I want a strong farm safety net program that helps farmers weather downturns in the market and survive natural disasters, but I do not want an unending stream of payments with no caps.

This amendment aims to help large farms get large bailouts while small farmers are left behind. Instead of fundamentally changing market dynamics, we should work together to make sure small and medium sized farmers do not get left behind in farm payment programs. This is especially true as we go into farm bill discussions in the next Congress.

OMNIBUS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this bill, the Consolidated Appropriations Act of FY23, addresses an issue that I have been dealing with for well over a decade, since I was Louisiana State Treasurer. The U.S. Treasury Department is sitting on nearly $30 billion in mature, unredeemed savings bonds, issued years or decades ago to hard-working Americans who wanted to invest in America. States, who have long held the responsibility of holding and making available lost assets, have tried to subject these savings bonds to the time-honored, reliable escheatment and unclaimed property process. At every turn, their efforts have been opposed by Treasury, which has also rebuffed any offers from the States to use their vast capabilities to help reunite bondholders or their rightful heirs to these funds. Instead, Treasury has made its own attempts at digitizing and updating its voluminous bondholder records and creating a database for users—efforts which have failed to make any meaningful dent in the amounts of unredeemed debt, according to their own status report.

This bill includes a provision that directs Treasury to provide States with information relating to bond purchases, including the name, applicable address, co-owners or beneficiaries, and the bond serial numbers which claimants often need to reclaim their funds. I understand that Treasury has said it may not have enough data in its records to match the serial numbers with the name and address of the bondholder; this is why the bill's language includes some flexibility, stating that the information Treasury must provide to States ''may'' include bond serial numbers. This wording allows Treasury to use its discretion in the limited instances when it is incapable of providing those numbers, but the overall language makes clear that Treasury is obligated to make every effort to locate relevant and necessary information and provide it to the correct States. I expect Treasury to issue regulations which will fulfill these responsibilities.

The bill's definitions ensure that this will cover both paper and paperless bonds—and I want to clarify also includes bonds that were issued in paper but have been lost, stolen, or destroyed. Treasury's own 2021 report on mature unredeemed debt describes the process for bond owners who have the necessary information but not the paper document itself as lengthy, complex, and a hindrance that discourages claimants. The clear purpose of this legislation is to make this process simpler by opening it up to States, and Treasury should issue regulations reflecting this intent.

PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, the purpose of the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is to help pregnant mothers in the workplace receive accommodations so that they can maintain a healthy pregnancy and childbirth. Therefore, I want to make clear for the record that the terms ''pregnancy'' and ''related medical conditions,'' for which accommodations to their known limitations are required under the legislation, do not include abortion.

On December 8, the sponsor of this legislation, Senator BOB CASEY stated on the Senate floor as follows: ''I want to say for the record, however, that under the act, under the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission, the EEOC, could not—could not—issue any regulation that requires abortion leave, nor does the act permit the EEOC to require employers to provide abortions in violation of State law.''

Senator CASEY's statement reflects the intent of Congress in advancing the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act today. This legislation should not be misconstrued by the EEOC or Federal courts to impose abortion-related mandates on employers, or otherwise to promote abortions, contrary to the intent of Congress.

PREGNANT WORKERS FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to expand upon the remarks I delivered earlier today on the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, which this body voted to include in the omnibus spending package. I first introduced this bill in 2012 with Senator SHAHEEN. Senator CASSIDY joined us this Congress, and the bill now has broad, bipartisan support.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a very straightforward piece of legislation; it closes a loophole in the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act to allow pregnant workers to request reasonable accommodations so that they can continue working safely during pregnancy and upon returning to work after childbirth. This is a commonsense bill that has broad, bipartisan support—everyone from the ACLU to the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops to the Chamber of Commerce.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is very simple. Pregnant workers should be able to request reasonable accommodations—a stool, a water bottle, a bathroom break—when such an accommodation would help them remain at work safely during their pregnancy and so they can return to work after childbirth. Other accommodations that a pregnant worker might request include, but are not limited to, light duty, temporary transfer, additional or more flexible breaks, changing food or drink policies, time off to recover from childbirth, accommodations for lactation needs, and flexible scheduling.

The bill is intended to help women like Peggy Young, a UPS driver who requested light duty while she was pregnant. Peggy was denied her request, even though other workers had received light duty, because there is no requirement under the 1978 Pregnancy Discrimination Act to provide reasonable accommodations. She was forced onto unpaid leave and eventually took her case all the way to the Supreme Court. She won, but the ruling did not provide full protections to the millions of workers who get pregnant each year. That is why we need the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, so that every pregnant worker will be able to request an accommodation without fear of being fired or forced on leave, when all she needs is a stool or a bathroom break.

Young did not solve this issue, and the standard is still unworkable for employers and pregnant workers. After Young, over two-thirds of women still lost their Pregnancy Discrimination Act pregnancy accommodation claims in court, mostly because they were unable to find a suitable comparator under the Young comparator framework. Pregnant workers need immediate relief to remain healthy and on the job. Pregnant workers should not have to muster evidence and identify someone else at work to get their own medically necessary accommodation, as basic as a stool or extra restroom breaks. Pregnant workers, especially in low-wage industries, usually do not have access to their coworkers' personnel files and do not know how all their coworkers are being treated.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act would create a clear, explicit right to accommodations, allowing pregnant workers to remain healthy and attached to the workforce. It is a solution that provides clarity to both employers and employees. That is why the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and other business groups support the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act.

The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act sets up a simple framework that is easily understood and utilized by both employers and employees. Under the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act, a pregnant employee may request reasonable accommodations from their employer, the same process that individuals with disabilities use under the Americans with Disabilities Act. Employers are familiar with it, the interactive process is easier for both the worker and the employer.

Workers will be able to secure the accommodations they need in a timely manner, while employers will avoid costly litigation over allegations of discrimination. A significant advantage of using this same framework is that employers are already familiar with it—and have over 30 years' experience providing reasonable accommodations to people with disabilities already.

Over the years, I and my colleagues—along with supporters of the legislation—have worked carefully to ensure that the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act will both protect pregnant workers from discrimination and provide actionable, realistic parameters and guidance for employers. That is why, as I mentioned previously, the bill has the support of over 200 advocacy groups from all parts of the ideological spectrum.

Now, some have claimed that the Americans with Disabilities Act—ADA—already gives pregnant workers who truly need accommodations a right to accommodations. That is simply not true. It is not what we are seeing on the ground or what courts are deciding in their rulings.

First, the ADA does not protect pregnant workers who need accommodations to prevent complications from arising in the first place, such as extra restroom breaks to prevent a urinary tract infection or temporary light duty to prevent a miscarriage, which doctors sometimes advise.

Second, many courts have held that the ADA does not protect even those pregnant workers with serious pregnancy complications like a high-risk pregnancy, bleeding, or severe nausea. That has remained the case even after Congress expanded the ADA in 2008. Clearly, the ADA, while a vitally important law, is not adequate to keep pregnant workers healthy and on the job.

It is time to step up and protect pregnant workers who just need a little help—a water bottle, a stool, light duty—in order to keep working safely. This is the right thing to do. The Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a reasonable and responsible bill that will help workers continue working safely during pregnancy and after childbirth. With broad support and a framework that is already familiar to employers, the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that should be enacted without delay.

In closing, I would like to reiterate my thanks to Senator CASSIDY, who has been a true partner on this bill, along with our staffs; Senator SHAHEEN, for cosponsoring with me all these years; Senator MURRAY and Senator BURR for their work to shepherd the bill through the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; and the majority leader, Senator SCHUMER, for helping us to see this bill through the U.S. Senate.

ENHANCING TRANSPARENCY ON INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS AND NON-BINDING INSTRUMENTS

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, the committee finished a report entitled, ''Enhancing Transparency on International Agreements and Non-Binding Instruments.'' I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that report be printed in the RECORD.

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

ENHANCING TRANSPARENCY ON INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS AND NON-BINDING INSTRUMENTS

Report on section 5947, Enhancing Transparency on International Agreements and Non-Binding Instruments, of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023, H.R. 7776.

I. PURPOSE

The Committee strongly supports robust diplomacy and international engagement, including efforts to advance U.S. interests through the negotiation and implementation of international agreements and nonbinding instruments with allies, partners, and other actors. These efforts must be conducted with accountability to Congress and, to the greatest extent appropriate, transparency for the public, as both are essential to our democracy.

The Case-Zablocki Act of 1972 (P.L. 92–403; also known as the ''Case Act'') was an important but highly-limited and long-outdated framework for reporting on binding international agreements. Section 5947 of H.R. 7776, Enhancing Transparency on International Agreements and Non-Binding Instruments, strengthens and modernizes the Case Act and makes it applicable, for the first time, to non-binding instruments. Even with this broadened scope, however, the Case Act is only the starting point—a basic notification and publication requirement. It does not replace consultation with Congress on the development of our foreign policy or substantive engagement with the public on commitments entered into on behalf of the American people.

II. COMMITTEE ACTION

Chairman Menendez and Ranking Member Risch first proposed an amendment to update the Case Act as part of the Committee's consideration of S. 1169, the Strategic Competition Act of 2021 (SCA). The bipartisan provision was included as section 310 of the SCA. On May 10, 2021, the Committee considered the SCA and ordered it reported, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, by a vote of 21–1.

A modified version of the Case Act reform passed the Senate on June 8, 2021 as section 3310 of S. 1260, the United States Innovation and Competition Act of 2021 (USICA).

The House of Representatives passed a further modified version as section 5947 of H.R. 7776, the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023 (NDAA or FY 23 NDAA), on December 8, 2022. The Senate subsequently passed section 5947 as part of the NDAA on December 15, 2022.

III. SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY

A summary of the provisions of section 5947 of H.R. 7776, follows:

Paragraph 5947(a)(1) amends 1 U.S.C. 112b as follows:

Subsection 112b(a): This subsection requires the Secretary of State not less frequently than once each month to provide to congressional leadership and the appropriate congressional committees a list of all international agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments signed, concluded, or otherwise finalized during the prior month, as well as those that entered into force or became operative. For such international agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments, the Secretary must provide the text and a detailed description of the legal authority relied on, as well as a description of any new or amended statutory or regulatory authority anticipated to be required to implement an agreement or qualified non-binding instrument. The required information must be provided in an unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

Subsection 112b(b): This subsection requires the Secretary of State to make public on the State Department website the text of newly-operative international agreements and qualifying non-binding instruments, with certain exceptions, as well as the information required to be reported to Congress under subsection 112b(a).

Subsection 112b(c): This subsection requires the Secretary of State to provide the text of implementing agreements or arrangements for international agreements or qualifying nonbinding instruments, or any other documents of similar purpose or function, whether binding or not binding, if not otherwise required to be submitted under subsection 112b(a)(1). The text must be provided within 30 days of receipt by the Secretary of a written communication from the Chair or Ranking Member of either appropriate congressional committee requesting the text.

Subsection 112b(d): This subsection requires any U.S. Government department or agency that enters into any international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument to provide the text to the Secretary of State within 15 days of signature or conclusion, or otherwise being finalized, in addition to a detailed description of the legal authority that provides authorization for each qualifying non-binding instrument to become operative after such instrument is signed. (With regard to international agreements, the Committee understands that the relevant agency would have already been obligated to submit the legal authority to the Department of State through the Circular-175 process.) This subsection further requires such department or agency to provide on an ongoing basis any implementing materials to the Secretary for transmittal to congressional leadership and the appropriate congressional committees to satisfy the requirements of subsection 112b(c).

Subsection 112b(e): This subsection requires each U.S. Government department or agency, including the Department of State, which enters into any international agreement or qualifying non-binding instrument to designate a Chief International Agreements Officer, with particular requirements. Further, it establishes an International Agreements Compliance Officer at the Department of State.

Subsection 112b(f): This subsection requires the substance of oral international agreements to be reduced to writing for purposes of meeting requirements of subsections 112b(a) and 112b(b).

Subsection 112b(g): This subsection provides that notwithstanding any other provision of law, an international agreement may not be signed or otherwise concluded on behalf of the United States, without prior consultation with the Secretary of State. Such consultation may encompass a class of agreements.

Subsection 112b(h): This subsection requires the Comptroller General to conduct an audit and submit the results to congressional leadership and appropriate congressional committees, at least every three years for nine years, assessing the Secretary of State's compliance with reporting requirements under this section, in addition to particular issues related to whether any failure