratic colleagues to shine a light on this revolting MAGA agenda.

On its surface, Project 2025 proposes the most conservative, most radical, most unhinged collection of policies in modern history. Let me say that again: Project 2025 proposes the most conservative, the most radical, the most unhinged collection of policies in modern history.

And when you dig even deeper, Project 2025 is even worse than that. It reads like a hard-right wish list for some of the nastiest, most harmful policies you can imagine. Project 2025 would devastate American education by abolishing the Department of Education and eliminating Head Start for 2.9 million students.

Republicans claim they care about families, but eliminating Head Start means Republicans want to kill a program that studies show makes it far more likely that low-income kids will graduate high school, attend college, earn more money, and lead healthier lives. That is what Republicans would eliminate by killing Head Start.

Project 2025 would send the cost of healthcare and prescription drugs soaring, repealing the \$35 cap on insulin for seniors on Medicare that Democrats enacted into law. The \$35 cap on insulin for seniors was a lifesaving reform—literally, a lifesaving reform. It will help ensure seniors won’t go broke trying to manage their diabetes. But Project 2025 callously, cruelly would kill that measure and tell seniors who struggle to afford insulin that they are on their own—utter cruelty.

Project 2025 would also intensify the GOP’s war on reproductive freedom by laying the groundwork for a national abortion ban, pushing States to monitor women’s pregnancies. Let me repeat that: Project 2025 pushes States to monitor women’s pregnancies.

This is what they call freedom? Give me a break.

Project 2025 would betray our veterans by cutting disability benefits for veterans and defunding VA hospitals, including the only VA on Long Island. The Northport VA could potentially, given their cuts, be defunded.

And, finally, 2025 would make it harder for Americans to own a home by privatizing Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, causing dramatic spikes in mortgage rates.

Owning a home is a hallmark of the American Dream. We shouldn’t make it harder for people to own homes, and that is precisely what 2025 would do.

So let me be clear: Project 2025 is the Trump agenda. Its staff reads like a

who is who of the first Trump administration, and many of them would be part of a second Trump administration and be in charge of writing policy. So make no mistake, America, if Donald Trump returns to the White House, Project 2025 will be the playbook his staff will use for implementing the policies of his new administration, and we are all in danger should that occur.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

#### NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to begin by reminding our colleagues of a report released before the August State work period. It is a report Congress commissioned in the fiscal year 2022 NDAA, produced by a panel of experts that Congress appointed—the bipartisan Commission on the National Defense Strategy.

The Commission was tasked with reviewing the Biden administration’s national defense strategy and conducting an independent assessment of the threats and requirements of our common defense.

Any of our colleagues who haven’t yet taken a close look at this report should. But I would like to reiterate a few of its conclusions that I discussed just last month as the Appropriations Committee finalized defense spending legislation for the coming year.

This ought to grab our attention, from the report:

[T]he U.S. military lacks both the capabilities and the capacity required to be confident it can deter and prevail in combat.

[T]he U.S. defense industrial base . . . is unable to meet the equipment, technology, and munitions needs of the United States and its allies and partners.

[T]he U.S. public are largely unaware of the dangers the United States faces or the costs (financial and otherwise) required to adequately prepare.

The report doesn’t flinch in assessing the full scale of the threats posed by major adversaries: Russian victory in Ukraine would make Moscow “an emboldened and likely stronger power, requiring NATO to build and deploy additional forces, potentially at the expense of other locations where these resources could be applied.

China is outpacing the United States and has largely negated the U.S. military advantage in the Western Pacific through two decades of focused military investment.

And, perhaps most alarmingly, the growing partnership and collaboration between our adversaries “increases the

likelihood that a conflict with one would expand to multiple fronts, causing simultaneous demands on U.S. and ally resources.

It is a sobering assessment with some urgent recommendations to go along with it. The question now is what we are willing to do about it.

Congress has a constitutional duty to provide for the common defense. We have a responsibility to align resources with our requirements and our strategy to provide funding adequate to ensure American military superiority.

Unfortunately, this is work Congress must do without help from this administration. And as one Commissioner, Roger Zakheim, has observed, President Biden's 2022 NDS mentioned neither "budget," "funding," nor "dollar."

But after a week back in Washington, Congress is no closer to delivering full-year top-line defense spending than we were back on August 1. The critical increases Vice Chair COLLINS secured over the President's anemic budget request are no closer to becoming law, neither is the National Defense Authorization Act, which the Democratic leader has yet to schedule for floor time.

So it is one thing to request expert analysis; it would be quite another to do the urgent work that analysis rightly prescribes.

#### **PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS**

Mr. President, on another matter, one of the few details Vice President HARRIS has shared about her governing agenda is a pledge to implement price controls at the grocery store to end so-called price-gouging.

The eerie echoes of Marxist propaganda in that talking point have already attracted attention. But we don't have to dig too far back in the history books to find an example that she may be drawing from.

The Biden-Harris administration itself has used similar language to describe another socialist-inspired price control scheme: the one to combat supposed price-gouging in the market for lifesaving pharmaceutical treatments.

And so far, prescription drug socialism is not working out too well. According to a recent study, nearly 3.5 million beneficiaries are expected to pay higher—higher—out-of-pocket costs as a result of the administration's proposed scheme.

But that hasn't stopped them. Last month, the administration released the maximum fair price for the first 10 medicines selected for its coercive negotiation program. Of course, when you dig into the details, the scheme sounds less like a negotiation than a shake-down.

If the dictated maximum fair price is not feasible, drugmakers have two choices: They can pay an exorbitant excise fee or they can withdraw entirely from participating in Medicaid and Medicare.

Now, remember, the real losers from this misguided policy are the vulner-

able patients who are left with fewer lifesaving cures.

Roche and AstraZeneca have indicated that they will be discontinuing certain drug trials or considering delaying launching cancer medications due to the financial penalties from the Inflation Reduction Act, and yet Biden and HARRIS seem largely unbothered.

Last month, President Biden went on the road to celebrate the results of the Cancer Moonshot Initiative, an accomplishment I was proud to partner with him on. But he hasn't reckoned with estimates that the Inflation Reduction Act could eliminate nine times the amount of funding for cancer research that the Cancer Moonshot created.

Let me say that again.

He hasn't reckoned with estimates that the Inflation Reduction Act could eliminate nine times the amount of funding for cancer research that the Cancer Moonshot created.

Vice President HARRIS, similarly blinded to the consequences of her work, has recently bragged about her role in passing the Inflation Reduction Act.

I can't imagine that Americans facing rare disease diagnoses are as proud of that record as she is.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

#### **SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAM**

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there was a time not that long ago when families had a similar challenge across America: what to do with mom and dad. At that time, there wasn't much to turn to. If you were fortunate, your parents, during the course of their lifetime, saved up enough money to take care of themselves.

But in my family and many others, it was common to have that spare bedroom for grandma and grandpa because there was no place else to go. It was part of American family life. It caused some hardship. The kids had to double up in the bedrooms, and some of the activities in the family were limited. But you did it because you loved them and they needed help and they couldn't take care of themselves.

In 1939, that started to change. A President named Franklin Delano Roosevelt thought, It is time for us to give some relief to these families, to give dignity to seniors in their retirement years. And he created a program called Social Security—now one of the most popular programs in the United States.

You don't hear many candidates for President standing up and saying, "I am going to cut Social Security benefits," do you? It is worshiped and venerated and respected and followed by families across America. But the critics in the creation of Social Security called it socialism. Socialism: Too much government, leave us alone; let mom and dad live in that spare bedroom; don't give them a separate savings account they can accumulate during their lifetime. If they do it, fine. If they don't, fine too. Socialism.

Fast forward to the 1960s. Now we have a new concern: How are we going

to pay for the healthcare of seniors now that they are living longer because of Social Security? What are we going to do about it?

There was a concern in Washington that the cost of medical care—surgeries and treatment—was just too expensive for the average person. And so President Lyndon Baines Johnson created Medicare. Medicare was a health insurance program for senior citizens across America.

When it started, it ushered in a dramatic change in healthcare in America. The construction of hospitals started expanding their pace across this country. Medicare made a big difference.

What did they say about it in criticizing it? Socialism: Too much government trying to provide healthcare for senior citizens. Of course, Medicaid came on its heels, as well, to take care of low-income individuals facing the same challenge.

"Socialism"—we hear that time and again. This morning, the Republican Senate leader criticized efforts to lower pharmacy drug costs across America. He called it prescription drug socialism. Here we go again. Any effort to help the average family who is trying to get by and trying to make ends meet that involves the government is criticized as socialism. The argument was made by the Republican leader that this socialism, this lowering of prescription drug prices, is ultimately going to stifle research and competition. He failed to mention one or two things.

First, he failed to mention that virtually every single prescription drug that is now making a difference across America started with government research. The National Institutes of Health—the premier medical research Agency in the world—did the basic research for virtually every single one of these drugs. As much as I admire the private sector—and I do—and as much as I wish the pharmaceutical industry well, the fact is, if they are honest about it, they are simply bargaining with the government that helped them get started to find profitable products.

The second thing I want to note that the Republican leader did not mention this morning is that, for decades now, we have allowed the Veterans Health Administration to negotiate drug prices. In other words, what we are now doing in Medicare, we have been doing for veterans. Our theory was our veterans deserve the best, and we have got to be able to afford it as a government, and they have to be able to afford it as individuals. So we negotiated these drug prices. I didn't hear any screaming and hollering about helping our veterans, because it was the right thing to do.

Doing that for veterans is virtually the same thing that is happening in other countries. Why are exactly the same drugs that are made in the United States sold in Canada for a fraction of the cost? Because the Canadian

Government negotiated—just like the Veterans Health Administration in the United States—for reasonable prices for Canadian citizens. Now we are doing the same thing. Finally, after decades of promise, it is happening. This notion that the top 10 drugs under Medicare are now going to be negotiated so that we can bring prices within reach of the government and individuals is simply an extension of what we have been doing at the VA for years. I have to tell you it makes a difference, a serious difference.

Imagine that the Biden-Harris proposal not only allows for negotiating prices down to a reasonable level for Medicare, but it also says that you in Medicare are limited to a \$2,000 annual expenditure for prescription drugs. And \$2,000 is a lot of money. Don't get me wrong. For a lot of people, it is a hardship to come up with that kind of money, but it is within the reach for most Americans to pay that amount of money. We know that drugs, otherwise, are too darned expensive for them.

Now, the critics of that, like the Senator from Kentucky, this morning, call it socialism. I call it the American approach to helping families—a realistic approach that says that pharmaceutical drugs should be affordable. If I understood the position of the Kentucky Senator this morning, he thinks it is a big mistake. I think it is a breakthrough. Finally, we are going to reach the day when we can negotiate prices for those not in Medicare who will be helped as well. So I wanted to start my remarks with that.

#### VENEZUELA

Mr. President, in 2018, 6 years ago, I visited Venezuela—a once prosperous, albeit imperfect, democracy suffering terrible economic and political decline.

As we drove around the streets of Caracas, the person from the Embassy in the car said: Take a look at something you might not notice. Notice the belts that the people of Caracas are wearing, particularly the men, and notice how long the end of the belt is and how many notches they have put in the belt. The people are starving in this country because of the government of Nicolas Maduro.

I told President Maduro at a meeting during that visit that the upcoming election, which was just months away, would only be credible if it was monitored and honest. He went ahead with the discredited election anyway. The result was as predicted: an exodus of millions of desperate people fleeing repression and economic collapse.

A few weeks ago, Venezuela held another Presidential election in which the regime had arbitrarily blocked key opposition candidates from the ballot and had tried to undermine the preelectoral process. This is an indication of what activities are going on. Venezuelan opposition candidate Edmundo Gonzalez eventually left the country, even though it was pretty clear from the results that we were able to glean from the Venezuelan elec-

tion that he was the winner. Ten million Venezuelans peacefully had voted. Results that were meticulously documented by credible monitors showed an overall win for this opposition candidate. Despite this, the Maduro regime refused to release the results and announced that they had won instead. It arbitrarily arrested thousands of opposition supporters and issued an outrageous warrant for the arrest of Gonzalez, forcing him to leave the country.

Enough of this madness. Enough of this outright theft of the Venezuelan voters' overwhelming choice for a better future. This week, I have introduced a simple 2-page bill terminating all U.S. petroleum cooperation and related trade with Venezuela until the legitimate results of the election are respected. I also filed it as an amendment to the annual Defense authorization bill.

The entrenched regime clings to power using oil revenues dependent on U.S. involvement. Under my bill, that is going to end and so will Maduro's financial strength. It is simply that simple. Are we going to do business as usual with a dictator who ignores the results of a freely held election?

I also appealed to our democratic allies in the region, including the democracies of the Caribbean, to stand resolute in the defense of a sweeping and clear vote by the Venezuelan people. They cannot sit idly by for another 6 years amidst regime-inflicted suffering and economic collapse in Venezuela. Our neighbors in Venezuela deserve better.

#### JUDICIAL CONFIRMATIONS

Mr. President, on a separate topic, over the past 3 years, something profound has happened on the floor of the Senate. We have been building on the most important accomplishments of the Biden-Harris administration: the confirmations of highly qualified, independent, even-handed judges to the Federal bench.

To date, we have confirmed 208 judges to lifetime positions on the Federal judiciary during my time as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee over the last 3½ years. This is progress. We have stayed on pace with the number of judges confirmed during the Trump administration, even though we have had the longest evenly divided Senate in history. We now only have a narrow majority of 51 to 49.

These confirmations highlight the Senate Judiciary Committee's and Biden-Harris administration's commitment to filling vacancies with highly qualified, diverse candidates who will ensure the fair administration of justice. This is a historic slate of judges we have approved who will rule with reason and restraint. They respect the rule of law, adhere to precedent, and answer only to the Constitution.

I have served on the Senate Judiciary Committee for more than two decades, including as chair for the past 3½ years. During that time, I have evaluated and voted on more than 1,000 judi-

cial nominees. The record is clear: President Biden's nominees to the Federal bench represent the best. Every single one—every single one—of the President's 208 judges so far has received at least a “qualified” rating from the American Bar Association, an indication that their peers found them to be high in integrity, professional competence, and judicial temperament.

Something that also stands out about President Biden's nominees, aside from their exceptional qualifications, is the professional and demographic diversity they bring. We have made history on the Senate Judiciary Committee and in the Senate in confirming more Black women to the Federal circuit courts than all of the previous Presidents of the United States combined. Of course, we have confirmed the first-ever Black woman to serve on the Supreme Court, Justice Ketanji Brown Jackson.

With Hispanic Heritage Month beginning this weekend, I would like to celebrate the historic nature of the Hispanic and Latino judges whom President Biden has nominated and we have approved. Just this week, we confirmed Jeannette Vargas to the Southern District of New York. During the Biden administration, the Senate has confirmed 37 Hispanic judges, more than any other President in history. President Biden also has appointed historic firsts to the bench, including the first-ever Hispanic judge to sit on the DC Circuit and the first Latina to sit on the Fifth. In my home State, Judge Nancy Maldonado became Illinois' first Latina Federal judge and, more recently, the first-ever Hispanic judge to serve on the Seventh Circuit.

Beyond this demographic diversity, there is recordbreaking professional diversity. In the past 3 years, we have confirmed more public defenders and circuit judges than all prior Presidents combined. There is nothing wrong with a former prosecutor being a Federal judge. I have voted for dozens of them, and I am sure they are competent in doing a good job. But if we want balance on the bench, we should make sure that we have diversity in professional background.

Another notable aspect of this record is that the vast majority—nearly 90 percent—of the Federal judges approved during the Biden administration have been bipartisan. This includes three-quarters of the appellate nominees. I want to thank my several Republican colleagues who have joined us in good faith to make this happen.

This focus on qualified, consensus nominees will go a long way to restoring trust in the judiciary. The American people want judges who look like America and understand the American experience in all of its forms. We will continue elevating judges who are qualified, principled, and committed—above all—to faithfully following the Constitution. The American people deserve nothing less.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### AUGUST WORK PERIOD

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, like many of our colleagues, I spend a lot of summer days on the road in my home State of South Dakota. The longer summer recesses give me the opportunity to travel the State far and wide, and with so much going on in South Dakota during the season, it is a great time for me to see familiar faces and to meet new folks as well.

I spend a lot of these summer days listening because what I hear from South Dakotans informs a lot of the work that I do here in the U.S. Senate.

In Howard, SD, I heard from healthcare professionals about some of the important programs that help them provide healthcare in rural areas.

Homebuilders in the Sioux Falls area told me about the headwinds they face from the Biden-Harris administration's overregulation, which has made building new homes more difficult and expensive.

At a Dakotafest in Mitchell, agricultural producers expressed their frustration that Congress has still not passed an updated farm bill—a frustration that I share. I have been pushing hard for Congress to take up a bill and will continue to do everything I can to advance this legislation. Another extension is no substitute for the certainty an updated farm bill would give farmers and ranchers as they make plans for the future, and getting it done should be a priority for Congress.

Traveling around South Dakota also gives me the chance to meet the people who keep our communities going.

I dropped in to hear from local officials in Leola and Eureka.

I got to learn about some of the things happening at Black Hills State University, and I toured South Dakota State's nursing simulation center in Brookings.

I visited the Liberty Center in Box Elder and saw the great work the Black Hills community does to make the area a welcoming place for service-members stationed at Ellsworth Air Force Base and for their families.

Whether it is Kuchen in Eureka, a quick bite at Ricky's Restaurant in Roscoe, or, of course, the Tubby Burger at the Brown County Fair, I know I can always find some good food to keep me fueled wherever I am traveling in South Dakota.

What would the summer be without a few celebrations? I was out in Rapid City for the annual Military Appreciation Barbecue, I joined the Fort Pierre 4th of July Parade, and I was back in my hometown of Murdo celebrating the 70th anniversary of the legendary Pio-

neer Auto Show and honoring the life of longtime museum owner Dave Geisler, who passed away earlier this year.

I had the opportunity to travel with my family in the Black Hills. We made stops in Spearfish Canyon, Hill City, Keystone, Lake Pactola, and Spearfish, among other places.

This summer was also notable for the successes of South Dakota's athletes. It was great to see two South Dakotans competing in the Olympics and Paralympics this year. Sioux Falls native Taryn Kloth competed in beach volleyball, and Miles Krajewski, a Yankton native and freshman at the University of South Dakota, made history as the first American to medal in badminton at the Paralympics, bringing home a silver medal in mixed doubles.

The Sioux Falls Little League All Star Team made it to the Little League World Series this summer, and by all accounts, they played well in Williamsport. They should be proud of their success, and I am glad to hear they were able to befriend fellow players from across the country and the world along the way.

It was great to be in Brookings this past weekend for the South Dakota State Jackrabbits' home opener, as they look to defend their back-to-back national titles this season.

Summer is a wonderful time in South Dakota, and it is a privilege to be able to spend part of it exploring our great State. The sunshine on the open prairie, the smell of the ponderosa pine, and the good people I meet along the way remind me how lucky I am to be a South Dakotan and what an honor it is to represent this special place in the U.S. Senate.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### DISASTER RELIEF FUNDING

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, Congress has one task over the next 2 weeks, and it is relatively straightforward: to keep the government open and avoid a pointless and costly shutdown that would hurt most Americans. And as we do that, there is one priority that we can't afford to neglect or punt, and that is providing disaster aid to communities across the country that are still waiting.

All across our country, in more than 20 States and territories, millions of Americans are reeling from disasters: wildfires, hurricanes, droughts, floods. And having lost their homes, their communities, their livelihoods, they count on the Federal Government to help.

For people on Maui, help is needed immediately. More than a year after the deadly fires that leveled an entire town, claimed 102 lives, and stole just about everything from those lucky enough to survive, nothing is normal yet. Survivors in temporary housing are being forced to move every few months. Many have moved five times in the last year, shattering any semblance of stability that they have been able to cobble together. Meanwhile, not a single home has been rebuilt so far. Not a single home has been rebuilt so far. That is a dire emergency for any community in any scenario, but it is especially worrying given that temporary housing assistance from FEMA is due to expire in 5 months.

The long and difficult recovery is squeezing survivors in other ways as well. With fewer jobs and smaller paychecks, people are having to figure out whether they can afford the most basic necessities. A recent poll of Maui wildfire victims found that 70 percent of survivors are cutting back on food and groceries—70 percent cutting back on food in the United States of America—and more than half are cutting back on medicine and other healthcare expenses.

So it is no surprise that people whose families have lived on Maui for generations are considering giving up and leaving the island altogether. And worse, thousands more are on the cusp of doing the same. For Lahaina to fully recover, it needs its people. For Lahaina to recover, it needs its people. And what those people need right now is tangible help—help with building a home, with finding a job, help with rebuilding their small businesses—the kind of help that will finally provide a reprieve from the constant worrying about what is next and hope that a better future awaits them after months of unimaginable suffering.

Providing that kind of help and relief to our fellow Americans in their hour of need is central to the promise of the Federal Government. There are not that many things that the Federal Government absolutely must do. There are not that many things that the Federal Government absolutely must do, but one of them is, when there is a disaster and a State or a county or an island or a reservation or a town is devastated by a natural disaster and the impact of that natural disaster exceeds the ability for that local unit of government to handle it, the President declares a disaster. And then FEMA comes in.

After that, HUD comes in with the support of the Congress through a program called Community Development Block Grants-Disaster Recovery. What does that mean? It is flexible funding for those communities to rebuild. FEMA came to the table and did the disaster response. Now we have to recover. People are not recovered. People are not recovered.

So we have an opportunity not to do something extraordinary but to do

something absolutely essential. We have an opportunity not to pass the Civil Rights Act but to do the thing that Congress always does, do the thing that Congress always does, which is, when a community gets flattened, we are there.

Now, the good news is that even though the House proposal for a continuing resolution sort of fell flat on its face for other reasons—because it was 6 months and because it had this other nonsense in it—it did have \$10 billion for disaster recovery. Now, that was a very narrow program called the Disaster Relief Fund, which absolutely needs those dollars, but the Republican House position is to fund disaster relief in the continuing resolution. We have got the chair and the ranking member in the U.S. Senate and the chair and the ranking member in the U.S. House of the Appropriations Committee saying they want to do disaster relief. We are not fighting about this as a partisan issue. We are not fighting about this as a partisan issue.

So we have an opportunity, again, not to do something unusual but to do the thing that we have always done. What would be unusual is to keep communities waiting for years now—years now. Wildfires in New Mexico. Unfortunately, there are some wildfires in Nevada as we speak. Twenty States waiting on help: Mississippi, Texas, Florida. All over the country, these communities need help.

A lot of stuff we do is really hard. A lot of stuff we do is really partisan. This is neither of those things. We just have to decide that among the things that the Federal Government does is that we come to the table for any American when a disaster hits. Let's get this done.

I yield the floor.

#### NOMINATION OF LAURA M. PROVINZINO

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today the Senate will vote to confirm Laura Provinzino to the U.S. District Court for the District of Minnesota.

Born in St. Cloud, MN, Ms. Provinzino received her B.A. from Lewis & Clark College, her B.A. from Oxford University as a Rhodes Scholar, and her J.D. from Yale Law School. After law school, she served as a law clerk to Judge Diana E. Murphy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit in Minneapolis.

Following her clerkship, Ms. Provinzino worked at Robins Kaplan LLP as a litigation associate, where her work involved civil litigation and criminal defense. Since 2010, she has been an assistant U.S. attorney in the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Minnesota. She handles all aspects of criminal investigation and prosecution and has prosecuted a wide variety of Federal crimes. Ms. Provinzino has served as a missing and murdered indigenous persons assistant U.S. attorney since 2023, after previously serving as deputy chief of the violent and major crimes section, deputy chief of the major crimes section, human traf-

ficking coordinator, and Project Safe Childhood coordinator. She has tried 16 cases to verdict, all of which were jury trials.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Ms. Provinzino as "well qualified" to serve on the district court. She has deep ties to the District of Minnesota, and she enjoys the strong support of both of her home State senators, Ms. KLOBUCHAR and Ms. SMITH. Ms. Provinzino's nomination has also received support from a range of individuals and organizations, including law enforcement officers, former Federal prosecutors, and organizations working to combat human trafficking.

Ms. Provinzino's significant litigation background and extensive experience in Federal court ensure that she will be a valuable addition to the district court. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting her nomination.

#### VOTE ON PROVINZINO NOMINATION

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

Mrs. COLLINS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 41, as follows:

#### [Rollcall Vote No. 238 Ex.]

##### YEAS—54

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

##### NAYS—41

Barrasso	Daines	McConnell
Blackburn	Fischer	Moran
Boozman	Grassley	Mullin
Braun	Hagerty	Paul
Britt	Hawley	Ricketts
Budd	Hoeven	Risch
Capito	Hyde-Smith	Romney
Cassidy	Johnson	Rubio
Cornyn	Lankford	Schmitt
Cotton	Lee	Scott (FL)
Crapo	Lummis	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Marshall	

Sullivan	Tillis	Wicker
Thune	Tuberville	Young

#### NOT VOTING—5

Ernst	Rosen	Vance
Kennedy	Rounds	

The nomination was confirmed.

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING). The clerk will report the Ritz nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kevin Gafford Ritz, of Tennessee, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

#### GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, it is no secret that the Senate has a long to-do list this month. The National Defense Authorization bill, the farm bill, and all 12 appropriations bills should be signed into law before the end of this month, but with 9 working days left on the schedule, we all know that is likely not to happen. But these deadlines are not a surprise. We have known about them for a long, long time, and many of them, like government funding, come up every year as well as the NDAA, which we have done for 60-plus years in a row.

Despite that, we find ourselves staring down the barrel at the end of the fiscal year without a clear direction from Leader SCHUMER on how he intends to see that the government is funded. It is astounding that the monumental task of funding the government has lingered in purgatory on the Senate calendar as the Democratic leader chooses to spend this Chamber's time, limited time, on political show votes on a number of partisan nominees.

I would also like to remind this Chamber of what the Democratic leader has wasted the Senate's time voting on this year. We have voted on things like protecting access to contraception—not in dispute; IVF, in vitro fertilization—not in dispute; and neither of which is under any kind of threat, but we had to have show votes to try to gain political advantage in the run-up to the November 5 election even if the narrative supporting the vote outcome is a false narrative.

We also voted on sweeping tax policy and a bill that never went through a single committee in the Senate and received zero input on the Republican side. We voted again on a border bill that didn't address major contributors to the massive illegal immigration we have seen during this administration. The majority leader has scheduled these show votes to give his vulnerable incumbents a political lifeline, putting politics over doing the most basic things that the Senate should be doing.

We spent weeks voting on the Biden-Harris administration's controversial nominees, many of whom are unqualified to fill the jobs that they have been nominated to. This partisan gamesmanship, when so much important



work remains to be done, is a waste of time, and it is an opportunity lost.

So let me just put this in greater context. It is not for the lack of effort on behalf of Senate committees. Both the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee have done their work in a bipartisan manner. On appropriations, Chair MURRAY and Vice Chair COLLINS have made serious progress on the appropriations bills. Virtually all of them have passed out of the Appropriations Committee with either unanimous support or strong bipartisan support.

The majority leader could have put those bills on the floor last July, not 9 days before a government shutdown, but he chose not to do it. So he points the finger of blame at our colleagues in the House of Representatives, who are trying to figure this out, but this is a wholly man-made disaster in the making, and it could have been avoided. We could have been voting on funding bills months ago instead of days, weeks, and months creeping by without even an inch of progress. These are bills like the National Defense Authorization bill, for example, that pay our service-members and ensure that government operations, big and small, continue day-to-day.

I would say that the work done by our Senate committees on a bipartisan basis is not necessarily easy work. It takes a lot of time and consideration by our colleagues on the Appropriations and Armed Services Committees. But the majority leader has sabotaged this productive bipartisan work by imposing a part-time work schedule on the Senate. It doesn't give us much room to maneuver or much time to actually debate, vote on, and pass legislation. Of course, when the Senate is in recess, which we have just come off of for about 6 weeks, committees can't meet, and it makes it difficult, if not impossible, to solve the biggest problems facing our country, of which there are many.

There is also this newfound phenomenon under the majority leader's schedule called recess Mondays. This means the Senate doesn't even come back to Washington until Tuesday, and then we are gone Thursday afternoon. It is hard to get real work done working part time. How on Earth are members of the various committees and subcommittees supposed to debate, amend, and advance 12 funding bills when the Senate is only working 2½ days a week? With this type of schedule, there just simply are not enough hours for our colleagues to complete the mountain of work ahead of them.

Our current posture shows the folly of this approach. Including today, we are only scheduled to be in session 9 days before adjourning for October, the entire month of October, just after coming off of a 6-week break.

Again, Chairman MURRAY and Vice Chair COLLINS have both said repeatedly that they want us to return to the normal appropriations process, not this

contrived narrative of an imminent government shutdown, with all that that would entail.

I want to say, I appreciate the good work that has been done by our colleagues on the Armed Services Committee and on the Appropriations Committee. Again, this is not easy. These are huge, important, and challenging issues that they have debated and voted on and produced bills that now await the majority leader scheduling them on the Senate floor. But because of the leader's inability or, rather, unwillingness to plan, we may end up kicking the can down the road in the form of a continuing resolution.

For those listening, a continuing resolution just means the status quo. It means just moving the deadline further down the road. We will still have to deal with these issues again—perhaps in December, perhaps in March, depending on how long the continuing resolution is.

But it is somewhat embarrassing to be a Member of the world's greatest deliberative body and to find ourselves in this situation once again. Again, this isn't a surprise. This isn't something that just popped up. We know what the deadline is, and we know we should have been doing our work a lot earlier.

There is no question that stopgap bills are better than a shutdown but just barely. It isn't a perfect solution, especially for critical missions like national defense.

As the Presiding Officer knows, during continuing resolutions, the Pentagon can't engage in any new starts, and basically they can't plan beyond the timeframe of the continuing resolution. Yet we know that there are wars raging in Ukraine, in the Middle East, and threats in the Indo-Pacific and in places like North Korea.

This is the most dangerous environment that our country has seen since World War II. Don't you think we would want to be able to fund the government on a timely basis so that the Pentagon can plan, so they don't have to worry about government shutdowns? Don't you think we would take up the National Defense Authorization bill that, again, passed out of committee months ago and has been available for floor action? This is the most basic function of the Senate when it comes to national defense, is passing the National Defense Authorization bill, but we are not going to do it because there simply isn't time.

I appreciate our colleagues in the House trying to figure out how to handle this under difficult circumstances—again, completely unnecessary—but I think we all understand that government shutdowns are not in anybody's best interest. We know that the problem that caused the shutdown is still going to be there staring us in the face when the government reopens, and the truth is, it is a whole lot more expensive and a whole lot more disruptive than it needs to be.

The bottom line is this: We have a duty and responsibility to pass full-

year, on-time appropriations bills. That is the bare minimum of governing. Short-term funding bills don't allow for long-term planning or stability when it comes to important functions like national defense or any other aspect of the Federal Government.

It is unfortunate that we are in this situation because the majority leader, who is the only person who can schedule action on the floor, has given us so few session days in which to consider these critical bills.

Strengthening defense, funding the government, and safeguarding our supply of food and fiber—these are essential to the welfare of our Nation.

The way the Senate has been run under the current management is no way to treat its most basic responsibilities. I can only hope that come November, there will be a new management elected by the American people because they don't have to put up with the status quo; they can change it. That is one of the great things about democracy. Democracies are capable of course correction. When they don't like the direction you are heading in, they can change it, and they could do that at the ballot box starting on November 5.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 778.

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

The motion was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Mary Kathleen Costello, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

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

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 778, Mary

Kathleen Costello, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Sheldon Whitehouse, Laphonza R. Butler, Benjamin L. Cardin, Mazie Hirono, Chris Van Hollen, Ben Ray Lujan, Brian Schatz, Thomas R. Carper, Margaret Wood Hassan, Christopher Murphy, Tammy Duckworth, Tina Smith, Jack Reed, Patty Murray, Amy Klobuchar.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call for the cloture motion filed today, September 12, be waived.

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

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

IVF

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, from the moment the MAGA Supreme Court reversed Roe, as Donald Trump promised they would, many of us warned that the hard right would not stop there in eliminating reproductive freedoms. Over the past few months, we have seen how IVF has become the hard right's next target.

A few months ago, the Alabama Supreme Court jeopardized access to IVF within their State, causing millions of women and couples to fear that even their freedom to start a family was now in danger.

So, in June, Democrats brought forward legislation to ensure IVF access would never be at risk and expand insurance coverage for this treatment, but almost every single Senate Republican voted against this vital legislation to have access to IVF.

Republicans can't claim to be pro-family only to block protections for IVF. The American people deserve another chance to see if Republicans are for access to IVF or against it; it is that simple. So next week, Mr. President, the Senate will vote once again to take up the very same bill we voted on earlier this summer, establishing a nationwide right to IVF and making it easier for people to access this critical treatment. Our bill should have passed in June, and it is more than good enough to pass now.

So let me say it again: Republicans can't claim to be pro-family on one hand only to block pro-family policies like Federal protections for IVF and the child tax credit. But that is what they did this summer, and I hope we get a different outcome when we vote for a second time.

The American people will be watching.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### NOMINATION OF KEVIN GAFFORD RITZ

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, it is really so unfortunate and really quite sad that I have to come to the floor today and speak because, today, the Senate Democrat leadership is moving forward with a vote that undermines the longstanding bipartisan traditions that this institution relies upon to serve the American people and, indeed, for each of us to be able to serve the citizens of our State.

In just a few moments, the Democrat leadership is going to move forward with a cloture vote on a judicial nominee, Kevin Ritz, whose home State Senators, which are Senator HAGERTY and me, were not properly consulted by the White House during his nomination process.

The consultation process between home State Senators and the White House on judicial nominees is essential to ensuring that a nominee is well suited to serve on the Federal bench. It is a part of our duty to provide advice and consent.

Of course, Senator HAGERTY and I attempted to work in good faith with the Biden-Harris administration to identify highly qualified nominees to fill the vacancy—the Tennessee vacancy—on the Sixth Circuit. We presented well-qualified nominees.

Yet, contrary to bipartisan precedent, the White House barely even worked with us. Apparently, what became quite evident was this White House—the Biden-Harris administration—preferred backroom deals to open deliberation.

This administration prefers a backroom deal to hearing the voice of the people from a State. This administration prefers backroom deals as opposed to considering nominees who have chosen to step forward and go through a nomination process with full transparency.

To be sure, this vote is all the more shameful because Mr. Ritz is deeply unsuited to serve on the Federal bench. That is not just something that I say; these are comments that have come to us from dozens—dozens—of Tennesseans.

In our country, every individual accused of a crime is entitled to due process of law. That is a bedrock principle of our justice system. Yet, as a Federal prosecutor and U.S. attorney for the Western District of Tennessee, Mr. Ritz has repeatedly flouted basic professional ethics.

Mr. Ritz, for example, has been accused of using highly unethical bait-and-switch tactics to trick indigent criminal defendants into accepting plea deals that they didn't agree to. And when defense attorneys pushed back on him, Mr. Ritz has been accused of making outright false statements to the court to cover up his misdeeds.

Indeed, Mr. Ritz has chosen to surround himself with those who seemingly treat their ethical obligations

with disdain. Mr. Ritz's deputy, for example, received a 1-year probation for prosecutorial misconduct.

To be clear, Mr. Ritz's record of unethical conduct is not my only objection to his nomination. There are Tennesseans who, for these same reasons, have come to us to object to his nomination.

Now, under his watch, as the chief Federal law enforcement officer, the city of Memphis has tragically become one of the most dangerous places to live in the United States.

In 2023, Memphis had the most homicides in its history and continues to lead the Nation in homicide rates this year. Now, there is a reason for this, and I think it is a reason that this Chamber needs to hear.

And it is not a reason that is supposition. It is a reason that is grounded in statistics and fact. And it is a reason that citizens in Tennessee, in Shelby County, in the Western District have raised to us, because they are concerned about crime; they are concerned about what is happening in their communities; they are concerned about juvenile crime and the rates that are there.

Now, here is their reason, and this is instructive to the Chamber as we consider this vote. As I said, Memphis has become one of the most dangerous places to live in the United States of America. In 2023, Memphis had the most homicides in its history and continues to lead the Nation in homicide rates this year.

And here comes your reason: Under Mr. Ritz's predecessor, the U.S. attorney's office in Memphis had a policy of charging 100 percent of prosecutable gun crimes. They charged them all. Yet, under his watch, Mr. Ritz has failed to uphold that prosecutorial standard which helped keep Memphians safe and helped keep dangerous people locked up behind bars.

And here is an example for you: Mr. Ritz's office failed to charge an individual with unlawful possession of a firearm, so this guy gets out and he goes on and he murders a Memphis police officer.

So when we hear about violent crime and the people we represent and we love are saying "do something about violent crime," they want these criminals locked up.

But if you are not going to charge them with prosecutable gun crimes, they are not going to be locked up, and they are going to do like this criminal in Memphis and they are going to go out and they are going to murder.

And the unfortunate thing is, in Memphis, they murdered a Memphis police officer. No one deserves a promotion—especially to one of the highest courts in the country—a lifetime appointment with a track record like Mr. Ritz.

Just because the White House wants to ignore this fact doesn't mean that the Senate should ignore this fact. Listen to the voices of Tennesseans who



have reached out to us and who have said to us: He does not deserve this seat.

I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose this reckless, unqualified nominee.

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.

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

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

Mrs. CAPITO. I would ask that we proceed with the rollcall vote.

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

### CLOTURE MOTION

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

The legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Executive Calendar No. 649, Kevin Gafford Ritz, of Tennessee, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Debbie Stabenow, John W. Hickenlooper, Sheldon Whitehouse, Tina Smith, Alex Padilla, Tammy Baldwin, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Angus S. King, Jr., Gary C. Peters, Peter Welch, Margaret Wood Hassan, Brian Schatz.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Kevin Gafford Ritz, of Tennessee, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 49, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 239 Ex.]

#### YEAS—49

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

#### NAYS—42

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

#### NOT VOTING—9

Daines	Marshall	Rounds
Ernst	Moran	Vance
Kennedy	Rosen	Wicker

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). On this vote, the yeas are 49, the nays are 42.

The motion is agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

#### BORDER SECURITY

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I ended up being a topic of conversation for the past month and a half or so in a lot of political conversations about immigration and the border. So I want to be able to come to this body and to say the immigration issues are still unresolved, but there has been a lot of re-writing of what actually has happened in the past year and all the negotiations.

Vice President HARRIS made a comment publicly just a few weeks ago, when she said:

Let me be clear. After decades in law enforcement, I know the importance of safety and security, especially at our border. Last year, Joe and I brought together Democrats and conservative Republicans to write the strongest border bill in decades.

I mean no disrespect to the Vice President, but we had 4 months of negotiations. She neither initiated those negotiations nor participated in a single second of those negotiations—not one second.

The Vice President's staff was never involved in any of the negotiations. The negotiations took 4 months because the people that sat down at the table all determined: We are in a very bad place. We need to resolve the chaos that is happening at our southern border.

For the first 6 weeks of those negotiations, the White House refused to participate at all in the negotiation—either from the President's staff, the President, or the Vice President or

Vice President's staff. So for the first 6 weeks of the 4 months of negotiations, the White House didn't want to discuss it. After 6 weeks, the White House then got involved in the negotiations. So it was three Senators and the White House to be able to walk through that.

Then, again for the next 3 months of our negotiations, it was a constant fight to get anything agreed to to secure our southern border. What we came up with and was the final agreement wasn't everything that I wanted, but it was enough to, at least, begin to make a change in what was happening at our southern border.

It was a pretty straightforward process. Asylum is very difficult to achieve. Only about 3 percent of the people that actually go through the hearings actually achieve asylum, but you don't find out that until usually 6 or 8 years after you have already been and have already gone through this long process.

So now we have thousands of people crossing our border asking for asylum, not because they believe they qualify but because they know they will stay here somewhere between 6 and 10 years while they wait for the hearing. And they, at least, get a decade in America, and then many of them then disappear.

So what we could get to agreement was, when you cross the border, you would cross the border—first person each day, they would have a much faster screening than would take hours or days, and they would be screened at the standard that was at the end. So instead of waiting 6 or 8 years or 10 years to get that final decision, you would get it rapidly.

So the first person that would cross each day would cross, would be quickly screened under a brandnew process, and then 97 percent of them would be deported immediately because they don't qualify for asylum, and everyone knows the joke. So first day, first person: You cross, quickly screened under a new process, deported immediately.

But if we got 5,000 people crossing, we don't have enough staff to screen that many people, so we created a border emergency authority that if you cross the border and you have got 5,000 people flooding the border and we don't have the staffing to do it, no one gets screened; you just get arrested and deported. So first person: cross, screened, deported. If we are overwhelmed by the cartels with high numbers, you just are deported immediately, and no one is screened. That is what we could finally come up with as an agreement.

Now, I have to tell you, I felt like that would dramatically slow the flow at our southern border and it would deal with the core issue that is the abuse of asylum. But there were a lot of issues I couldn't get agreement on that, quite frankly, many of my colleagues on the Republican side were very frustrated that we couldn't make progress on, some of those very commonsense things; for instance, if you are going to request asylum, you have to request asylum at a port of entry.

You can't come across the border between the ports of entry in the open desert or swim the river and then say when you get caught: Oh, I want asylum. It was obvious you were trying to sneak into the country.

And we were saying: If you are a true asylum seeker and you believe you are requesting asylum, come to a port of entry. We thought that was a pretty commonsense thing to say: We will expedite your process to asylum if you come to a port, not if we have to chase you in the desert. I couldn't get that agreement. My Democratic colleagues would not agree to that. That was a great frustration on the Republican side.

We wanted to be able to require the "Remain in Mexico" program. The Supreme Court had already spoken and said that had to be done. It was not being done. So that if we were flooded with people, they are not waiting for 8 or 10 years here; they are actually waiting in another country to be able to come through the process. They would still get their appointment. My Democratic colleagues would have none of that.

We also wanted an end to the two big parole programs that the Biden administration has created. One of them is called CBP ONE. That is, if you come to a port of entry and tell DHS ahead of time "I'm coming," then DHS, when you arrive at the port of entry, will quickly give you paperwork, will give you a work permit that day, and will release you into the country for a decade as you await your hearing.

It was a fast-track process into the country that was actually inviting more people to illegally cross into the country. We now have 1,500 people a day that are coming through that process. We have no idea if they qualify for asylum because they are not being screened for asylum.

We wanted an end to that process because we felt like it is actually inviting more illegal immigration rather than trying to deter it. And it is not just us saying that. The inspector general for the Department of Homeland Security made this statement. They felt that CBP did not gather intelligence or conduct sufficient analysis of data generated by CBP ONE appointments to protect against fraudulent applications and misuse and public safety threats.

That is not us saying that; that is the inspector general saying that. We wanted an end to that program. Through the negotiations that were long and hard, I got agreement that that program would end, that we would put a stop to that program.

But there was a second program called the CHNV program. This is 30,000 people a month that are coming in. These are folks from Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, and Venezuela—30,000 a month. This was another program that was wholly created out of the Biden administration that has never existed in any other administration. It was a parole

authority to say: If you will contact us before you come from one of these countries and someone here in the United States will "sponsor" you or at least say "I know them," then you can get into the country and be paroled into the country. This is not even an asylum request. This is just you are just released into the country.

We wanted to have a stop to that program as well because there are all kinds of issues with that program. But that one, my Democratic colleagues would not agree to and said: No. We will stop the CBP ONE parole program. We won't stop the slowdown of Cubans, Haitians, Nicaraguans, and Venezuelans coming in, in very high numbers.

By the way, the deal was supposedly that we would take in 30,000 of those folks and Mexico would take in 30,000 of those folks. The problem is, we have asked for the numbers that Mexico has taken in; and, so far, the State Department won't give us an answer, and DHS won't give us an answer. As far as we can tell, the Mexican side has been zero while we have been 30,000.

Now, we felt there was a problem with the way the program was being run. And by the way, again, we are not the only ones that think that. DHS itself shut down that program for part of this summer because they found what they called egregious fraud problems; that is, some sponsors sponsoring dozens of people to be able to come in and an overflow of individuals not being properly screened. There are major problems with the program. Unfortunately, the program has restarted again.

Now, why do I walk through this? I keep hearing this rewrite of history that it was President Trump himself that told all Republicans: It is a great deal, but don't do it. Now, there is no doubt President Trump made a statement that it is not enough. He wanted everything in it, and he said: Don't do it. No question that statement was made, but no question that belief was already shared by several folks on my side of the aisle saying we wanted an end to all these parole programs. We also want to stop applying between ports of entry and, if you are going to apply, only at ports of entry.

And several of my colleagues said the House bill—that was H.R. 2—it was that or nothing. They wanted everything or nothing. And suddenly, this whole system falls apart.

I stood here at this exact same spot saying to my colleagues on my side of the aisle: We should do as much as we can do. This is as much as we can get right now with a Democratic Senate, with a Democratic White House. Let's do all we can to be able to stop it.

Obviously, I didn't win that part of the debate, but I also don't want people rewriting history and what actually occurred in the debate because there were serious issues that were unresolved in the bill that are still out there.

My frustration is, all of it is still out there. We still have the same issue

with asylum that this bill would have fixed. We still have the same issue between ports of entry. That is still unfixed. And we still have not one of those parole programs but both of those parole programs happening.

Interestingly enough, in the last couple of months, the numbers at the border have started slowing down. It has been very interesting. I don't know if you noticed even during the Presidential debate that happened earlier this week, ABC News asked Vice President HARRIS: The number of border crossings for illegal immigration was very high during your first 3 years, but they seem to have slowed down the closer we are getting to the election. Why?

She actually didn't answer that question at all. She totally skipped it. And ABC News didn't follow up with her, shockingly, to be able to do a followup question to say: You didn't answer the initial question. You said everything else but why.

Well, I can give you a couple of things on that. Two things have occurred in the past few months: Mexico has had their elections, and we are having ours. So suddenly, Mexico is starting to enforce their border a little better, and this administration is enforcing the border a little better with the authorities they already have.

Now, when I say "a little better," it has gone from 5,000 people illegally crossing a day to about 3,400 people illegally crossing a day. That number is still five times what were crossing during the Obama administration.

My request has been the same for President Biden all along: If you won't enforce the border the same way President Trump enforced it, at least enforce it the same way President Obama enforced it. Under President Obama, we had half a million people illegally crossing a year. Now, we have 2½ million people illegally crossing in a year. Same law—same exact law, enforced completely differently.

Why is this an issue? It is not just an issue in our economy. It is not just an issue in our schools. It is not just an issue in crime in our communities. It is also a national security issue.

In June, the FBI picked up eight ISIS-affiliated individuals that were in our country, that had come across our southern border and had asked for asylum. They were from Tajikistan. And they had gotten the quick review at the border and had been released, like hundreds of thousands of others had that same month. But these eight were different. They are ISIS-affiliated. And they scattered around the country to Philadelphia, New York, and Los Angeles and began their flight. Thankfully, our FBI picked them up. But of the 2½ million people that have crossed just last year, how many did we miss?

I have been very outspoken on this issue. We moved from the border issue being just an issue about how do we manage our own border and illegal immigration to a national security issue.

Madam President, 3,400 people a day illegally crossing our border is still an epic high number. And while the media has looked away because now it is no longer 5,000 a day, 3,400 a day is still way too high. Our system is still overwhelmed, and we still have tens of thousands of people coming in of what this administration calls special-interest aliens. That is folks that, by their own definition, are considered a national security threat. But there are so many, we don't have the opportunity to be able to follow all of them.

That was those eight that were picked up that were ISIS-affiliated. They had been designated as special-interest aliens. Thankfully, we were later able to find them and pick them up, but there are thousands of them currently in the country. Hopefully, they mean us no harm, but currently we have no idea.

That is something that needs to change. National security should not be a partisan issue. I understand it is an election year. This should not be a partisan issue. This should be a how-do-we-fix-this issue; this should be a how-do-we-resolve-this issue. And if the numbers are going down after I was told that the numbers were sky-high because of climate change—that was really what I was told by DHS. In fact, the White House, in 2021, put out a report on climate change and migration, saying that we have dramatically increased numbers because of climate change, not because of lack of border enforcement.

My response to them now is: Well, if the numbers are going down at the border, apparently the climate is getting better worldwide because the numbers are coming down. It is not an issue of climate migration; it is an issue of enforcement at our southern border. If that occurs, the numbers go down. If it doesn't, the numbers skyrocket because we are the United States of America, and people want to be able to be in the greatest country in the world. And I don't blame them.

We, as Americans, though, also have the right to be able to know we live in security and the people that are coming into our country, we know who they are, we know where they are from, and we verified any kind of criminal background that may or may not be there. That is not an unfair request to be able to make.

One last thing. Currently, the House has passed what they call the SAVE Act, and there is an ongoing debate in the House right now how this will fit. The SAVE Act is a pretty simple thing. The SAVE Act just says if you are not legally present in the United States, you can't vote.

Now, it is already Federal law that no one who is a noncitizen can vote in Federal elections. That is already the law. That is the trust part though. There is no verify portion of this. One of the basic principles of trust is verify. Right now, we are all trust. It is against the law, but there is no verification.

The SAVE Act just says we are not going to just trust that people that are not legally present here don't vote; we are going to verify that. You can't register to vote until you can show that you are actually a citizen of the United States. That shouldn't be a radical concept. It should be straightforward.

I have been one of the folks that have asked the current Attorney General: Can you show us any prosecutions or even any attempts to be able to prosecute individuals that were not legally present in the United States that attempted to vote? Because we know some stories. There are some newspaper stories scattered around the country of a few of those stories. We just asked a simple question: Can you tell us any prosecutions?

In Oklahoma, we have about 40 people every election across our State—about 40 people vote twice. They will do absentee voting and then they will show up and vote again. Do you know what they get? They get a knock on the door from law enforcement a couple of months later saying you violated State law; you voted twice. We actually enforce our law that discourages people in the future from then coming and trying that again because they know they are being enforced.

We thought it is a reasonable question to ask the Attorney General: How are you enforcing Federal law in this area? It is not that we are asking for something new. It is how are we enforcing what is existing. So far, the Attorney General, after months of asking the question, has given us no answer.

I look forward to the day that this body can sit down with each other and say: Let's solve the national security issues because we all know they are there. We all see it. We all go through the same briefings. Let's solve those, and let's have an immigration system where we honor legal immigration and deter illegal immigration. That is what most countries do. But for some reason, our politics have gotten in the way of us solving this.

Let's find a way to be able to solve this in the days ahead. I have no delusions that it is going to get solved in the next 2 weeks, but we do need to sit down and resolve this in the days ahead.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOKER). The Senator from California.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. BUTLER. 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.

## 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MAXWELL SCHOOL OF CITIZENSHIP AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to congratulate Syracuse University's Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs on its 100th anniversary.

One Hundred Years. A remarkable milestone. A remarkable legacy. A remarkable school.

The Maxwell School is the oldest school of its kind in America and was once again ranked the No. 1 school for public affairs in 2024 by U.S. News & World Report.

Success and excellence is the norm for the Maxwell School: It has held the No. 1 spot every year save one since these rankings began more than 30 years ago.

Founded in 1924, thanks to the investment and vision of Syracuse University alumnus and entrepreneur George H. Maxwell, the Maxwell School is dedicated to supporting impactful research and preparing students to become leaders who seek evidence-based solutions, encourage civil discourse, and commit to leaving the world better than they found it.

You can get a sense of what the Maxwell School stands for by pondering the words of the Athenian Oath, which is inscribed on its foyer wall. It encourages us to ever strive to "transmit this city not only not less, but greater, better and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

And the Maxwell School does live up to those ideals.

The school's more than 38,500 graduates are living and working across the globe, helping to inform public policy, including key legislation that has come before us here, helping to forge compromise amid divide, bringing aid to those in need and defending democracy.

Its alumni include foreign ambassadors, legislators, journalists, economists, and numerous familiar names such as former Congresswoman and HHS Secretary Donna Shalala, New York State Governor Kathy Hochul, Syracuse Mayor Ben Walsh, and former Detroit Mayor Dave Bing.

The school is home to 15 interdisciplinary research centers and institutes focused on pressing societal issues. One especially dear to me is named for the late Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan; the Moynihan Institute of Global Affairs serves as a critical hub for collaboration, research, and examination of complex global issues.

The Maxwell School offers a rich mix of undergraduate, graduate professional, and scholarly M.A. and Ph.D. programs across the social sciences.

Though it is based in Syracuse, it has a strong presence here in the Nation's Capital, offering programs and internship opportunities and world class instruction through a partnership with the Center for Strategic and International Studies.

Thanks to a unique relationship with the Council of Europe and Syracuse

University's five study abroad centers, the Maxwell School also offers students and scholars increasing opportunities for global engagement.

The Maxwell School's work supports the foundations and institutions of democracy itself, here and across the globe. This is vital at this time in our world's history.

I congratulate Syracuse University, the Maxwell School, Chancellor Kent Syverud, Maxwell Dean David Van Slyke, and the school's faculty, students, staff, and alumni for everything they do to leave the world better than they found it.

#### NOMINATION OF JOHN BRADFORD WIEGMANN

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am announcing my intent to object to any unanimous consent request to proceed to the nomination of John Bradford Wiegmann to be the General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence (ODNI), subject to the Department of Justice fulfilling its commitment to me to provide a list of certain legal opinions.

Opinions of the Department's Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) carry enormous weight, guiding government agencies and providing legal bases for entire programs. They have precedential value, continuing in force from administration to administration. Yet Congress and the public have limited insight into these opinions. The potential risks of this secret law are most apparent in the world of intelligence, where the OLC wrote opinions green-lighting warrantless surveillance and torture without the oversight or awareness of the congressional intelligence communities.

In December 2023, I made a modest request of the Justice Department. Christopher Fonzzone, then ODNI General Counsel, had been nominated to be Assistant Attorney General in charge of OLC. I asked him for a list of OLC opinions directed to an element of the intelligence community and any other opinions related to surveillance authorities. The Department of Justice then committed to responding to my request "as expeditiously and thoroughly as possible." Nine months later, I have not received the list.

It is my intent to lift the hold on Mr. Wiegmann as soon as the Department abides by its commitment and provides me with the list I requested.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### TRIBUTE TO NILS JOHNSON

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, along with my Idaho congressional delegation colleagues Senator Jim Risch and Representatives Mike Simpson and Russ Fulcher, we honor and thank Nils Johnson for his years of service to Idaho. We know that we are joined by all those who served in the Idaho con-

gressional delegation from 1991 until now, particularly Senator Larry Craig, who was Nils' boss during his tenure in the U.S. Senate. Those former Members of Congress include: Senators Dirk Kempthorne, the late Steve Symms, and the late James McClure; and former Representatives Raul Labrador, Bill Sali, the late Helen Chenoweth, C.L. "Butch" Otter, Walt Minnick, Richard Stallings, and Larry LaRocco.

Originally from New Hampshire, Nils has dedicated much of his professional career to working on behalf of Idahoans, and we are profoundly grateful. Although he left working for Congress more than 20 years ago, he continued to serve Idaho through other positions, including his current position as director of legislative and regulatory affairs at Holland & Hart for the past 17 years, where his focus has been on issues of particular importance to Idaho among Western States. This includes public land and natural resource management, Western water quality and quantity, nuclear waste, Federal and State mining, Federal energy, and Federal appropriations issues. Previously, he served as a senior consultant at MGN, Inc., and he was principal and partner at McClure, Gerard and Neuenschwander, Inc.

Throughout, he has utilized and built on his significant experience in both Houses of Congress and natural resources to advance needed improvements to Federal policy. Nils had a more than 15-year career as a hydrologist for the U.S. Forest Service before coming to the Hill. This knowledge base undoubtedly shaped his approach to his work in the U.S. House of Representatives, where he served as Republican staff director of the House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Mining, Energy, Interior, and Insular Affairs and his later more than a decade of service as director of natural resources, environment and energy and senior legislative assistant to U.S. Senator for Idaho Larry E. Craig. Working on natural resources issues for Idaho requires tackling some of the most pressing challenges in our great State, where the productivity and beauty of our public and private lands also carry competing interests requiring his practical and thoughtful problem solving. He established himself as a mentor for younger, newer staffers throughout the delegation and provided insight and leadership as our State has navigated some difficult natural resources and energy issues.

Upon leaving the Senate in 2000, we have also greatly benefited from Nils' steadfast management of a regular breakfast on Capitol Hill for the past 20 or so years. These breakfasts, called the Idaho Industries Breakfasts, have been held regularly in Washington, DC, when Congress is in session. They bring together representatives of Idaho's businesses and producers with the Idaho congressional delegation and staff for valuable, informal personal gatherings. The breakfasts have been

instrumental in broadening friendships and advancing the many common interests in our vast but still deeply connected State. It is impossible to quantify the relationships that have been strengthened and the progress Nils has had a hand in shaping through his unwavering commitment to organizing these forums all these years.

As we thank Nils for the years of hard work he has devoted to Idaho and our country, we wish him well as he retires from DC life to spend more time between Maryland and South Carolina with his family, particularly his six grandchildren. We hope the years ahead afford him the fulfillment of more time spent enjoying the natural resources he worked to sustain through his decades of sound and pragmatic work. Nils, we congratulate you and wish you all the best.●

##### TRIBUTE TO JAMES FAUTH

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, today I have the distinct honor of recognizing James Fauth of Phillips County for his record-breaking chinook salmon he caught while boating on Fort Peck Lake.

Fauth, a retired power company lineman from Malta, took his 25-year-old pontoon boat out for a leisure day of fishing alongside his wife Nancy and friends Tony and Emily Simonsen. After several hours of patience and perseverance, Fauth noticed his spinning rod come to life off a downrigger and jumped into action. He figured it was a salmon because he had been tracking them deep on his sonar and the fish was putting up a fight. The rod's original 20-pound line had never been replaced, so Fauth was hopeful it wouldn't break. After approximately 5 minutes of back-and-forth battling with the fish on the other end, Fauth was overjoyed when his \$29 Wal-Mart rod and reel proved to get the job done as he landed the chinook in the boat.

The enormous salmon, weighing an astounding 32.62 pounds and measuring 38 inches long with a 28-inch girth, broke the previously held State record set by Greg Haug in 2020 with a 32.05 pound salmon, also taken from Fort Peck Lake. The area is no stranger to impressive catches, but Fauth's recent trophy stands out for obvious reasons. The story of Fauth's historic catch will live on in history, and residents of River's Bend Assisted Living in Malta will soon get a special up-close look at the record breaking salmon, as Fauth has chosen to donate it to the facility so residents can enjoy it. What makes this story all the more special is that the assisted living facility is owned by Tony and Emily Simonsen, who got to bear witness to the historic catch on the Fauth family pontoon.

It is my distinct honor to recognize James Fauth for his once-in-a-lifetime catch that earned him the title as Montana's new State record salmon angler. This historic catch is a celebration of the Treasure State's natural resources

and a nod to our shared Montana way of life rooted in our passion for the great outdoors. Way to go, James; your story will forever be tied to one of the greatest catches ever made on Fort Peck Lake. You make Montana proud.●

#### TRIBUTE TO GENERAL MIKE MINIHAN

● Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to General Mike Minihan, U.S. Air Force. After 34 distinguished years of exceptional service to our Nation, General Minihan will soon retire from his position as commander, Air Mobility Command (AMC), Scott Air Force Base, IL.

As commander, Air Mobility Command, General Mike Minihan led U.S. Transportation Command's air component, executing the air mobility mission in support of the joint force, allies, and partners with a fleet of nearly 1,100 aircraft. The command encompasses Eighteenth Air Force, the U.S. Air Force Expeditionary Center, the 618th Air Operations Center, 17 wings, and two groups, which provide rapid global mobility from more than 100 locations worldwide. Nearly 104,000 Active-Duty, Air National Guard, Air Force Reserve airmen, and civilians comprise the air mobility Total Force, providing command and control of inter-theater and intra-theater airlift, air refueling, aeromedical evacuation, global air mobility support, and Presidential and senior leader air transport in support of national interests.

General Minihan entered the Air Force in April 1990 after receiving his commission through the ROTC program at Auburn University. He completed undergraduate pilot training in 1991 and has served as an aircraft commander, instructor pilot, and evaluator pilot in the C-130 Hercules. He has commanded in garrison, crisis, and combat and at the squadron, wing, and task force levels. He also held numerous joint, combined and Air Force staff assignments. Prior to his current position, General Minihan served as deputy commander for U.S. Indo-Pacific Command.

As commander, Air Mobility Command, General Minihan radically redesigned and shifted the culture of the command from a force focused on moving cargo, personnel, and fuel to the preeminent mechanism for Joint Force Maneuver. General Minihan re-envisioned Exercise Mobility Guardian in 2023, transitioning the exercise from a service-specific test of air mobility and logistics training executed over the continental United States to a joint and combined large-scale exercise in the Pacific. This exercise displayed unrivaled mobility air power, showcasing America's unique ability to provide rapid global mobility and put the world on notice that AMC can explode into theater to meet any combatant commander's requirements. In addition, General Minihan oversaw the rapid deployment of assistance to

Ukraine and, later, to Israel and Gaza, taking appropriate proactive measures to sense and seize the environment to allow the combatant commander to project and sustain forces and demonstrate U.S. resolve and will.

General Minihan retires as a command pilot with more than 3,400 flying hours and qualifications in C-130, KC-10, and C-32 aircraft. Over General Minihan's distinguished career he has earned numerous joint and Air Force decorations including the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, three Legions of Merit, six Air Medals, and seven Aerial Achievement Medals. He has also led his airmen through several joint and Air Force organizational awards recognizing team excellence that include Joint Meritorious Unit Award, Meritorious Unit Award, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, Republic of Korea Cheonsu Medal, and the Order of Saint Maurice.

General Minihan has served his Nation for over three decades honorably and with passion and love for his airmen, and we thank him for all he has done for our great Nation.●

#### TRIBUTE TO GENERAL JACQUELINE D. VAN OVOST

● Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, it is with great pride and gratitude that I rise to celebrate the career of General Jacqueline D. Van Ovost, who is retiring after 36 years of honorable service in the U.S. Air Force. General Van Ovost currently serves as the commander of U.S. Transportation Command, where she is responsible for projecting and sustaining our Nation's military power globally to assure our friends, deter our adversaries, and if necessary, respond to win decisively. She has undoubtedly excelled in executing her duties.

In her time as USTRANSCOM's commander, she directed mobility operations supporting the movement of 60 Presidential Drawdown Authorities to deliver aid critical to Ukraine's defense against Russia's unprovoked invasion. Additionally, she has directed mobility forces to respond to the shifting strategic environment in western Africa, unrest in Haiti, and regional threats in the Middle East and the Red Sea, ultimately ensuring the safety of our deployed servicemembers, allies, and commercial shipping fleets from around the world.

General Van Ovost began her career at the U.S. Air Force Academy. Following her commissioning, she graduated from pilot training. Over the course of her time in service, she deployed multiple times and was one of the first women to fly in combat. She is also a graduate of the U.S. Air Force Test Pilot School, which gave her the opportunity to fly over 30 aircraft throughout her career. She commanded two flying wings, served on joint staff and as the chief of staff for Headquarters Air Force, and commanded Air Mobility Command during the non-

combatant evacuation operation from Afghanistan, moving over 124,000 evacuees to safety.

General Van Ovost is a mobility leader and strategic thinker who expertly directed those under her command and leveraged commercial support to provide the best options possible for our senior leaders. In every position that she held, she led with unmatched grace, dedication, dignity, professionalism, and respect for all those she encountered. Her character and leadership had untold positive impacts on thousands of servicemembers and their families.

She advanced our Nation's mobility and logistics capabilities, supported our allied and partner nations, and advanced our strategic objectives to defend our citizens.

General Van Ovost is a true military leader, one whom our country is endlessly grateful for having amongst its ranks. I thank her for her over 36 years of dedicated and faithful service to the United States of America.●

#### REMEMBERING REBECCA WENCHI WONG

● Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, I rise today with a heavy heart to honor and commemorate the extraordinary life of Rebecca Wenchong Wong, whose journey epitomizes resilience, sacrifice, and the pursuit of a better future for her family. Rebecca Wong's story is not just a testament to her strength and determination, but also a poignant reminder of the countless sacrifices made by immigrants in search of a better life for their families here in this country.

Born in Shanghai, China, Rebecca Wenchong Wong experienced the severe hardships of famine and political turmoil. Amidst the dire conditions of Communist China, she made the heart-wrenching decision to send her 6-year-old daughter away to safety, so that she might have a chance at life free from hunger and oppression. They were separated for 21 years, enduring the pain of isolation and absence while holding fast to hope of reunion.

In 1982, Rebecca was reunited with her daughter in Shanghai, marking the end of a long and painful separation. Her daughter Chantale Yok-Min Wong, who is now the esteemed U.S. Ambassador to the Asian Development Bank, stands as a testament to the love and sacrifices of her mother.

Rebecca's life was marked by service and resilience. Before the Cultural Revolution, she worked as a surgical nurse, eventually becoming the head of the nursing staff. During the poorest periods in Communist China's history, she served as a barefoot doctor, providing essential medical care to rural communities. This selfless service took a toll on her health, but her spirit remained unbroken.

After joining her daughter in the United States in 1990 and along with her son, Rebecca and her husband

Frank Yaoyung Wong settled in San Francisco. Despite their advanced age, they embraced their new life with vigor and curiosity, exploring new cultures and continually learning. Rebecca's sharp mind and strong will made her a central figure in her family and community.

In her later years, Rebecca and her husband became beloved members of the OnLok 30th Street Senior Center, where they engaged in various activities, enriching their lives and those around them. Even in her 90s, Rebecca remained a source of wisdom and care, particularly for her husband until his passing.

Rebecca's passing at the age of 98 marks the end of a life filled with love, sacrifice, and resilience. Her legacy lives on through her children, grandchildren, and the countless lives she touched.

I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in honoring the life and legacy of Rebecca Wenchu Wong for her indomitable spirit, her unwavering love for her family, and her lifelong commitment to service. Her story is a beacon of hope and inspiration for all who strive for a better future.●

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:08 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1516. An act to establish Department of Homeland Security funding restrictions on institutions of higher education that have a relationship with Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 9456. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 with respect to foreign investments in United States agriculture, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1516. An act to establish Department of Homeland Security funding restrictions on institutions of higher education that have a relationship with Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 9456. An act to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 with respect to foreign investments in United States agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

#### MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following concurrent resolution was discharged from the Committee on the Budget pursuant section 300 of the Congressional Budget Act and placed on the calendar:

S. Con. Res. 41. Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year

2025 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2026 through 2034.

#### MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 8580. An act making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8771. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, foreign operations, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8774. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8998. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2025, and for other purposes.

#### MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bill was read the first time:

H.R. 820. An act to direct the Federal Communications Commission to publish a list of entities that hold authorizations, licenses, or other grants of authority issued by the Commission and that have certain foreign ownership, and for other purposes.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCHATZ, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 4000. A bill to reaffirm the applicability of the Indian Reorganization Act to the Lytton Rancheria of California, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 118-223).

By Mr. SANDERS, from the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 4755. A bill to reauthorize traumatic brain injury programs, and for other purposes.

S. 4762. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize programs and research relating to autism, and for other purposes.

S. 4776. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2025 through 2029, and for other purposes.

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 5029. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to establish a research and development-intensive small biotech manufacturer exception from the Medicare drug price negotiation program; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 5030. A bill to establish a National Critical Minerals Council within the Executive

Office of the President to develop and coordinate the implementation of a national critical mineral strategy for the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. BUTLER (for herself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 5031. A bill to promote a 21st century artificial intelligence workforce and to authorize the Secretary of Education to carry out a program to increase access to prekindergarten through grade 12 emerging and advanced technology education and upskill workers in the technology of the future; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. WARREN:

S. 5032. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to restrict the sale and procurement of certain weapons and ammunition by the Department of Defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. SMITH, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 5033. A bill to amend the Child Care Access Means Parents in School Program under the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. CASEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. SMITH, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 5034. A bill to provide additional benefits to American workers whose employment has been impacted as a result of the transition to a clean energy economy; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mrs. FISCHER):

S. 5035. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish an external provider scheduling program to assist the Department of Veterans Affairs in scheduling appointments for care and services under the Veterans Community Care Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 5036. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rate of the special pension payable to Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. KAINE, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. COONS):

S. 5037. A bill to strengthen the role of the United States with respect to the Indian Ocean region, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. LUMMIS, and Mr. RICKETTS):

S. 5038. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to eliminate a waiver under that Act, to eliminate an authorization for States to use new motor vehicle emission and new motor vehicle engine emissions standards identical to standards adopted in California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. HICKENLOOPER:

S. 5039. A bill to establish a mineral and mining innovation program within the Department of Energy to advance domestic mineral resources, economic growth, and national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.



By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 5040. A bill to provide for the regulation of certain communications regarding prescription drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MERKLEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 5041. A bill to provide grants to local educational agencies to help public schools reduce class size in the early elementary grades, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 5042. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the exercise of eminent domain for the construction or modification of electric transmission facilities and to protect State control over the siting of electric transmission facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

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

S. 5043. A bill to require coordination among Federal agencies that administer sanctions lists with respect to the inclusion of individuals and entities on such lists; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Ms. BUTLER):

S. 5044. A bill to authorize grants to implement school-community partnerships for preventing substance use and misuse among youth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. YOUNG, and Mr. WICKER):

S. 5045. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to modify a provision relating to criminal penalties for damaging or destroying pipeline facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. PAUL, Mr. KING, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LUJAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. 5046. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services, acting through the Commissioner of Food and Drugs, to publish a final rule relating to nonclinical testing methods; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PADILLA, Ms. WARREN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 5047. A bill to require carbon scoring by the Congressional Budget Office; to the Committee on the Budget.

By Mr. WELCH:

S. 5048. A bill to establish the use of ranked choice voting in elections for the offices of Senator and Representative in Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. SMITH, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 5049. A bill to modify the definition of disaster in the Small Business Act to include low or no snowfall amounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. DAINES:

S. 5050. A bill to prohibit the importation of certain minerals from the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FETTERMAN (for himself, Mr. KAINE, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 5051. A bill to amend the National Trails System Act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the feasibility of designating Washington's Trail—1753 as a national historic trail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. TESTER:

S. 5052. A bill to prohibit the importation of critical minerals from the Russian Federation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COONS (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. REED, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mrs. HYDE-SMITH):

S. 5053. A bill to reauthorize the national service laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

S. 5054. A bill to impose an assessment related to fossil fuel emissions, to establish the Polluters Pay Climate Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

## SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. MULLIN):

S. Res. 812. A resolution supporting the designation of September 20, 2024, as "National Concussion Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCH):

S. Res. 813. A resolution honoring the life of Steven D. Symms, former United States Senator for the State of Idaho; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. CORNYN):

S. Res. 814. A resolution designating September 2024 as "National Literacy Month"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BUTLER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. KELLY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. Res. 815. A resolution designating the week beginning on September 9, 2024, as "National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. ROMNEY):

S. Res. 816. A resolution recognizing the 73rd anniversary of the signing of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Philippines and the strong bilateral security alliance between our two nations in the wake of persistent and escalating aggres-

sion by the People's Republic of China in the South China Sea; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. Con. Res. 41. A concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2025 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2026 through 2034; placed on the calendar.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 141

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 141, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve certain programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs for home and community based services for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 633

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 633, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Everett Alvarez, Jr., in recognition of his service to the United States.

S. 656

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 656, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the rules for approval by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of commercial driver education programs for purposes of veterans educational assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 711

At the request of Mr. BUDD, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY) were added as cosponsors 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. 1007

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1007, a bill to establish in the Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor of the Department of State a Special Envoy for the Human Rights of LGBTQI+ Peoples, and for other purposes.

S. 1185

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1185, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from prohibiting the use of lead ammunition or tackle on certain Federal land or water under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

S. 1274

At the request of Mrs. FISCHER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut

(Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1274, a bill to permanently exempt payments made from the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Account from sequestration under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

S. 1669

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

S. 1960

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) and the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1960, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons responsible for violations of the human rights of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and intersex (LGBTI) individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 1998

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1998, a bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to include Indian Tribes in certain provisions relating to priority resource concerns.

S. 2311

At the request of Mr. PADILLA, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2311, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles, California.

S. 2897

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2897, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to molecularly targeted pediatric cancer investigations, and for other purposes.

S. 3125

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3125, a bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3236

At the request of Mr. WELCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3236, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare coverage of ambulance services that do not include transportation.

S. 3525

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. HELMY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3525, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to maintain a peer-to-peer support line to provide emotional support, information, brief intervention, and mental

health resources to youth who are experiencing stress or who are at risk of, or affected by, mental health disorders, and to establish a grant program for local educational agencies to employ school-based mental health coordinators.

S. 3532

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. HELMY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3532, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a Task Force on Youth Mental Health Data Integration.

S. 3751

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3751, a bill to expand and modify the grant program of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide innovative transportation options to veterans in highly rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 3812

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 3812, a bill to provide firearm licenses an opportunity to correct statutory and regulatory violations, and for other purposes.

S. 4075

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) 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. 4141

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4141, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the FIFA World Cup 2026, and for other purposes.

S. 4285

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4285, a bill to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 to improve cooperation between the United States and Israel on anti-tunnel defense capabilities.

S. 4363

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4363, a bill to secure the rights of public employees to organize, act concertedly, and bargain collectively, which safeguard the public interest and

promote the free and unobstructed flow of commerce, and for other purposes.

S. 4426

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4426, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish a time-limited conditional approval pathway, subject to specific obligations, for certain drugs and biological products, and for other purposes.

S. 4832

At the request of Mrs. BRITT, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4832, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to amend the rules of the Commission to include a shark attack as an event for which a wireless emergency alert may be transmitted, and for other purposes.

S. 4919

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4919, a bill to establish a regulatory sandbox program under which agencies may provide waivers of agency rules and guidance, and for other purposes.

S. 5023

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5023, a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to improve falls prevention research and activities, and for other purposes.

S.J. RES. 39

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 39, a joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the article of amendment commonly known as the "Equal Rights Amendment" has been validly ratified and is enforceable as the 28th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and the Archivist of the United States must certify and publish the Equal Rights Amendment as the 28th Amendment without delay.

S.J. RES. 87

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 87, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of the Treasury relating to "Clean Vehicle Credits Under Sections 25E and 30D; Transfer of Credits; Critical Minerals and Battery Components; Foreign Entities of Concern".

S.J. RES. 93

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 93, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Commerce relating to "Revision of Firearms License Requirements".

S.J. RES. 96

At the request of Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 96, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Education relating to "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Sex in Education Programs or Activities Receiving Federal Financial Assistance".

S.J. RES. 103

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 103, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Federal Communications Commission relating to "Safeguarding and Securing the Open Internet; Restoring Internet Freedom".

S. RES. 669

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 669, a resolution designating October 10, 2024, as "American Girls in Sports Day".

S. RES. 687

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 687, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding United Nations General Assembly Resolution 2758 (XXVI) and the harmful conflation of China's "One China Principle" and the United States "One China Policy".

AMENDMENT NO. 3138

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3138 intended to be proposed to S. 4638, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3177

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3177 intended to be proposed to S. 4638, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3189

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a co-

sponsor of amendment No. 3189 intended to be proposed to S. 4638, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 3262

At the request of Mr. HICKENLOOPER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3262 intended to be proposed to S. 4638, a bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BRAUN):

S. 5040. A bill to provide for the regulation of certain communications regarding prescription drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

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

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

S. 5040

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Protecting Patients from Deceptive Drug Ads Online Act".

#### SEC. 2. REGULATION OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS REGARDING PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) REGULATION OF COMMUNICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 333) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h)(1) In the case of a social media influencer or health care provider who makes false or misleading communications regarding a drug approved under section 505 or licensed under section 351 of the Public Health Service Act, and subject to section 503(b), shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty in an amount described in paragraph (g)(1), in accordance with a process similar to the process described in paragraph (g)(2).

"(2) For purposes of this paragraph—

"(A) the term 'false or misleading communications'—

"(i) means advertisements or promotional communications on a social media platform from which there is a financial benefit to the person engaging in such communications regarding such drug—

"(I)(aa) that are made knowingly or recklessly; and

"(bb) contain a false or inaccurate statement or material omission of fact regarding a drug described in subparagraph (1); or

"(II) fail to include information in brief summary relating to side effects, contra-

indications, and effectiveness of the drug in the same manner and to the same extent as such information is required in prescription drug advertisements pursuant to section 502(n); and

"(ii) does not include—

"(I) statements that take place in the course of bona fide patient care or medical research that are made by professionals engaged in such patient care or medical research; or

"(II) statements that describe the person's own experience, opinion, or value judgment; and

"(B) the term 'social media influencer' means a private individual who has perceived credibility or popularity and who expresses their opinions, beliefs, findings, recommendations, or experience on social media platforms to an audience, including in a manner conveying trust or expertise on a topic, for the purpose to promoting or advertising certain information or products or inducing behavior by the audience."

(2) GUIDANCE.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") shall issue guidance on how the Secretary will administer paragraph (h) of section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 333), as added by paragraph (1), including with respect to the factors that will be considered in determining whether a communication is false or misleading communication, as defined in such paragraph (h), including—

(A) the various types of statements or omission of facts regarding a prescription drug that would constitute false or misleading, such as statements or omissions related to safety, efficacy, approved or unapproved uses, directions for use from the label approved by the Food and Drug Administration, scientific information, or other similar attributes;

(B) whether the inclusion of the information in brief summary described in paragraph (h)(2)(A)(i)(III) of section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 333), as added by paragraph (1), alone is sufficient in each circumstance to avoid such a determination;

(C) actions taken by the social media influencer, health care provider, or other person to demonstrate compliance with such paragraph (h); and

(D) characteristics specific to various social media platforms, and the speed of dissemination of the content on such platform.

(3) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS FOR TELEHEALTH PROVIDERS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 502(n) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 352(n)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "For purposes of this paragraph, 'manufacturer, packer, or distributor' includes a person who issues or causes to be issued an advertisement or other descriptive printed matter with respect to a specific drug subject to section 503(b)(1) and who directly or indirectly offers to bring together a potential patient and a prescriber or dispenser through use of electronic information and telecommunication technologies to engage in prescribing or dispensing of any drug subject to section 503(b)(1). Nothing in this paragraph shall apply to a private communication between a practitioner licensed by law to prescribe or dispense a prescription drug (or an individual under the direct supervision of such a practitioner) and an individual patient or their representative."

(B) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall update the regulations promulgated to carry out section 502(n) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21

U.S.C. 352(n)) in accordance with the amendments made by subparagraph (A).

(4) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this subsection, including the amendments made by this subsection, precludes a drug manufacturer from taking any corrective action to mitigate the potential for patient harm from false or misleading communications described in paragraph (h)(2)(A) of section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 353), as added by paragraph (1).

(5) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by paragraphs (1) and (3) shall take effect 180 days after the date on which the regulations described in paragraph (3)(B) are finalized.

(b) **REPORTING REQUIREMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Any payment described in paragraph (2) with respect to the promotion of, or communications regarding, a covered drug shall be treated as a payment from an applicable manufacturer to a covered recipient for purposes of section 1128G of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7h), and shall be reported to the Secretary of Health and Human Services by the drug manufacturer or health care provider making the payment and made publicly available by the Secretary in accordance with such section 1128G.

(2) **PAYMENTS DESCRIBED.**—A payment described in this paragraph is—

(A) a payment by a drug manufacturer to a health care provider, including a telehealth company or other similar entity, or social media influencer; or

(B) a payment by a health care provider, including a telehealth provider or other similar entity, to a social media influencer.

(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

(A) the terms “applicable manufacturer” and “covered recipient” have the meanings given such terms in section 1128G(e) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320a-7h); and

(B) the term “covered drug” means any drug, including a biological product (as defined in section 351(i) of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 262(i))), for which payment is available under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.) or a State plan under title XIX or XXI of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.; 42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.) (or a waiver of such a plan).

(c) **MARKET SURVEILLANCE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUG ADVERTISING OR PROMOTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may conduct market surveillance activities regarding any promotion of prescription drugs on social media platforms. The activities under this section may include—

(A) activities, carried out directly or by contract, relating to—

(i) aggregating and analysis of public communications (which may involve the use of artificial intelligence applications), including to establish any relationship between a manufacturer of a prescription drug and individuals engaging in communications about such drug;

(ii) analytical tools to review submissions of promotional communications;

(iii) engagement with representatives of social media platforms on strategies and opportunities to address false or misleading promotion of prescription drugs, including through methods of technology or functionality to identify and assess false or misleading communications;

(iv) developing and disseminating public facing communications and educational materials and programs for prescription drug manufacturers, social media platforms, and the public, which may include communications and educational materials and programs regarding the Bad Ad program of the Food and Drug Administration;

(B) hiring additional staff for the Office of Prescription Drug Promotion of the Center

for Drug Evaluation and Research and the Advertising and Promotional Labeling Branch of the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research for the review of advertising or promotion of prescription drugs on digital platforms, such as social media, and such other purposes as the Secretary determines appropriate; and

(C) establishing a task force, jointly with the Federal Trade Commission, to coordinate and enhance communication between the Federal Trade Commission and the Food and Drug Administration related to monitoring of, and compliance activities relating to, prescription drug advertising or promotion.

(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall be construed to affect the authority of the Secretary to carry out activities described in such paragraph pursuant to other provisions of law.

(3) **FDA NOTICE TO MANUFACTURERS.**—The Secretary may establish a process for providing information to the holder of an approved application of a prescription drug under section 505 of this Act or section 351 of the Public Health Service Act for the purpose of notifying such holder of instances of communications by health care providers or social media influencers that fail to include information in brief summary relating to side effects, contraindications, and effectiveness of the drug in the same manner and to the same extent as such information is required in prescription drug advertisements pursuant to section 502(n) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 352(n)).

(4) **REPORTING.**—The Secretary shall—

(A) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress a report on the activities carried out under this subsection;

(B) not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to Congress, and make publicly available, a report on the activities carried out under this subsection; and

(C) make publicly available on the website of the Food and Drug Administration notice of all enforcement actions taken under paragraph (h) of section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 333), as added by subsection (a).

(5) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—To carry out this subsection, there are authorized to be appropriated \$15,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2025 through 2029.

(d) **SOCIAL MEDIA INFLUENCER.**—In this section, the term “social media influencer” has the meaning given such term in paragraph (h) of section 303 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 333), as added by subsection (a).

(e) **SEVERABILITY.**—If any provision of this Act or of any amendment made by this Act, or the application of such provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of the provisions of this Act and of the amendments made by this Act and the remainder of the provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), and the application of any such provision or amendment to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances, shall not be affected.

## SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

### SENATE RESOLUTION 812—SUPPORTING THE DESIGNATION OF SEPTEMBER 20, 2024, AS “NATIONAL CONCUSSION AWARENESS DAY”

Ms. HASSAN (for herself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. MULLIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 812

Whereas mild traumatic brain injury, otherwise known as a concussion, is an important health concern for children, teens, and adults;

Whereas, according to information from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention—

(1) there are as many as 1,600,000 to 3,800,000 sports-related concussions annually;

(2) as many as 5,300,000 individuals live with the long-term effects of a traumatic brain injury;

(3) between 2010 and 2016, an estimated 2,000,000 children under age 18 visited an emergency department because of a traumatic brain injury sustained during sports- or recreation-related activities;

(4) each year an estimated 283,000 children seek care in emergency departments in the United States for a sports- or recreation-related traumatic brain injury, with traumatic brain injuries sustained in contact sports accounting for approximately 45 percent of those visits;

(5) research suggests that many children with a traumatic brain injury do not seek care in emergency departments or do not seek care at all, resulting in a significant underestimate of prevalence; and

(6) approximately 15 percent of all high school students in the United States self-reported 1 or more sports- or recreation-related concussions within the preceding 12 months;

Whereas the seriousness of concussions should not be minimized in athletics, and return-to-play and return-to-learn protocols can help ensure recovery;

Whereas concussions can affect physical, mental, and social health, and a greater awareness and understanding of proper diagnosis and management of concussions is critical to improved outcomes; and

Whereas the Senate can raise awareness about concussions among the medical community and the public: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of September 20, 2024, as “National Concussion Awareness Day”;

(2) recognizes that mild traumatic brain injury, otherwise known as a concussion, is an important health concern;

(3) commends the organizations and individuals that raise awareness about mild traumatic brain injury;

(4) encourages Federal, State, and local policymakers to work together—

(A) to raise awareness about the effects of concussions; and

(B) to improve the understanding of proper diagnosis and management of concussions; and

(5) encourages further research and prevention efforts to ensure that fewer individuals experience the most adverse effects of mild traumatic brain injury.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 813—HONORING THE LIFE OF STEVEN D. SYMMS, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF IDAHO**

Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. RISCHE) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

**S. RES. 813**

Whereas Steven D. Symms—

(1) was born in Nampa, Idaho, in 1938; and  
(2) graduated from the University of Idaho, in Moscow, Idaho, in 1960 with a Bachelor of Science in Horticulture;

Whereas Steven D. Symms served proudly in the United States Marine Corps, achieving the rank of First Lieutenant;

Whereas, after his military service, Steven D. Symms returned to Symms Fruit Ranch to build the family business;

Whereas Steven D. Symms was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1972, and was reelected in 1974, 1976, and 1978;

Whereas Steven D. Symms was elected to the United States Senate in 1980, and was reelected in 1986;

Whereas, during the tenure of Steven D. Symms in the United States Senate, he—

(1) served on the Committee on Finance, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Armed Services, the Joint Economic Committee, and chaired the Subcommittee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the Committee on Environment and Public Works

(2) helped shape and enact the 1981 Reagan tax cuts;

(3) worked to enact legislation that enhanced the highway infrastructure system of the United States; and

(4) advanced improvements for Mountain Home Air Force Base, Gowen Field, and the Idaho National Laboratory;

Whereas, after retiring from the United States Senate in 1992, Steven D. Symms worked as a consultant and later joined the partnership of Perry, Romani, DeConcini, and Symms in Washington, D.C., where he was respected by colleagues across the political spectrum;

Whereas Steven D. Symms received the “Iron Mike” award from the United States Marine Corps League for his contributions to the United States and the Marine Corps;

Whereas Steven D. Symms received the Idaho Statesman of the Year Award from Idaho State University, recognizing his steady leadership in political circles;

Whereas Steven D. Symms worked across the aisle for the betterment of Idaho and our country, as he bravely defended our freedoms;

Whereas Steven D. Symms was predeceased by his—

(1) wife, Loretta Fuller Symms;  
(2) former wife, Frances Stockdale Symms;  
(3) son, Daniel Thomas Symms;  
(4) brother, R.A. “Dick” Symms; and  
(5) his sister, Shirley Maggard Ickes; and  
Whereas Steven D. Symms is survived by his—

(1) sister, Ginger Kleweno (Gilbert);  
(2) sister-in-law, Nancy Symms;  
(3) cousins Jim and Kathy Mertz and Roger and Jan Bacon;

(4) daughters Susan Stauffer (Darris), Amy Crabtree (Charles), and Katy Senkus (Stephen);

(5) stepchildren Vickie Fuller (Jeff), Jodi Fuller (Diane), Brad Fuller (Jeffrey); and

(6) many loving grandchildren, great-grandchildren, nieces, and nephews: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That—

(1) the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of Steven D. Symms, former Member of the Senate;

(2) the Senate directs the Secretary of the Senate to—

(A) communicate this resolution to the House of Representatives; and

(B) transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the family of Steven D. Symms; and

(3) when the Senate adjourns today, it stands adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Steven D. Symms.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 814—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2024 AS “NATIONAL LITERACY MONTH”**

Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KING, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. CORNYN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

**S. RES. 814**

Whereas reading is a cornerstone for personal growth, economic opportunity, and a strong society;

Whereas recent assessments, such as the National Assessment of Educational Progress, report unacceptably poor student reading proficiency, highlighting the need for effective literacy instruction;

Whereas the Program for the International Assessment of Adult Competencies estimates that 48,000,000 adults in the United States cannot read above a third-grade level;

Whereas educational disparities persist among students in various States and districts, particularly impacting students of color, those from low-income backgrounds, and English learners;

Whereas citizens who struggle to achieve reading proficiency are less likely to graduate high school or be employed and are more likely to be incarcerated;

Whereas the interim report by the National Reading Panel found that the cost to taxpayers of adult illiteracy is \$224,000,000,000 per year and that United States companies lost nearly \$40,000,000,000 annually because of illiteracy;

Whereas reading proficiency is linked to economic mobility and overall life success;

Whereas an interdisciplinary body of research, known as the science of reading, demonstrates the effectiveness of evidence-based reading strategies in improving literacy outcomes;

Whereas access to print reading materials and robust content knowledge is essential for literacy success, with disparities affecting millions of children, particularly those from low-income households and communities of color;

Whereas evidence-based reading strategies include reading instruction and interventions based on rigorous scientific research that have demonstrated effectiveness in improving literacy development and skills in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension; and

Whereas the Federal Government currently invests in literacy education through programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act (29 U.S.C. 3271 et seq.), and the

Museum and Library Services Act (20 U.S.C. 9101 et seq.); Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2024 as “National Literacy Month”; and

(2) calls on the Federal Government, States, localities, schools, libraries, non-profit organizations, businesses, and the people of the United States to observe National Literacy Month with appropriate programs and activities.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 815—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING ON SEPTEMBER 9, 2024, AS “NATIONAL HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS WEEK”**

Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. BUTLER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. KELLY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. REED, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. WARNOCK, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

**S. RES. 815**

Whereas Hispanic-serving institutions are degree-granting institutions that have a full-time equivalent undergraduate enrollment of at least 25 percent Hispanic students;

Whereas Hispanic-serving institutions play an important role in educating many low-income and underserved students and creating opportunities and increasing access to higher education for such students;

Whereas, in the 2022–2023 academic year, 600 Hispanic-serving institutions operated in the United States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, enrolling more than 5,200,000 students;

Whereas Hispanic-serving institutions are engines of economic mobility and a major contributor to the economic prosperity of the United States;

Whereas Hispanic-serving institutions represent 20 percent of all institutions of higher education, yet serve 31.7 percent of all undergraduate students and 66.2 percent of all Hispanic undergraduate students;

Whereas Hispanic-serving institutions are located in 28 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico;

Whereas the number of emerging Hispanic-serving institutions, defined as institutions that do not yet meet the threshold of 25 percent Hispanic full-time equivalent enrollment but serve a Hispanic student population of between 15 and 24.9 percent, stands at 412 institutions operating in 43 States and the District of Columbia;

Whereas Hispanic-serving institutions are actively involved in empowering and improving the communities in which the institutions are located;

Whereas Hispanic-serving institutions are leading efforts to increase Hispanic participation in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (commonly known as “STEM”);

Whereas 9 of the top 10 institutions of higher education ranked by the Social Mobility Index were Hispanic-serving institutions;

Whereas celebrating the vast contributions of Hispanic-serving institutions strengthens the culture of the United States; and

Whereas the achievements and goals of Hispanic-serving institutions deserve national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the achievements and goals of Hispanic-serving institutions across the United States;

(2) expresses support for the designation of “National Hispanic-serving institutions Week”; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for Hispanic-serving institutions in honor of Hispanic Heritage Month.

**SENATE RESOLUTION 816—RECOGNIZING THE 73RD ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE MUTUAL DEFENSE TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND THE PHILIPPINES AND THE STRONG BILATERAL SECURITY ALLIANCE BETWEEN OUR TWO NATIONS IN THE WAKE OF PERSISTENT AND ESCALATING AGGRESSION BY THE PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF CHINA IN THE SOUTH CHINA SEA**

Mr. RICKETTS (for himself, Mr. COONS, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. KAINE, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. ROMNEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 816

Whereas the United States and the Philippines have maintained diplomatic relations for 78 years, founded on the basis of deeply interconnected strategic and economic interests and close bonds between our two populations;

Whereas the United States-Philippines partnership was forged in blood, as more than 20,000 Americans and hundreds of thousands of Filipinos were killed during the Philippines campaigns during World War II;

Whereas, following the Japanese invasion and occupation of the Philippines from 1941 to 1945, the former United States commonwealth secured its official independence on July 4, 1946;

Whereas, in March 1947, the United States and the Philippines signed a Military Bases Agreement;

Whereas, on August 30, 1951, the United States and the Philippines signed a Mutual Defense Treaty;

Whereas the Mutual Defense Treaty makes clear the United States-Philippine collective intent to resolve international disputes peacefully, undertake separate and joint development of the capacity to resist attack, and consult with one another when the territorial integrity, political independence, or security of the United States or the Philippines is under threat of external armed attack in the Pacific;

Whereas the Mutual Defense Treaty is the foundation of our security alliance and all other enabling defense agreements between the United States and the Philippines, including the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement;

Whereas the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement allows for a strengthened United States military presence in the Philippines to increase bilateral cooperation and interoperability and to provide training to the Armed Forces of the Philippines, with increased rotation of United States military

personnel and assistance devoted to strengthening the territorial defense and humanitarian and maritime operations of the Philippines;

Whereas, in February 2023, the United States and the Philippines committed to designating four additional locations under the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement, increasing the total from five to nine;

Whereas those locations have strategic value for the United States and the Philippines, increase confidence in the alliance, and provide real opportunities for operational cooperation to advance shared security priorities;

Whereas the Mutual Defense Treaty serves as a deterrent against the increasing territorial aggression by the People’s Republic of China in the South China Sea;

Whereas, in 2009, the People’s Republic of China began unlawfully extending its territorial and sovereignty claims in the South China Sea under its “nine-dash line” construct, violating the territorial rights and internationally recognized exclusive economic zones of the Philippines, Brunei, Malaysia, and Vietnam;

Whereas, since 2014, the People’s Republic of China has substantially expanded its ability to monitor and project power throughout the South China Sea via the construction of militarized artificial islands;

Whereas, on September 25, 2015, at the White House, President of the People’s Republic of China Xi Jinping stated that “China does not intend to pursue militarization” of the Spratly Islands and China’s outposts would not “target or impact any country”;

Whereas, on July 12, 2016, the arbitral tribunal constituted under Annex VII to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea unanimously decided to invalidate the People’s Republic of China’s claim to nearly 90 percent of the South China Sea, including areas determined by the tribunal to be part of the Philippines’ exclusive economic zone and continental shelf;

Whereas, despite the decision being final and legally binding, the People’s Republic of China, which refused to participate in the arbitration, has continued to reject and further violate the decision;

Whereas the People’s Republic of China has employed a variety of assertive and aggressive tactics against the Philippines, including through its coast guard, research vessels, and commercial maritime vessels, to coerce and enforce its arbitrary and unlawful territorial claims in the South China Sea, such as by ramming, shadowing, blocking, encircling, firing water cannons at, and using military-grade lasers against Philippine civilian ships and military vessels;

Whereas the People’s Republic of China has repeatedly denied the Philippines from lawfully delivering humanitarian supplies to members of the Armed Forces of the Philippines stationed at the BRP Sierra Madre at Second Thomas Shoal;

Whereas, on June 17, 2024, coast guard sailers from the People’s Republic of China brandished knives and other weapons in a clash with Philippine naval vessels attempting to resupply marines on Second Thomas Shoal, resulting in a severe injury to a member of the Armed Forces of the Philippines;

Whereas, on August 8, 2024, the People’s Republic of China dangerously and provocatively dropped flares in the path of a Philippine Air Force aircraft conducting a routine patrol over the Scarborough Shoal;

Whereas, on August 19, 2024, People’s Republic of China Coast Guard vessels performed aggressive maneuvers in the South China Sea, recklessly colliding with and damaging two Philippine Coast Guard vessels near the Sabina Shoal;

Whereas, on August 27, 2024, the Commander of the United States Indo-Pacific Command, Admiral Samuel Paparo, said the United States military is open to consultations with the Philippines about escorting Philippine ships delivering food and other supplies to the Armed Forces of the Philippines in the South China Sea;

Whereas, on August 31, 2024, a People’s Republic of China Coast Guard ship rammed a Philippine Coast Guard ship, the BRP Teresa Magbanua, three times without any provocation, causing damage to the Philippine ship near the Sabina Shoal; and

Whereas August 30, 2024, marked the 73rd anniversary of the signing of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Philippines: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 73rd anniversary of the signing of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Philippines and the longstanding alliance between our two nations;

(2) appreciates the trust of the Philippine people in the bilateral alliance and their support for increased defense cooperation and United States military presence in the Philippines;

(3) acknowledges the determination of the Philippine people and the Armed Forces of the Philippines to resist coercion by the People’s Republic of China;

(4) condemns the People’s Republic of China’s persistent and unprovoked aggression in the South China Sea to enforce its unlawful territorial and sovereignty claims;

(5) reaffirms that Article IV of the Mutual Defense Treaty extends to armed attacks on the Armed Forces, public vessels, or aircraft of the Philippines, including the Philippine Coast Guard, anywhere in the South China Sea;

(6) considers aggression by the People’s Republic of China in the Philippines’ internationally recognized exclusive economic zone to be a direct assault on its sovereignty and territorial integrity;

(7) urges the President to take appropriate and necessary actions in response to escalatory behavior of the People’s Republic of China in order to restore deterrence and help the Philippines defend itself;

(8) supports the unwavering commitment of the United States to deepening security cooperation with the Philippines, including advancing Philippine defense modernization and enhancing interoperability through military exercises, training, joint patrols, and increased information sharing;

(9) supports other nations growing their political and security partnerships with the Philippines;

(10) commits to advance cooperation among the United States, the Philippines, Japan, South Korea, and Australia; and

(11) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the right to freedom of navigation and overflight, respecting maritime rights under international law, and ensuring a free and open Indo-Pacific.

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41—SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025 AND SETTING FORTH THE APPROPRIATE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2026 THROUGH 2034**

Mr. PAUL submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was placed on the calendar:



S. CON. RES. 41

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),*

# SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2025.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2025 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2026 through 2034.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2025.

## TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

### Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.

Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

## TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 2001. Deficit reduction fund for efficiencies, consolidations, and other savings.

Sec. 2002. Reserve fund relating to health savings accounts.

## TITLE III—BUDGET PROCESS

Sec. 3001. Voting threshold for points of order.

Sec. 3002. Emergency legislation.

Sec. 3003. Enforcement of allocations, aggregates, and other levels.

Sec. 3004. Point of order against legislation providing funding within more than 3 suballocations under section 302(b).

Sec. 3005. Duplication determinations by the Congressional Budget Office.

Sec. 3006. Breakdown of cost estimates by budget function.

Sec. 3007. Sense of the Senate on treatment of reduction of appropriations levels to achieve savings.

Sec. 3008. Prohibition on preemptive waivers.

Sec. 3009. Adjustments for legislation reducing appropriations.

Sec. 3010. Authority.

Sec. 3011. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

## TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

### Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

#### SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2025 through 2034:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$3,751,008,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,052,877,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$4,365,167,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028: \$4,500,675,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029: \$4,635,385,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2030: \$4,799,347,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2031: \$5,047,893,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032: \$5,226,529,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2033: \$5,442,436,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034: \$5,662,382,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: –\$44,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: –\$197,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: –\$445,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028: –\$442,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029: –\$432,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030: –\$430,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031: –\$450,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032: –\$473,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033: –\$498,000,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034: –\$522,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$5,256,764,378,612.

Fiscal year 2026: \$4,898,244,964,427.

Fiscal year 2027: \$4,600,960,065,632.

Fiscal year 2028: \$4,292,582,465,867.

Fiscal year 2029: \$4,089,998,581,272.

Fiscal year 2030: \$4,424,315,565,903.

Fiscal year 2031: \$4,657,250,004,865.

Fiscal year 2032: \$4,823,876,001,217.

Fiscal year 2033: \$4,994,989,055,218.

Fiscal year 2034: \$5,214,324,916,610.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$5,160,162,200,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$4,850,552,708,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$4,559,519,785,520.

Fiscal year 2028: \$4,285,948,838,389.

Fiscal year 2029: \$4,028,792,148,085.

Fiscal year 2030: \$4,369,347,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031: \$4,597,893,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032: \$4,753,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033: \$4,944,436,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034: \$5,140,382,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$1,453,154,200,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$994,675,708,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$639,352,785,520.

Fiscal year 2028: \$227,273,838,389.

Fiscal year 2029: –\$174,592,851,915.

Fiscal year 2030: \$0.

Fiscal year 2031: \$0.

Fiscal year 2032: \$0.

Fiscal year 2033: \$0.

Fiscal year 2034: \$0.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$38,096,473,200,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$41,137,820,400,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$43,632,330,108,000.

Fiscal year 2028: \$45,836,752,893,520.

Fiscal year 2029: \$47,709,467,731,909.

Fiscal year 2030: \$49,163,300,879,994.

Fiscal year 2031: \$50,830,253,879,994.

Fiscal year 2032: \$52,540,238,879,994.

Fiscal year 2033: \$54,624,047,879,994.

Fiscal year 2034: \$56,952,711,879,994.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$31,115,711,200,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$34,060,482,400,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$36,632,836,108,000.

Fiscal year 2028: \$38,932,622,893,520.

Fiscal year 2029: \$40,901,576,731,909.

Fiscal year 2030: \$42,551,392,879,994.

Fiscal year 2031: \$44,465,462,879,994.

Fiscal year 2032: \$46,479,173,879,994.

Fiscal year 2033: \$48,573,124,879,994.

Fiscal year 2034: \$50,771,176,879,994.

#### SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2025 through 2034 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$991,176,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$929,919,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,014,463,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$970,070,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,037,537,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,000,183,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,060,744,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,032,754,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,084,648,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,045,646,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,109,415,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,074,867,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,135,231,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,098,638,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,162,639,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,122,094,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,190,775,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,159,703,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,218,935,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,180,388,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$98,438,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$80,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$92,331,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$90,852,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$94,223,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$93,444,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$96,071,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$93,763,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$98,062,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$95,273,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$100,095,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$95,898,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$102,219,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$97,808,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$104,439,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$99,788,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$106,654,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$101,834,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$108,941,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$103,887,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,550,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,458,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,427,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,888,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,301,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,906,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,163,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,995,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,080,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,755,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,041,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$45,546,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$48,041,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$46,493,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,093,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$47,484,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,140,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,499,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,234,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$49,555,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$40,987,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,028,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$41,176,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,978,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,131,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$54,852,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028:  
(A) New budget authority, \$44,925,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$52,752,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48,151,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,690,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2030:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,736,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,283,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2031:  
(A) New budget authority, \$47,422,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$48,091,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032:  
(A) New budget authority, \$50,659,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,198,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2033:  
(A) New budget authority, \$35,296,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$34,091,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,910,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,770,000,000.  
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$75,354,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$72,235,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$77,025,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$81,529,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,785,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$84,654,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028:  
(A) New budget authority, \$72,272,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$82,895,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029:  
(A) New budget authority, \$73,716,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$80,456,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2030:  
(A) New budget authority, \$75,083,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$77,337,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2031:  
(A) New budget authority, \$76,650,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$76,433,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032:  
(A) New budget authority, \$78,514,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$76,120,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2033:  
(A) New budget authority, \$80,323,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$77,805,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034:  
(A) New budget authority, \$82,068,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$79,664,000,000.  
(6) Agriculture (350):  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,767,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,302,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,774,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,564,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,984,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,951,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,893,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$32,132,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029:  
(A) New budget authority, \$33,103,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$32,418,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2030:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,268,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,305,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2031:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,427,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,321,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032:  
(A) New budget authority, \$32,132,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,825,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:  
(A) New budget authority, \$32,560,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$31,063,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034:  
(A) New budget authority, \$32,938,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$31,645,000,000.  
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,369,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, — \$6,342,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,241,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, — \$9,037,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$22,395,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, — \$6,094,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028:  
(A) New budget authority, — \$62,726,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, — \$70,351,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,099,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$12,983,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2030:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,422,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$8,897,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2031:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,559,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$3,314,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,536,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, — \$404,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2033:  
(A) New budget authority, \$19,348,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, — \$8,344,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,488,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, — \$1,816,000,000.  
(8) Transportation (400):  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$165,696,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$141,215,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$168,779,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$149,712,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$170,839,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$159,064,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028:  
(A) New budget authority, \$172,908,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$166,576,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029:  
(A) New budget authority, \$174,750,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$171,764,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2030:  
(A) New budget authority, \$171,336,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$171,271,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2031:  
(A) New budget authority, \$173,112,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$174,798,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032:  
(A) New budget authority, \$181,681,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$184,365,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2033:  
(A) New budget authority, \$184,080,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$187,678,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034:  
(A) New budget authority, \$186,734,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$191,056,000,000.  
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,988,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,816,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$59,064,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$59,905,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$60,193,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,739,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,188,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,458,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,402,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,170,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2030:  
(A) New budget authority, \$63,664,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,113,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,947,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,031,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,152,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$56,955,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2033:  
(A) New budget authority, \$67,517,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,114,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034:  
(A) New budget authority, \$68,877,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,158,000,000.  
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$151,113,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$168,952,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$153,590,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$163,144,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$156,002,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$151,632,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028:  
(A) New budget authority, \$159,376,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$153,809,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029:  
(A) New budget authority, \$162,476,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$156,803,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2030:  
(A) New budget authority, \$165,906,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$159,958,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2031:  
(A) New budget authority, \$169,423,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$163,276,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032:  
(A) New budget authority, \$173,080,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$166,732,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2033:  
(A) New budget authority, \$176,554,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$170,135,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034:  
(A) New budget authority, \$179,653,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$173,309,000,000.  
(11) Health (550):  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$908,003,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$899,441,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$889,530,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$891,587,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$923,708,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$921,838,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028:  
(A) New budget authority, \$967,468,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$963,437,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,018,895,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,006,453,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2030:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,063,034,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,050,620,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2031:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,101,712,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,098,694,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,154,956,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,151,136,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2033:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,215,985,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,204,908,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,257,586,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,246,466,000,000.  
(12) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$943,898,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$943,538,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,007,605,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,007,286,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,076,885,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,076,551,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,225,301,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,224,971,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,146,865,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,146,553,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,309,494,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,309,195,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,401,970,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,401,686,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,499,559,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,499,305,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,740,208,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,739,943,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,757,574,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,757,266,000,000.

## (13) Income Security (600):

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$714,147,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$707,121,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$702,201,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$699,981,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$706,187,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$701,521,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$727,377,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$728,578,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$731,506,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$718,414,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$751,744,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$743,338,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$768,056,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$759,139,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$787,710,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$777,960,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$810,722,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$807,559,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$821,201,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$811,246,000,000.

## (14) Social Security (650):

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$62,603,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$62,603,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$74,593,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$74,593,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$80,801,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$80,801,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$84,852,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$84,852,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$89,448,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$89,448,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$94,332,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$94,332,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$99,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$99,100,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$104,219,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$104,219,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$110,088,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$110,088,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$115,917,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$115,917,000,000.

## (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$347,115,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$343,802,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$367,944,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$373,118,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$389,956,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$389,394,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$411,627,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$429,583,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$430,098,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$406,023,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$450,187,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$446,172,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$469,669,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$465,585,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$489,775,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$486,235,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$510,709,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$531,303,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$532,021,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$532,116,000,000.

## (16) Administration of Justice (750):

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$87,681,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$86,154,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$87,274,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$85,800,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$89,518,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$87,838,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$91,770,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$89,784,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$94,104,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$91,914,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$96,612,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$94,109,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$99,184,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$96,373,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$107,101,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$103,931,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$110,106,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$106,755,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$112,766,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$109,717,000,000.

## (17) General Government (800):

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,041,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$41,296,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,550,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,266,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,576,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,143,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,672,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,398,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,617,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,275,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,249,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$40,610,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,044,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,400,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,080,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$36,829,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$38,111,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$37,592,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,192,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$38,659,000,000.

## (18) Net Interest (900):

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,075,933,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,075,933,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,117,417,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,117,417,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,137,024,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,137,024,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,186,166,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,186,166,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,244,744,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,244,744,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,317,426,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,317,426,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,405,186,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,405,186,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,502,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,502,400,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,612,929,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,612,929,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,730,442,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,730,442,000,000.

## (19) Allowances (920):

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$55,051,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$30,556,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, -\$56,342,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$46,465,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, -\$57,565,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$52,620,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, -\$58,775,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$55,731,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, -\$60,173,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$57,881,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, -\$61,613,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$59,629,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, -\$63,088,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$61,212,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, -\$64,622,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$62,742,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, -\$66,172,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$64,305,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, -\$67,813,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$65,879,000,000.

## (20) New Efficiencies, Consolidations, and Other Savings (930):

## Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$410,291,621,388.  
(B) Outlays, -\$402,751,800,000.

## Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, -\$899,877,035,573.  
(B) Outlays, -\$891,115,292,000.

## Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, -\$1,373,252,934,368.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,360,884,214,480.

## Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, -\$1,918,228,534,133.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,915,264,161,611.

## Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, -\$2,303,761,418,728.  
(B) Outlays, -\$2,269,285,851,915.

## Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, -\$2,318,985,434,097.  
(B) Outlays, -\$2,290,180,000,000.

## Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, -\$2,381,314,995,135.

(B) Outlays, —\$2,350,971,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$2,559,447,998,783.  
(B) Outlays, —\$2,522,131,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2033:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$2,868,401,944,782.  
(B) Outlays, —\$2,839,381,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$2,901,217,083,390.  
(B) Outlays, —\$2,860,071,000,000.  
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$126,752,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$126,752,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$130,520,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$130,520,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$136,267,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$136,417,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$140,461,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$140,608,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$142,831,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$142,823,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2030:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$147,130,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$147,121,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2031:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$151,299,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$151,290,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$156,779,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$156,770,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2033:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$162,542,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$162,533,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034:  
(A) New budget authority,  
—\$167,122,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, —\$167,113,000,000.

#### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

#### SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$1,287,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$1,341,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$1,391,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028: \$1,443,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029: \$1,498,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2030: \$1,555,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2031: \$1,613,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2032: \$1,673,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2033: \$1,734,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2034: \$1,796,000,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025: \$1,549,110,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$1,647,112,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$1,740,634,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2028: \$1,838,483,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2029: \$1,938,394,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030: \$2,040,598,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031: \$2,146,676,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032: \$2,255,005,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033: \$2,364,405,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034: \$2,478,100,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,670,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,536,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,873,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,782,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,075,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,002,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,279,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,206,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,488,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,415,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,704,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,628,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,925,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,847,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,157,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,076,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,393,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,309,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$8,640,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$8,553,000,000.

#### SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$282,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$282,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$292,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$292,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$303,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$303,000,000.

Fiscal year 2028:

(A) New budget authority, \$313,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$313,000,000.

Fiscal year 2029:

(A) New budget authority, \$324,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$324,000,000.

Fiscal year 2030:

(A) New budget authority, \$335,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$335,000,000.

Fiscal year 2031:

(A) New budget authority, \$346,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$346,000,000.

Fiscal year 2032:

(A) New budget authority, \$358,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2033:

(A) New budget authority, \$370,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$370,000,000.

Fiscal year 2034:

(A) New budget authority, \$382,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$382,000,000.

#### TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

#### SEC. 2001. DEFICIT REDUCTION FUND FOR EFFICIENCIES, CONSOLIDATIONS, AND OTHER SAVINGS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this

resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to efficiencies, consolidations, and other savings by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would reduce the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2029 and the period of the total of fiscal years 2025 through 2034.

#### SEC. 2002. RESERVE FUND RELATING TO HEALTH SAVINGS ACCOUNTS.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to health savings accounts by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes.

#### TITLE III—BUDGET PROCESS

#### SEC. 3001. VOTING THRESHOLD FOR POINTS OF ORDER.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “covered point of order” means a point of order—

(1) under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.), or a concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(2) which, but for subsection (b), may be waived only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn.

(b) VOTING THRESHOLD.—In the Senate—

(1) a covered point of order may be waived only by the affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn; and

(2) an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a covered point of order.

#### SEC. 3002. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement, by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn, in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, and sections 401 and 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(7)) for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) DESIGNATIONS.—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms “direct spending”, “receipts”, and “appropriations for discretionary accounts” mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(e) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.—

(A) WAIVER.—Paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) APPEALS.—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this subsection.

(3) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(f) CRITERIA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) INAPPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 4001(a) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022, shall no longer apply.

#### SEC. 3003. ENFORCEMENT OF ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND OTHER LEVELS.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—During each of fiscal years 2025 through 2034, it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would cause the amount of new budget authority, outlays, or deficits to be more than, or would cause the amount of revenues to be less than, the amount set forth under any allocation, aggregate, or other level established under this resolution.

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

#### SEC. 3004. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST LEGISLATION PROVIDING FUNDING WITHIN MORE THAN 3 SUBALLOCATIONS UNDER SECTION 302(b).

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that appropriates amounts that are within more than 3 of the suballocations under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(b)).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of two-thirds of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

#### SEC. 3005. DUPLICATION DETERMINATIONS BY THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the term “covered bill or joint resolution” means a bill or joint resolution of a public character reported by any committee of Congress (including the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget of either House);

(2) the term “Director” means the Director of the Congressional Budget Office;

(3) the term “existing duplicative or overlapping feature” means an element of the Federal Government previously identified as an area of duplication, overlap, or fragmentation in a GAO duplication and overlap report;

(4) the term “GAO duplication and overlap report” means each annual report prepared by the Comptroller General under section 21 of Public Law 111–139 (31 U.S.C. 712 note); and

(5) the term “new duplicative or overlapping feature” means a new Federal program, office, or initiative created under a covered bill or joint resolution that would duplicate or overlap with an existing duplicative or overlapping feature.

(b) DUPLICATION DETERMINATIONS.—For each covered bill or joint resolution—

(1) the Comptroller General of the United States shall, to the extent practicable—

(A) determine the extent to which the covered bill or joint resolution creates a risk of a new duplicative or overlapping feature and, if the risk so warrants, identify—

(i) the name of the new Federal program, office, or initiative;

(ii) the section of the covered bill or joint resolution at which the new duplicative or overlapping feature is established; and

(iii) the GAO duplication and overlap report in which the existing duplicative or overlapping feature is identified; and

(B) submit the information described in subparagraph (A) to the Director and the committee that reported the covered bill or joint resolution; and

(C) publish the information prepared under subparagraph (A) on the website of the Government Accountability Office; and

(2) subject to subsection (c), the Director may include the information submitted by the Comptroller General under paragraph (1)(B) as a supplement to the estimate for the covered bill or joint resolution to which the information pertains submitted by the Director under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653).

(c) ESTIMATE BY DIRECTOR.—If the Comptroller General of the United States has not submitted to the Director the information for a covered bill or joint resolution under subsection (b)(1)(B) on the date on which the Director submits the estimate for the covered bill or joint resolution to which the information pertains under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653), the Director may, on the date on which the Comptroller General submits the information to the Director, prepare and submit to each applicable committee the information as a supplement to the estimate for the covered bill or joint resolution.

#### SEC. 3006. BREAKDOWN OF COST ESTIMATES BY BUDGET FUNCTION.

Any cost estimate prepared by the Congressional Budget Office shall specify the percentage of the estimated cost that is within each budget function.

#### SEC. 3007. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TREATMENT OF REDUCTION OF APPROPRIATIONS LEVELS TO ACHIEVE SAVINGS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) H. Con. Res. 448 (96th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1981, gave authorizing committees reconciliation instructions which amounted to approximately two-thirds of the savings required under reconciliation.

(2) The language in H. Con. Res. 448 resulted in a debate about how reconciling discretionary spending programs could be in order given that authorizations of appropriations for programs did not actually change spending and the programs authorized would be funded through later annual appropriation. The staff of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate and the counsel to the Majority Leader advised that upon consultation with the Parliamentarian, the original instructions on discretionary spending would be out of order because of the phrase, “to modify programs”. This was seen as too broad and programs could be modified without resulting in changes to their future appropriations.

(3) To rectify this violation, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate reported S. Con. Res. 9 (97th Congress), revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1983, to include reconciliation, which revised the language in the reconciliation instructions to change entitlement law and “to report changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce appropriations levels so as to achieve savings”.

(4) This was understood to mean changes in authorization language of discretionary programs would be permissible under reconciliation procedures provided such changes in law would have the result in affecting a change in later outlays derived from future appropriations. Further it was understood that a change in authorization language that caused a change in later outlays was considered to be a change in outlays for the purpose of reconciliation.

(5) On April 2, 1981, the Senate voted 88 to 10 to approve S. Con. Res. 9 with the modified reconciliation language.

(b) **SENSE OF THE SENATE.**—It is the sense of the Senate that committees reporting changes in laws within the jurisdiction of that committee sufficient to reduce appropriations levels so as to achieve savings shall be considered to be changes in outlays for the purpose of enforcing the prohibition on extraneous matters in reconciliation bills.

#### **SEC. 3008. PROHIBITION ON PREEMPTIVE WAIVERS.**

In the Senate, it shall not be in order to move to waive or suspend a point of order under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) or any concurrent resolution on the budget with respect to a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report unless the point of order has been specifically raised by a Senator.

#### **SEC. 3009. ADJUSTMENTS FOR LEGISLATION REDUCING APPROPRIATIONS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations in effect under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) and the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the reduction in the amount of discretionary appropriations for a fiscal year caused by the measure.

#### **SEC. 3010. AUTHORITY.**

Congress adopts this title under the authority under section 301(b)(4) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(4)).

#### **SEC. 3011. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

### **AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED**

SA 3266. Mr. WARNOCK (for himself and Mr. BUDD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3267. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3268. Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3269. Mr. KAINE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3270. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3271. Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3272. Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3273. Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3274. Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3275. Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 3276. Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. Schumer to the bill S. 4638, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

### **TEXT OF AMENDMENTS**

SA 3266. Mr. WARNOCK (for himself and Mr. BUDD) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### **DIVISION \_\_\_\_\_—FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES FOR SERVICEMEMBERS**

##### **SEC. \_\_\_\_\_01. SHORT TITLE.**

This division may be cited as the “Fair Debt Collection Practices for Servicemembers Act”.

##### **SEC. \_\_\_\_\_02. ENHANCED PROTECTION AGAINST DEBT COLLECTOR HARASSMENT OF SERVICEMEMBERS.**

(a) **COMMUNICATION IN CONNECTION WITH DEBT COLLECTION.**—Section 805 of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **COMMUNICATIONS CONCERNING SERVICE-MEMBER DEBTS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term ‘covered member’ means—

“(A) a covered member or a dependent as defined in section 987(i) of title 10, United States Code; and

“(B)(i) an individual who was separated, discharged, or released from duty described

in such section 987(i)(1), but only during the 365-day period beginning on the date of separation, discharge, or release; or

“(ii) a person, with respect to an individual described in clause (i), described in subparagraph (A), (D), (E), or (I) of section 1072(2) of title 10, United States Code.

“(2) **PROHIBITIONS.**—A debt collector may not, in connection with the collection of any debt of a covered member—

“(A) threaten to have the covered member reduced in rank;

“(B) threaten to have the covered member’s security clearance revoked; or

“(C) threaten to have the covered member prosecuted under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice).”.

(b) **UNFAIR PRACTICES.**—Section 808 of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692f) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(9) The representation to any covered member (as defined under section 805(e)(1)) that failure to cooperate with a debt collector will result in—

“(A) a reduction in rank of the covered member;

“(B) a revocation of the covered member’s security clearance; or

“(C) prosecution under chapter 47 of title 10, United States Code (the Uniform Code of Military Justice).”.

#### **SEC. \_\_\_\_\_03. GAO STUDY.**

The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study and submit a report to Congress on the impact of this division on—

(1) the timely delivery of information to a covered member (as defined in section 805(e) of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, as added by this division);

(2) military readiness; and

(3) national security, including the extent to which covered members with security clearances would be impacted by uncollected debt.

#### **SEC. \_\_\_\_\_04. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**

Nothing in this division shall be construed to prevent legally informing servicemembers of their debt and collecting the debt from servicemembers through legal means.

SA 3267. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

#### **SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. USE OF ROYALTY GAS AT MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT.**

Section 342 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15902) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) **MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT.**—At the request of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary shall—

“(1) take in-kind royalty gas from any lease on the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant in McAlester, Oklahoma; and

“(2) sell such royalty gas to the Department of Defense in accordance with subsection (h)(1), for use only at that plant, only for energy resilience purposes, and only to the extent necessary to meet the natural gas needs of that plant.”.

SA 3268. Mr. BRAUN (for himself and Mr. KAINE) submitted an amendment



intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

**SEC. 1095. BENJAMIN HARRISON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AND WILDERNESS.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—The term “Advisory Committee” means the advisory committee for the National Recreation Area established under subsection (d)(1).

(2) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—The term “Management Plan” means the management plan for the National Recreation Area and Wilderness developed under subsection (e)(1).

(3) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Benjamin Harrison National Recreation Area and Wilderness Establishment Act of 2023” and dated March 27, 2024.

(4) **NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.**—The term “National Recreation Area” means the Benjamin Harrison National Recreation Area established by subsection (b)(2).

(5) **NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AND WILDERNESS.**—The term “National Recreation Area and Wilderness” means the Benjamin Harrison National Recreation Area and Wilderness established by subsection (b)(1).

(6) **NONWILDERNESS CORRIDOR.**—The term “nonwilderness corridor” means the land 100 feet in width from either side of the centerline of the existing trails and roads, as depicted on the map as “Non-Wilderness Corridor”, which is not included as part of the “Proposed Wilderness”, as depicted on the map.

(7) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service.

(8) **STATE.**—The term “State” means the State of Indiana.

(9) **WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—The term “Wilderness addition” means the land added to the Charles C. Deam Wilderness by subsection (b)(3).

(b) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in the State the Benjamin Harrison National Recreation Area and Wilderness as a subunit of the Hoosier National Forest, consisting of—

- (A) the National Recreation Area; and
- (B) the Wilderness addition.

(2) **BENJAMIN HARRISON NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.**—There is established in the State the Benjamin Harrison National Recreation Area, consisting of approximately 29,382 acres of National Forest System land depicted on the map as “Proposed National Recreation Area (NRA)”.

(3) **CHARLES C. DEAM WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—The approximately 15,300 acres of National Forest System land in the State generally depicted on the map as “Proposed Wilderness” shall be added to and administered as part of the Charles C. Deam Wilderness in accordance with Public Law 97-384 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 96 Stat. 1942), consisting of—

(A) the approximately 2,028.8 acres of National Forest System land in the State generally depicted on the map as the “Deckard Ridge Units A, B, and C”;

(B) the approximately 2,633 acres of National Forest System land in the State generally depicted on the map as the “Panther Creek Units A and B”;

(C) the approximately 5,456.9 acres of National Forest System land in the State gen-

erally depicted on the map as the “Nebo Ridge Units A, B, C, D, and E”;

(D) the approximately 2,141.4 acres of National Forest System land in the State generally depicted on the map as the “Browning Mountain Unit”;

(E) the approximately 2,161.9 acres of National Forest System land in the State generally depicted on the map as the “Hickory Ridge Units A, B, C, D, and E”;

(F) the approximately 878.3 acres of National Forest System land in the State generally depicted on the map as the “Mose Ray Branch Unit”.

(4) **AVAILABILITY OF MAP.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file the map, and make the map available for public inspection, in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(c) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The Secretary shall manage—

(1) the Wilderness addition (other than the nonwilderness corridors) in a manner that is consistent with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(2) the National Recreation Area in a manner that ensures—

(A) the protection of the water quality of the public water supply of Monroe Reservoir in the State in accordance with section 303(e)(1) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6542(e)(1)); and

(B) the promotion of recreational opportunities in the National Recreation Area.

(3) **HUNTING, FISHING, AND TRAPPING.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall allow hunting, fishing, and trapping in the National Recreation Area and Wilderness.

(B) **LIMITATIONS.**—The Secretary, in consultation with designees from the State Department of Natural Resources and the Corps of Engineers, may, for reasons of public safety, species enhancement, or management of a species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), designate areas in which, and establish seasons during which, no hunting, fishing, or trapping is permitted in the National Recreation Area and Wilderness.

(C) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this section affects the jurisdiction of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the National Recreation Area and Wilderness.

(4) **RECREATION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall—

(i) in the National Recreation Area, continue to permit and provide for appropriate nonmotorized and motorized recreational uses, including hiking, viewing of nature and wildlife, camping, horseback riding, mountain biking, and other existing recreational uses; and

(ii) permit the nonmechanized recreational use of the Wilderness addition, in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) within the boundary of the “Proposed Wilderness” indicated on the map.

(B) **LIMITATIONS.**—The Secretary, in consultation with designees from the State Department of Natural Resources and the Corps of Engineers, may designate zones in which, and establish periods during which, a recreational use shall not be permitted in the National Recreation Area and Wilderness under subparagraph (A) for reasons of public safety, species enhancement, or management of a species listed as endangered or threatened under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(C) **TRAIL PLAN.**—Notwithstanding any provisions of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) or any other provision of law, the Secretary, in consultation with interested parties, shall establish a trail plan—

(i) to maintain existing mountain biking, hiking, and equestrian trails in the non-wilderness corridors; and

(ii) to develop mountain biking, hiking, and equestrian trails in the National Recreation Area.

(5) **VEGETATION MANAGEMENT.**—

(A) **WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—Consistent with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), timber removal or management shall not be permitted in the Wilderness addition, except as the Secretary determines to be necessary for public safety and management of diseases, as described in section 293.3 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(B) **NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.**—Vegetation management within the National Recreation Area shall be consistent with—

(i) the Management Plan; and

(ii) any applicable Forest Service land management plan.

(d) **NATIONAL RECREATION AREA FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish an advisory committee to advise the Secretary with respect to the management of the National Recreation Area.

(2) **MEMBERSHIP.**—The Advisory Committee shall be composed of members appointed by the Secretary, from among—

(A) representatives of local government;

(B) forest ecologists;

(C) experts in dispersed recreation;

(D) local residents who own or reside in property located not more than 2 miles from the boundary of the National Recreation Area;

(E) representatives of conservation and outdoor recreation groups;

(F) consulting foresters;

(G) the Director of the State Department of Natural Resources (or designees);

(H) wildlife experts; and

(I) designees from the Corps of Engineers.

(e) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a comprehensive management plan for the long-term protection and management of the National Recreation Area.

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The Management Plan shall—

(A) be developed—

(i) in consultation with the Advisory Committee;

(ii) after providing an opportunity for public comment; and

(iii) after engaging with interested or affected federally recognized Indian Tribes, other Federal agencies, and State and local governments, including the State Department of Natural Resources;

(B) address management issues associated with the National Recreation Area, including—

(i) fires;

(ii) invasive species;

(iii) the response to insect and disease infestations;

(iv) measures needed to protect the public water supply provided by Monroe Reservoir;

(v) the establishment, maintenance, and closure of camp sites, campgrounds, trails, and roadways; and

(vi) any other issues identified by the Advisory Committee; and

(C) include—

(i) measures to preserve and protect native and historical resources, flora, fauna, and recreational, scenic, and aesthetic values within the National Recreation Area; and

(ii) measures to prevent degradation of the public water supply provided by Monroe Reservoir.

## (f) FUNDING.—

(1) No ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

(2) USE OF EXISTING FUNDS.—This section shall be carried out using amounts otherwise made available to the Secretary.

## (g) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

(1) affects the Corps of Engineers use permits for flowage rights within the National Recreation Area and Wilderness established by the order entitled “Joint Order Interchanging Administrative Jurisdiction of Department of the Army Lands and National Forest Lands” (35 Fed. Reg. 10382 (June 25, 1970));

(2) prevents the Corps of Engineers from carrying out the water control management plan of the Corps of Engineers within the National Recreation Area and Wilderness as described in the Corps of Engineers water control manual;

## (3) prevents the Corps of Engineers from—

(A) disposing of, or otherwise managing, real estate interests held by the Corps of Engineers as of the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) acquiring additional real estate interests required to support the operation or maintenance of Monroe Lake;

(4) affects the use of motor vessels (as defined in section 2101 of title 46, United States Code) on Monroe Lake;

(5) results in the closure of any State or county roadway in the National Recreation Area and the nonwilderness corridors;

(6) precludes the ownership, use, or enjoyment of private land within the National Recreation Area and Wilderness;

(7) otherwise affects access to private land or cemeteries within the National Recreation Area and Wilderness;

(8) affects the access to land within the nonwilderness corridors and within 100 feet of the outer boundary of the Wilderness addition by any State or private entity or organization with a permit, special use authorization, or other right to access land within the Wilderness addition, as described in section 5(a) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1134(a)), for the purpose of maintaining infrastructure located within the Wilderness addition, including access by—

(A) the Smithville Telephone Company;

(B) Jackson County Water Utility;

(C) Jackson County Rural Electric;

(D) the ANR Pipeline Company;

(E) the Monroe County commissioners;

(F) Hoosier Trails Council, BSA; and

(G) the State Department of Natural Resources; or

(9) affects the access to land within the Wilderness addition by the State Department of Natural Resources or appropriate public safety officers with the use of motor vehicles, mechanized equipment, or motorboats for emergencies involving the health and safety of persons within the Wilderness addition, in accordance with section 4(c) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(c)).

**SEC. 1096. ADDITIONS TO ROUGH MOUNTAIN AND RICH HOLE WILDERNESSES.**

(a) ROUGH MOUNTAIN ADDITION.—Section 1 of Public Law 100–326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584; 114 Stat. 2057; 123 Stat. 1002) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(21) ROUGH MOUNTAIN ADDITION.—Certain land in the George Washington National Forest comprising approximately 1,000 acres, as generally depicted as the ‘Rough Mountain Addition’ on the map entitled ‘GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL FOREST – South half – Alternative I – Selected Alternative Management Prescriptions – Land and Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement’ and dated March 4, 2014, which is incorporated in the Rough

Mountain Wilderness Area designated by paragraph (1).”

## (b) RICH HOLE ADDITION.—

(1) POTENTIAL WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain land in the George Washington National Forest comprising approximately 4,600 acres, as generally depicted as the “Rich Hole Addition” on the map entitled “GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL FOREST – South half – Alternative I – Selected Alternative Management Prescriptions – Land and Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement” and dated March 4, 2014, is designated as a potential wilderness area for incorporation in the Rich Hole Wilderness Area designated by section 1(2) of Public Law 100–326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584).

(2) WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—The potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) shall be designated as wilderness and incorporated in the Rich Hole Wilderness Area designated by section 1(2) of Public Law 100–326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584) on the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) publishes in the Federal Register notice that the activities permitted under paragraph (4) have been completed; or

(B) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) MANAGEMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), the Secretary shall manage the potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

## (4) WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To enhance natural ecosystems within the potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) by implementing certain activities to improve water quality and aquatic passage, as set forth in the Forest Service document entitled “Decision Notice for the Lower Cowpasture Restoration and Management Project” and dated December 2015, the Secretary may use motorized equipment and mechanized transport in the potential wilderness area until the date on which the potential wilderness area is incorporated into the Rich Hole Wilderness Area under paragraph (2).

(B) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, shall use the minimum tool or administrative practice necessary to carry out that subparagraph with the least amount of adverse impact on wilderness character and resources.

**SA 3269.** Mr. KAINÉ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle H of title X, add the following:

**SEC. 1095. ADDITIONS TO ROUGH MOUNTAIN AND RICH HOLE WILDERNESSES.**

(a) ROUGH MOUNTAIN ADDITION.—Section 1 of Public Law 100–326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584; 114 Stat. 2057; 123 Stat. 1002) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(21) ROUGH MOUNTAIN ADDITION.—Certain land in the George Washington National Forest comprising approximately 1,000 acres, as generally depicted as the ‘Rough Mountain Addition’ on the map entitled ‘GEORGE

WASHINGTON NATIONAL FOREST – South half – Alternative I – Selected Alternative Management Prescriptions – Land and Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement’ and dated March 4, 2014, which is incorporated in the Rough Mountain Wilderness Area designated by paragraph (1).”

## (b) RICH HOLE ADDITION.—

(1) POTENTIAL WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain land in the George Washington National Forest comprising approximately 4,600 acres, as generally depicted as the “Rich Hole Addition” on the map entitled “GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL FOREST – South half – Alternative I – Selected Alternative Management Prescriptions – Land and Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement” and dated March 4, 2014, is designated as a potential wilderness area for incorporation in the Rich Hole Wilderness Area designated by section 1(2) of Public Law 100–326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584).

(2) WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—The potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) shall be designated as wilderness and incorporated in the Rich Hole Wilderness Area designated by section 1(2) of Public Law 100–326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584) on the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this section as the “Secretary”) publishes in the Federal Register notice that the activities permitted under paragraph (4) have been completed; or

(B) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) MANAGEMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), the Secretary shall manage the potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

## (4) WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To enhance natural ecosystems within the potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) by implementing certain activities to improve water quality and aquatic passage, as set forth in the Forest Service document entitled “Decision Notice for the Lower Cowpasture Restoration and Management Project” and dated December 2015, the Secretary may use motorized equipment and mechanized transport in the potential wilderness area until the date on which the potential wilderness area is incorporated into the Rich Hole Wilderness Area under paragraph (2).

(B) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, shall use the minimum tool or administrative practice necessary to carry out that subparagraph with the least amount of adverse impact on wilderness character and resources.

**SA 3270.** Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title X, insert the following:

**Subtitle —PENSION PLANS****SEC. 10. GUARANTEED BENEFIT CALCULATION FOR CERTAIN PLANS.**

Subtitle B of title IV of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29

U.S.C. 1321 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“SEC. 4024. GUARANTEED BENEFIT CALCULATION FOR CERTAIN PLANS.**

“(a) IN GENERAL.—

“(1) INCREASE TO FULL VESTED PLAN BENEFIT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of determining what benefits are guaranteed under section 4022 with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary under a covered plan specified in paragraph (4) in connection with the termination of such plan, the amount of monthly benefits shall be equal to the full vested plan benefit with respect to the participant.

“(B) NO EFFECT ON PREVIOUS DETERMINATIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to change the allocation of assets and recoveries under sections 4044(a) and 4022(c) as previously determined by the corporation for the covered plans specified in paragraph (4), and the corporation’s applicable rules, practices, and policies on benefits payable in terminated single-employer plans shall, except as otherwise provided in this section, continue to apply with respect to such covered plans.

“(2) RECALCULATION OF CERTAIN BENEFITS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which the amount of monthly benefits with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary described in paragraph (1) was calculated prior to the date of enactment of this section, the corporation shall recalculate such amount pursuant to paragraph (1), and shall adjust any subsequent payments of such monthly benefits accordingly, as soon as practicable after such date.

“(B) LUMP-SUM PAYMENTS OF PAST-DUE BENEFITS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the corporation, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, shall make a lump-sum payment to each eligible participant or beneficiary whose guaranteed benefits are recalculated under subparagraph (A) in an amount equal to—

“(i) in the case of an eligible participant, the excess of—

“(I) the total of the full vested plan benefits of the participant for all months for which such guaranteed benefits were paid prior to such recalculation, over

“(II) the sum of any applicable payments made to the eligible participant; and

“(ii) in the case of an eligible beneficiary, the sum of—

“(I) the amount that would be determined under clause (i) with respect to the participant of which the eligible beneficiary is a beneficiary if such participant were still in pay status; plus

“(II) the excess of—

“(aa) the total of the full vested plan benefits of the eligible beneficiary for all months for which such guaranteed benefits were paid prior to such recalculation, over

“(bb) the sum of any applicable payments made to the eligible beneficiary.

Notwithstanding the previous sentence, the corporation shall increase each lump-sum payment made under this subparagraph to account for foregone interest in an amount determined by the corporation designed to reflect a 6 percent annual interest rate on each past-due amount attributable to the underpayment of guaranteed benefits for each month prior to such recalculation.

“(C) ELIGIBLE PARTICIPANTS AND BENEFICIARIES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, an eligible participant or beneficiary is a participant or beneficiary who—

“(I) as of the date of the enactment of this section, is in pay status under a covered plan or is eligible for future payments under such plan;

“(II) has received or will receive applicable payments in connection with such plan (within the meaning of clause (ii)) that does not exceed the full vested plan benefits of such participant or beneficiary; and

“(III) is not covered by the 1999 agreements between General Motors and various unions providing a top-up benefit to certain hourly employees who were transferred from the General Motors Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan to the Delphi Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan.

“(ii) APPLICABLE PAYMENTS.—For purposes of this paragraph, applicable payments to a participant or beneficiary in connection with a plan consist of the following:

“(I) Payments under the plan equal to the normal benefit guarantee of the participant or beneficiary.

“(II) Payments to the participant or beneficiary made pursuant to section 4022(c) or otherwise received from the corporation in connection with the termination of the plan.

“(3) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) FULL VESTED PLAN BENEFIT.—The term ‘full vested plan benefit’ means the amount of monthly benefits that would be guaranteed under section 4022 as of the date of plan termination with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary if such section were applied without regard to the phase-in limit under subsection (b)(1) of such section and the maximum guaranteed benefit limitation under subsection (b)(3) of such section (including the accrued-at-normal limitation).

“(B) NORMAL BENEFIT GUARANTEE.—The term ‘normal benefit guarantee’ means the amount of monthly benefits guaranteed under section 4022 with respect to an eligible participant or beneficiary without regard to this section.

“(4) COVERED PLANS.—The covered plans specified in this paragraph are the following:

“(A) The Delphi Hourly-Rate Employees Pension Plan.

“(B) The Delphi Retirement Program for Salaried Employees.

“(C) The PHI Non-Bargaining Retirement Plan.

“(D) The ASEC Manufacturing Retirement Program.

“(E) The PHI Bargaining Retirement Plan.

“(F) The Delphi Mechatronic Systems Retirement Program.

“(5) TREATMENT OF PBGC DETERMINATIONS.—Any determination made by the corporation under this section concerning a recalculation of benefits or lump-sum payment of past-due benefits shall be subject to administrative review by the corporation. Any new determination made by the corporation under this section shall be governed by the same administrative review process as any other benefit determination by the corporation.

“(b) TRUST FUND FOR PAYMENT OF INCREASED BENEFITS.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury a trust fund to be known as the ‘Delphi Full Vested Plan Benefit Trust Fund’ (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Fund’), consisting of such amounts as may be appropriated or credited to the Fund as provided in this section.

“(2) FUNDING.—There is appropriated, out of amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as are necessary for the costs of payments of the portions of monthly benefits guaranteed to participants and beneficiaries pursuant to subsection (a) and for necessary administrative and operating expenses of the corporation relating to such payments. The Fund shall be credited with amounts from time to time as the Secretary of the Treasury, in coordination with the Director of the corporation, determines

appropriate, out of amounts in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

“(3) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available for the payment of the portion of monthly benefits guaranteed to a participant or beneficiary pursuant to subsection (a) and for necessary administrative and operating expenses of the corporation relating to such payment.

“(c) REGULATIONS.—The corporation, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor, may issue such regulations as necessary to carry out this section.”.

**SEC. 10. PENSION-LINKED EMERGENCY SAVINGS ACCOUNT CONTRIBUTIONS.**

(a) EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT INCOME SECURITY ACT OF 1974 AMENDMENT.—Section 801(d)(1)(A)(i) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (29 U.S.C. 1193(d)(1)(A)(i)) is amended by striking “\$2,500” and inserting “\$5,000”.

(b) INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986 AMENDMENT.—Section 402A(e)(3)(A)(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “\$2,500” and inserting “\$5,000”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect as though included in the enactment of the SECURE 2.0 Act of 2022 (Public Law 117-328).

**SA 3271.** Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. HEINRICH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title XVI, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . PHYSICAL AND CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS FOR HIGHLY CAPABLE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE SYSTEMS.**

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE.—The term “artificial intelligence” has the meaning given such term in section 5002 of the National Artificial Intelligence Initiative Act of 2020 (15 U.S.C. 9401).

(2) COVERED ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGY.—The term “covered artificial intelligence technology” means a technology specified in the guidance developed under subsection (c)(3), including all components of that technology, such as source code and numerical parameters of a trained artificial intelligence system, and details of any proprietary methods used to develop such a system.

(3) COVERED ENTITY.—The term “covered entity” means an entity that enters into a Department of Defense contract that engages in the development, deployment, storage, or transportation of a covered artificial intelligence technology.

(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Source code, numerical parameters, and related technology associated with highly capable artificial intelligence systems in the possession of private artificial intelligence companies are an invaluable national resource that would pose a grave threat to United States national security if stolen by a foreign adversary through a cyber operation or insider threat.

(2) Numerous foreign adversaries have the capacity to engage in cyber operations to extract important data from private companies, absent the most stringent cybersecurity protections.

(c) **SECURITY FRAMEWORK.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Defense, acting through the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Cyber Policy, shall develop a framework describing best practices for artificial intelligence cybersecurity, physical security, and insider threat mitigation to address or mitigate risks relating to national security or foreign policy, including to protect vital national resources from theft that would do grave damage to the United States and to protect the proprietary trade secrets used in the development of covered artificial intelligence technologies which, if compromised, may create risks to United States national security or foreign policy.

(2) **RISK-BASED FRAMEWORK.**—The framework developed under paragraph (1) shall be risk-based, with stronger security corresponding proportionally to the national security or foreign policy risks posed by the artificial intelligence technology being stolen or tampered with. The framework shall include multiple security levels, where—

(A) at least one security level shall be equivalent to the requirements described in NIST Special Publication 800-181 (relating to protecting controlled unclassified information in nonfederal systems and organizations);

(B) at least one security level shall be equivalent to the requirements described in NIST Special Publication 800-172 (relating to enhanced security requirements for protecting controlled unclassified information); and

(C) at least one security level shall be stronger than NIST Special Publication 800-172 (relating to enhanced security requirements for protecting controlled unclassified information) and shall describe a security posture capable of mitigating risks posed by the highest threat actors, including foreign intelligence agencies of peer and near-peer nations.

(3) **COVERED ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TECHNOLOGIES.**—

(A) **GUIDANCE.**—The framework developed under paragraph (1) shall provide clear guidance about which artificial intelligence technologies are covered under the framework. Such technologies shall be those that, if obtained by a foreign adversary, would pose a grave threat to the national security of the United States.

(B) **OBJECTIVE EVALUATION PROCEDURES.**—Where feasible, the guidance provided under subparagraph (A) shall be specified in terms of objective evaluation procedures that measure or estimate the national security implications of the artificial intelligence technology, either before, during, or after it has been developed.

(4) **USE OF EXISTING FRAMEWORKS.**—To the maximum extent feasible, the framework developed under paragraph (1) shall be implemented using one or more existing cybersecurity frameworks developed by the Department of Defense or other Federal agencies, such as the Cybersecurity Maturity Model Certification framework. Where needed, the Secretary may augment those frameworks to implement additional security levels as described in paragraph (2).

(d) **SECURITY REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may amend the Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, or take other similar action, to require covered entities to implement the best practices described in the framework developed under subsection (c).

(2) **RISK-BASED RULES.**—Requirements implemented in rules developed under para-

graph (1) shall be as narrowly tailored as practicable to the specific covered artificial intelligence technologies developed, deployed, stored, or transported by a covered entity, and shall be calibrated accordingly to the different tasks involved in development, deployment, storage, or transportation of components of those covered artificial intelligence technologies.

(e) **REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary, shall submit to the congressional defense committees an update on the status of implementation of the requirements of this section.

**SA 3272.** Mr. MARSHALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle D of title XII, add the following:

**SEC. 1266. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR WUHAN INSTITUTE OF VIROLOGY OR ECOHEALTH ALLIANCE.**

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2025 for the Department of Defense may be made available—

(1) for the Wuhan Institute of Virology for any purpose; or

(2) to fund any work to be conducted in the People's Republic of China by EcoHealth Alliance, Inc., including—

(A) work to be conducted by—

(i) any subsidiary of EcoHealth Alliance, Inc.;

(ii) any organization directly controlled by EcoHealth Alliance, Inc.; or

(iii) any individual or organization that is a subgrantee or subcontractor of EcoHealth Alliance, Inc.; and

(B) any grant for the conduct of any such work.

**SA 3273.** Mr. BOOKER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of subtitle A of title XII, add the following:

**SEC. 1216. ENHANCING FLEXIBILITY WITH RESPECT TO SENIOR USAID PERSONNEL.**

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including sections 5314 and 5315 of title 5, United States Code, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) may modify the annual rate of basic pay for one USAID employee receiving compensation at the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for Level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, to Level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of such title.

**SA 3274.** Mr. MANCHIN (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted an amend-

ment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title XVI, insert the following:

**SEC. —. IMPROVEMENTS RELATING TO CYBER WORKFORCE AND LEADERSHIP.**

(a) **MODIFICATION REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR SENIOR MILITARY ADVISOR FOR CYBER POLICY AND DEPUTY PRINCIPAL CYBER ADVISOR.**—Section 392a(b) of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy” and inserting “the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Cyber Policy”; and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking “, the following:” and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting “the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Cyber Policy”; and

(2) in paragraph (3)(A)—

(A) in clause (i), by striking “the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy” and inserting “the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Cyber Policy”; and

(B) in clause (ii), by striking “Under Secretary” and inserting “Assistant Secretary of Defense for Cyber Policy”; and

(C) in clause (iii), by striking “Under Secretary of Defense for Policy” and inserting “Assistant Secretary of Defense for Cyber Policy”; and

(D) by striking clause (iv).

(b) **MILITARY DEPUTY PRINCIPAL CYBER ADVISORS.**—Section 392a of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(d) **MILITARY DEPUTY PRINCIPAL CYBER ADVISORS.**—

“(1) **APPOINTMENT.**—For each Principal Cyber Advisory appointed under subsection (c)(1)(A) for a service, the secretary concerned shall appoint a member of the armed forces from the respective service to act as a deputy to the Principal Cyber Advisor for that service.

“(2) **REQUIREMENT.**—Each deputy appointed pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be appointed from among flag officers of the respective service.”

(c) **CYBER WORKFORCE INTERCHANGE AGREEMENT.**—The Secretary of Defense shall plan and coordinate an interchange agreement for the cyber workforce in the Cyber Excepted Service of the Department of Defense that is similar to the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System Interchange Agreement that was in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) **ESTABLISHMENT OF SENIOR EXECUTIVE POSITION EQUIVALENTS WITHIN CYBER EXCEPTED SERVICE.**—The Secretary may establish Senior Executive Service position (as defined in section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code) equivalents, including senior level and scientific and professional positions as well as highly qualified experts, within the Cyber Excepted Service in a manner similar to the Defense Civilian Intelligence Personnel System (DCIPS) so that the Department of Defense can recruit and retain civilians with superior qualifications and experience with greater hiring flexibility.

**SA 3275.** Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. TESTER)

submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ . COUNTERING CCP DRONES.**

(a) DETERMINATION OF WHETHER UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS MANUFACTURERS ARE CHINESE MILITARY COMPANIES.—Pursuant to the annual review required under section 1260H(a) of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (Public Law 116-283; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), the Secretary of Defense shall determine if any entity that manufactures or assembles unmanned aircraft systems (as defined in section 44801 of title 49, United States Code), or any subsidiary, parent, affiliate, or successor of such an entity, should be identified under such section 1260H(a) as a Chinese military company operating directly or indirectly in the United States.

(b) ADDITION OF CERTAIN EQUIPMENT AND SERVICES OF DJI TECHNOLOGIES AND AUTEL ROBOTICS TO COVERED COMMUNICATIONS EQUIPMENT AND SERVICES LIST.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 2 of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1601) is amended—

(A) in subsection (c), by adding at the end the following:

“(5) The communications equipment or service being—

“(A) communications or video surveillance equipment produced or provided by—

“(i) Shenzhen Da-Jiang Innovations Sciences and Technologies Company Limited (commonly known as ‘DJI Technologies’);

“(ii) Autel Robotics; or

“(iii) with respect to an entity described in clause (i) or (ii) (referred to in this clause as a ‘named entity’)—

“(I) any subsidiary, affiliate, or partner of the named entity;

“(II) any entity in a joint venture with the named entity; or

“(III) any entity to which the named entity has issued a license to produce or provide that telecommunications or video surveillance equipment; or

“(B) telecommunications or video surveillance services, including software, provided by an entity described in subparagraph (A) or using equipment described in that subparagraph.

“(6)(A) The communications equipment or service being any communications equipment or service produced or provided by an entity—

“(i) that is a subsidiary, affiliate, or partner of an entity that produces or provides any communications equipment or service described in any of paragraphs (1) through (5) (referred to in this subparagraph as a ‘covered entity’);

“(ii) that is in a joint venture with a covered entity; or

“(iii) to which a covered entity has issued a license to produce or provide that communications equipment or service.

“(B) An executive branch interagency body described in paragraph (1) may submit to the Commission a petition to have an entity recognized as an entity to which subparagraph (A) applies.”; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(e) INAPPLICABILITY TO AUTHORIZED INTELLIGENCE ACTIVITIES.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection, the terms ‘intelligence’ and ‘intelligence community’ have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

“(2) INAPPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, an action by the Commission under subsection (b)(1) based on a determination made under paragraph (5) or (6) of subsection (c) shall not apply with respect to any—

“(A) activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.);

“(B) activity of an element of the intelligence community relating to intelligence; or

“(C) activity of, or procurement by, an element of the intelligence community in support of an activity relating to intelligence.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2 of the Secure and Trusted Communications Networks Act of 2019 (47 U.S.C. 1601) is amended by striking “paragraphs (1) through (4)” each place that term appears and inserting “paragraphs (1) through (6)”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection, and the amendments made by this subsection, shall take effect on the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) FIRST RESPONDER SECURE DRONE PROGRAM.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The term “eligible entity” means an agency of an entity described in clause (ii) that has as a primary responsibility the maintenance of public safety.

(ii) ENTITY DESCRIBED.—An entity described in this clause is any of the following:

(I) Each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

(II) A political subdivision, including a unit of local government, of an entity described in subclause (I).

(III) A Tribal Government.

(B) ELIGIBLE SMALL UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM.—The term “eligible small unmanned aircraft system” means a small unmanned aircraft system, as defined in part 107 of title 14, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), that—

(i) was not designed, manufactured, or assembled, in whole or in part, by a foreign entity of concern; or

(ii) does not include software or 1 or more critical components from a foreign entity of concern.

(C) FOREIGN ENTITY OF CONCERN.—The term “foreign entity of concern” has the meaning given the term in section 9901 of the William M. (Mac) Thornberry National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2021 (15 U.S.C. 4651).

(D) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Transportation.

(E) UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM.—The term “unmanned aircraft system” has the meaning given such term in section 44801 of title 49, United States Code.

(2) AUTHORITY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a program, to be known as the First Responder Secure Drone Program, to provide grants to eligible entities to facilitate the use of eligible small unmanned aircraft systems.

(3) USE OF GRANT AMOUNTS.—An eligible entity may use a grant provided under this subsection to—

(A) purchase or lease eligible small unmanned aircraft systems;

(B) purchase or lease software, training, and other services reasonably associated

with the purchase or lease of eligible small unmanned aircraft systems; and

(C) dispose of unmanned aircraft systems owned by the eligible entity.

(4) APPLICATION.—To be eligible to receive a grant under this subsection, an eligible entity shall submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such form, and containing such information as the Secretary may require, including an assurance that the eligible entity or any contractor of the eligible entity, will comply with relevant Federal regulations.

(5) FEDERAL SHARE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Federal share of the allowable costs of a project carried out using a grant provided under this subsection shall not exceed 50 percent of the total allowable project costs.

(B) WAIVER.—The Secretary may increase the Federal share under subparagraph (A) to up to 75 percent if an eligible entity—

(i) submits a written application to the Secretary requesting an increase in the Federal share; and

(ii) demonstrates that the additional assistance is necessary to facilitate the acceptance and full use of a grant under this subsection, due to circumstances such as alleviating economic hardship, meeting additional workforce needs, or any other uses that the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(6) SUNSET OF PROGRAM.—The program established under this subsection shall end on the date that is 2 years after the date on which the Secretary establishes the program.

**SA 3276.** Mr. SCHUMER (for Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Mr. LANKFORD)) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. SCHUMER to the bill S. 4638, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2025 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title X, insert the following:

**Subtitle —Antisemitism**

**SEC. \_\_\_\_ 1. NATIONAL COORDINATOR TO COUNTER ANTISEMITISM.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Executive Office of the President the position of National Coordinator to Counter Antisemitism (in this section referred to as the “National Coordinator”). The individual serving in the position of National Coordinator shall not have, or be assigned, duties in addition to the duties of the position of National Coordinator if those additional duties infringe on the National Coordinator’s duties as described in this subtitle.

(b) DUTIES OF THE NATIONAL COORDINATOR.—Subject to the authority, direction, and control of the President, the National Coordinator shall—

(1) serve as the principal advisor to the President on countering domestic antisemitism;

(2) coordinate Federal efforts to counter antisemitism, including ongoing and multiyear implementation of Federal Government strategies to counter antisemitism;

(3) conduct a biennial review of the implementation of Federal Government strategies to counter antisemitism for a period of 10 years, including—

(A) an evaluation of all actions that have been implemented; and

(B) recommendations for any updates to those actions, as necessary; and

(4) review the internal and external antisemitism training and resource programs of Federal agencies and ensure that such programs include training and resources to assist Federal agencies in understanding, deterring, and educating people about antisemitism.

#### SEC. 2. INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE TO COUNTER ANTISEMITISM.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—The President shall establish an Interagency Task Force to Counter Antisemitism (in this section referred to as the “Task Force”).

(b) **APPOINTMENT.**—The President shall appoint the members of the Task Force, which shall include representatives from any agency the President considers to be relevant.

(c) **CHAIR.**—The National Coordinator established in section 1(a) shall be the Chair of the Task Force.

(d) **ACTIVITIES OF THE TASK FORCE.**—The Task Force shall carry out each of the following activities:

(1) Coordinate implementation of Federal Government strategies to counter antisemitism.

(2) Measure and evaluate the progress of the United States in the areas of—

(A) providing education about antisemitism;

(B) countering antisemitism; and

(C) providing support, protection, and assistance to individuals and communities targeted by antisemitism.

(3) Create and implement interagency procedures for collecting and organizing data, including research results and resource information from relevant agencies (as described in subsection (b)) and researchers, on domestic antisemitism, while—

(A) respecting the confidentiality of individuals targeted by antisemitism; and

(B) complying with any Federal, State, or local laws affecting confidentiality, such as laws applying to court cases involving juveniles.

(4) Engage in consultation with Congress, nonprofit organizations, including Jewish community organizations, and other entities, as determined to be appropriate by the Task Force, to advance the purposes of this section.

(e) **ACTIVITIES OF THE CHAIR.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and every 6 months thereafter until the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Chair of the Task Force shall provide a briefing on the activities of the Task Force to—

(1) the majority leader and minority leader of the Senate; and

(2) the Speaker and minority leader of the House of Representatives.

#### NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator RON WYDEN, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of John Bradford Wiegmann, of the District of Columbia, to be General Counsel of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, dated September 12, 2024.

#### AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Ms. BUTLER. Madam President, I have six requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

##### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 12, 2024, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

##### COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 12, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 12, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 12, 2024, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 12, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

##### COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Thursday, September 12, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

#### TRACKING AND REPORTING ABSENT COMMUNITY-MEMBERS EVERYWHERE ACT

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 2120 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

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

The clerk will report the bill by title. The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2120) to direct the Attorney General to include a data field in the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System to indicate whether the last known location of a missing person was confirmed or was suspected to have been on Federal land, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 2120) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 2120

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Tracking and Reporting Absent Community-Members Everywhere Act” or the “TRACE Act”.

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ATTORNEY GENERAL.**—The term “Attorney General” means the Attorney General, acting through the Director of the National Institute of Justice.

(2) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The term “Federal land” means land owned by the United States that is under the administrative jurisdiction of—

(A) the Secretary of Agriculture;

(B) the Secretary of the Interior (except land held in trust for the benefit of an Indian Tribe); or

(C) the Secretary of Defense only with respect to land and water resources projects administered by the Corps of Engineers.

#### SEC. 3. DATA FIELD IN THE NATIONAL MISSING AND UNIDENTIFIED PERSONS SYSTEM RELATED TO FEDERAL LAND.

The Attorney General shall include in the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System a data field to indicate whether the last known location of the missing person was confirmed or was suspected to have been on Federal land, including any specific location details about the unit of Federal land that was the last known location of the missing person.

#### SEC. 4. REPORT.

Not later than January 15 of the second calendar year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that contains, for the previous calendar year, the number of cases in the National Missing and Unidentified Persons System for which the missing person's last known location was confirmed or was suspected to have been on Federal land.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF STEVEN D. SYMMS, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE STATE OF IDAHO

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 813, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 813) honoring the life of Steven D. Symms, former United States Senator for the State of Idaho.

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

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 813) was agreed to.



The preamble was agreed to.

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

#### NATIONAL LITERACY MONTH

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 814, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 814) designating September 2024 as "National Literacy Month".

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

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 814) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

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

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—H.R. 820

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 820) to direct the Federal Communications Commission to publish a list of entities that hold authorizations, licenses, or other grants of authority issued by the Commission and that have certain foreign ownership, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

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

#### ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2024

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned under the provisions of S. Res. 813 until 3 p.m. on Monday, September 16; 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 Ritz nomination postclosure; further, that all time be considered expired at 5:30 p.m. on Monday and that if any nominations are confirmed during Monday's session, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Ms. BUTLER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order following the remarks of Senator McCONNELL.

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

The Republican leader.

#### TRIBUTE TO DAVID HAUPTMANN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, when I announced back in February that I would be wrapping up my time as Republican leader, I assured our colleagues that I wouldn't be bowing out of worthwhile fights anytime soon, and, of course, I meant that. But it is never too early to tell the folks you work with that you appreciate them. There is no such thing as saying "thank you" too often. So this is as good a time as any to brag a bit about the team I have been so fortunate to have in my Capitol office.

Today, I would like to focus on a number of my talented communications staff, beginning with the longest serving member of our team, senior research adviser David Hauptmann. David himself has joked once or twice that he came with the furniture in the Leader's office, but I would rather not give up the credit for making such a great personnel decision myself.

In a line of work where turnover and burnout aren't uncommon, David's longevity is truly remarkable. But, like me, he relishes a worthy fight. We have seen plenty of them over the years together, and there always seems to be another one just around the corner.

By my count, David has been on hand for the last six Supreme Court nomination fights. Time and again, with tenacious focus, he has sifted through archives, combed media coverage, and lent deep institutional knowledge that equips my entire team for success. More than once, his research quite literally changed the course of confirmations.

But as much as I would like to believe this principled public servant has stuck around all this time out of personal loyalty, it is clear to anyone who knows David that what animates his work the most is a deep devotion to the Senate as an institution. Every last-minute project, every weekend session

spent away from his lovely wife Allison—all in defense of what makes the Senate the Senate. I know he agrees it has been worth every second.

So, David, thank you so much.

#### TRIBUTE TO MATTHEW BURTON

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, that is just half of the office's all-star research team. In any organization that has been around for a while, bringing in fresh ideas is essential, and Matt Burton has brought an invaluable new perspective as research director over the past year.

As is so often the case with recovering House staffers, I like to think Matt wasted no time at all becoming a Senate guy through and through, and behind his mild manner are killer political instincts and an unbeatable attention to the smallest details. These are, of course, essential qualities in a team I literally lean on for everything from equipping the conference with background research on the issues of the day, to vetting the records of pending nominations, to catching factual errors in drafts of my remarks. Simply put, nothing—nothing—gets past Matt Burton.

So this speech is a rare occasion when Matt hasn't seen and scoured an advance copy. We are in uncharted territory, and I hope he will forgive me for breaking protocol just this once.

Matt, it has been great having you on the team. Thank you for having my back.

#### TRIBUTE TO RYAN FLYNN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, of course, the excellent work of our researchers and the whole team gets a major leg up thanks to the talents of my digital director, Ryan Flynn.

For as long as digital media have played a major role in politics, I have been fortunate to have a maven on the team making sure we could compete in a fast-changing online landscape. Each one has brought a unique perspective and incredible talents.

Ryan has met this high bar and pushed it even higher. He has excelled at a job that requires him to wear multiple hats. In a single day, he is in the trenches of online messaging campaigns and racing around the Capitol in real life to capture and preserve important moments for posterity.

Aside from a small handful of senior-most advisers, Ryan is often the only one in the room with me in the highest profile meetings with foreign heads of state and other notables, and he just takes it all in stride.

I am grateful that Ryan's wife Clare allows us to occupy so much of his time. I know the team is particularly grateful for Ryan's ability to lighten even the most demanding situations—sometimes with sincere encouragement, sometimes with a practical joke.

Ryan, thank you for all the hard work. Or as you say yourself, "Thanks for playing."

# TRIBUTE TO KAILY GRABEMANN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now, Ryan is not the only one with the tough job of making me look good. That task also rests in the capable hands of my broadcast media adviser, Kaily Grabemann.

Kaily is simply the best in the business at what she does. Whether it is a quick radio call-in from the road or a big prime-time interview in the studio, Kaily makes sure I am armed and ready, including the occasional visual touch-ups she likes to refer to as “glam.”

As our colleagues know, I am not always a frequent flyer on the cable news networks. But with Kaily's help, I keep a close eye on who is. And in that regard, I am hardly the only beneficiary of her media savvy. For years now, colleagues across the Republican conference have come to rely on Kaily as a clearinghouse for media advisability, helping Senators get on the air with important messages and helping producers get the Senators they are looking for.

For the sake of their sanity, most folks in this town try to avoid spending too much time glued to the news. To my good fortune, Kaily doesn't have that luxury. There are a number of things I am sure Kaily would rather do with her evenings or Sunday mornings—like, perhaps, train for the next marathon—but I am grateful she has been so willing to keep a watchful eye out instead.

Kaily, thank you so much.

# TRIBUTE TO SCOTT SLOOFMAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now, this entire operation I have just described is rowing in the same direction thanks to the staff director of the Senate Republican communications center, Scott Sloofman.

Scott is actually a two-timer on my staff. The first time around, he hitched a ride back to Washington after steering my campaign's research operation through a vigorous reelection fight in 2014. It was clear from the beginning that he had a knack for politics like few people I have ever met.

As it turns out, “Sloof” felt so at home in the trenches of campaign life that we had to let him go out and win a few other races before he was ready to settle into life here in the Senate. When he came back, we wanted to make him feel at home so we lined up a couple of high-stakes Supreme Court confirmation battles and budget reconciliation fights.

Through it all, Sloof has displayed unflappable political instincts. And as the coordinator of a multipronged communications team, he has never been afraid to bet big on the right message. Time and again, his willingness to question assumptions, challenge conventional wisdom, and play devil's advocate have made his colleagues and me sharper and better prepared to take on tough challenges.

So, Sloof, I am glad to have you in my corner. Thank you so much.

# TRIBUTE TO CATHERINE FRANCOIS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now, the fine work of the communications center only makes it here to the floor because we have talented wordsmiths like my deputy speech writer, Catherine Francois, on the job. From her seat in the same noisy bullpen where the rest of the team wrestles with the news cycle, Catherine is engaged in a relentless process of air traffic control: digesting the latest news and research, helping me organize my thoughts on a given topic, running interference with fact checks and formatting, and getting the best possible draft on paper by the time the Senate opens every day, before doing it all over again the next day. It is a workflow that could make anyone's head spin, but Catherine's grace amid the chaos is all the more impressive when you consider that my team managed to poach her from the comparatively steady, contemplative world of policy analysis and think tanks.

So the comms center may have been quite a culture shock, but the habits of a true policy wonk die hard. Catherine has lent us an invaluable knack for hunting down fresh sources, interesting data, and underdiscussed angles on the issues of the day and then helping me package them in a compelling way for delivery from this podium. And I am so grateful for her contributions.

Catherine, thank you very much.

# TRIBUTE TO DYLAN VORBACH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now on my chief speech writer, Dylan Vorbach. I admit that when Dylan's long-time predecessor, Andy Quinn, told me he was leaving, I worried what I would do without him. After all, the rapport you build with a speech writer is built on a lot of trust.

I shouldn't have worried. Dylan stepped right into the senior role and quickly became an invaluable partner in my preparations for all sorts of speaking engagements, especially on the topic of American leadership, which is what I have focused on so heavily.

Dylan is a consummate professional: loyal, reliable, and steady. He is a high-capacity, low-drama individual—an ideal combination for a job where everything can change on you in an instant.

When we engage in daily partisan warfare, Dylan's pen is as sharp as they come. But Dylan carries a unique piece of his own portfolio as well.

This institution is special, and the Senate leaders have a responsibility to the institution on certain occasions to speak not only for ourselves but also for our colleagues: a funeral for a beloved colleague, a tribute to a retiring doorkeeper, a heroic Congressional

Gold Medal recipient, or the Senate spouses who really keep all of us grounded. In each and every moment, Dylan strikes the perfect grace note. He makes us look better than we are, and that serves us all very, very well.

I am not quite sure how a young man raised in New England has managed to become an honorary son of the South, but ever since Dylan came to us from our former colleague Luther Strange, he has hung onto an extra talent for channeling the best parts of our country.

But Dylan's talents extend far beyond putting words on a page. Somehow, his idea of unwinding on the weekend is a multiday baking project or an off-road bike race. I am just grateful he hasn't broken any of his typing fingers.

So, Dylan, thank you so much.

# TRIBUTE TO JERRY CALENGOR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, now, some of my staff can do their work from the relative peace and quiet of the office, but the last two folks I would like to thank today are dug in on the frontlines.

First, my deputy press secretary, Jerry Calengor. As some of our colleagues may recall, I have had good luck in the past hiring sharp communicators from the State of Minnesota. It must be something in one of those lakes.

Serious pride in his roots, along with a wicked sense of humor, helped him hit the ground running in the busy bullpen where much of this team spends their days. He wasted no time becoming an essential member of the research team, particularly when it came to carefully vetting nominations.

But it didn't take long to recognize Jerry's aptitude for dealing with the press more directly, and I am proud of the way Jerry has grown as a trusted adviser I turn to as I prepare for interviews, including our weekly stakeout. Appropriately, he still keeps an old hockey helmet at his desk for days when the incoming barrage from the press corps is especially thick.

Jerry is fortunate that his wife Grace tolerates this rough-and-tumble day job. As I didn't understand it, she was willing to road-trip back from their wedding so he could be in the office for a busy Monday.

On top of it all, Jerry is responsible for taking a last careful look at just about every public statement and press release I make, and then making sure people actually see them. I am grateful to have his good judgment and eagle eye double-check our work.

So, Jerry, thank you.

# TRIBUTE TO DOUG ANDRES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, finally, to folks around the Senate—or Twitter, as I understand—this last one needs no introduction: my trusted press secretary, Doug Andres. Doug is,

without a doubt, the most skilled navigator of the Capitol Hill press corps a Senator could hope for.

I hired him specifically for his reputation as an unmatched flack. Over his years in the Speaker's office, he had already tilted successfully with the House and executive branch press corps, and I had a feeling he would do the same here in the Senate. Boy, was I right. It may have something to do with his disarming, deadpan wit. It certainly helps that Doug is the kind of guy everyone wants to be friends with outside of work.

Whatever the reason, Doug has got an uncanny nose for news. He is consistently able to predict stories that are still miles off and around the bend. Frankly, I shudder to think how many headaches he could create for the rest of us if he wanted to switch sides.

For now, there is only one thing I ever worry could distract Doug from his duties as my early warning system with the press, and that is his growing role as ringleader of a group of prominent figures who actually share his name. We had a Doug running for President earlier this year, and another one is the Second Gentleman. But there is no doubt that the heart and soul of the "Doug Caucus" is right here in the Senate, and I know my entire team sleeps safer with Doug on the job.

So, Doug, thank you for everything.

Mr. President, I will need another few speeches to adequately thank the whole team around me in the leader's office for all of their outstanding work—work that is not nearly finished. It is a great problem to have, and I will have much more to say soon.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,  
SEPTEMBER 16, 2024, AT 3 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 3 p.m., Monday, September 16, 2024, and does so as a further mark of respect to the late Steven D. Symms, former Senator from Idaho.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 3:30 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 16, 2024, at 3 p.m.

---

#### CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by  
the Senate September 12, 2024:

##### THE JUDICIARY

LAURA MARGARETE PROVINZINO, OF MINNESOTA, TO  
BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT  
OF MINNESOTA.