

mortgage insurance program for first responders, and for other purposes.

S. 3018

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish requirements with respect to the use of prior authorization under Medicare Advantage plans, and for other purposes.

S. 3335

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3335, a bill to provide liability protection for the sharing of information regarding suspected fraudulent, abusive, or unlawful robocalls, illegally spoofed calls, and other illegal calls by or with the registered consortium that conducts private-led efforts to trace back the origin of suspected unlawful robocalls, and for the receipt of such information by the registered consortium, and for other purposes.

S. 3789

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3789, a bill to amend the Native American Tourism and Improving Visitor Experience Act to authorize grants to Indian tribes, tribal organizations, and Native Hawaiian organizations, and for other purposes.

S. 3889

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3889, a bill to reform the labor laws of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 4007

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Iowa (Ms. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. 4007, a bill to require the Attorney General to propose a program for making treatment for post-traumatic stress disorder and acute stress disorder available to public safety officers, and for other purposes.

S. 4105

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) were added as cosponsors of S. 4105, a bill to treat certain liquidations of new motor vehicle inventory as qualified liquidations of LIFO inventory for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

S. 4226

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4226, a bill to designate baby formula as a scarce and critical material under the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 38

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 38, a concurrent resolution declaring a state of emergency due to the Russian invasion of Ukraine, in order to establish a waiver of the minimum tonnage requirements of section 55305 of title 46, United States Code.

S. CON. RES. 39

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 39, a concurrent resolution honoring the 1,000,000 individuals who have died from COVID-19 in the United States.

S. RES. 529

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 529, a resolution supporting a democratic, pluralistic, and prosperous Bosnia and Herzegovina on the 30th Anniversary of its declaration of independence.

S. RES. 632

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 632, a resolution calling for the immediate release of Russian opposition leader Vladimir Kara-Murza, who was unjustly detained on April 11, 2022.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. KELLY, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 4231. A bill to support water infrastructure in Reclamation States, and other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the STREAM Act (Support to Rehydrate the Environment, Agriculture and Municipalities Act), which I am introducing today alongside my cosponsors Senators MARK KELLY and KYRSTEN SINEMA. This is a bill intended to address the massive drought affecting much of the Western United States.

As the past 2 years demonstrate all too painfully, drought exacerbated by climate change—increasingly severe and prolonged drought—is a stark reality for California and the West.

This has resulted in shortages of water for agriculture, for irrigation, and increasingly threatens residential and business uses. The drought has threatened endangered species and results in a drying of the ground and plantlife that makes wildfire an even greater threat.

If we don't take action now, it is only going to get worse. Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory scientists project that climate change will cause a 54-percent drop in the Sierras' snowpack within the next 20 to 40 years and a 79-

percent drop by the end of the century. This change alone could be devastating for California, because we absolutely depend on this snowpack. The Sierra snowpack provides 30 percent of our water supply and is our biggest reservoir.

For these reasons and others we need an "all of the above" water strategy, including No. 1, increased water supply; No. 2, incentivizing projects that build in environmental benefits and drinking water for disadvantaged communities, and No. 3, investing in separate environmental restoration efforts.

The bill I am introducing today helps meet this challenge in four fundamental ways:

No. 1, it authorizes significant water supply funding that, in combination with the bipartisan infrastructure law, would provide California with 1.04 million additional acre-feet of water per year on average, enough water for over 6 million people;

No. 2, it provides additional financial incentives for water supply projects that include environmental benefits and drinking water for disadvantaged communities;

No. 3, it reforms the Congressional review process to more quickly approve water supply projects, and a new loan program combined with grants to more cost-effectively fund new non-Federal water supply projects; and

No. 4, it significantly invests not only in water supply projects but also in environmental restoration to help imperiled species adapt to climate change as well.

To demonstrate why this bill is so desperately needed, let me illustrate the extent and damage caused by the current drought in the West.

A precursor of the even more prolonged dry spells coming with climate change, California's 2020 to 2022 drought has had severe impacts on farms, cities, and the environment.

In 2021, the drought caused the California agriculture industry to shrink by an estimated 8,745 jobs and incur \$1.2 billion in direct costs, according to a report prepared for the California Department of Food and Agriculture by researchers at the University of California at Merced. In addition, reduced water deliveries resulted in 395,000 acres of cropland left dry and unplanted.

Counting "spillover effects" in the broader economy, the U.C. Merced analysis found the total impacts were more than 14,600 lost jobs, both full time and part time, and \$1.7 billion in gross revenue losses.

In both 2021 and 2022, homes in significant parts of the State have been at risk of running dry. Last year, large parts of Marin and Sonoma Counties and the Mendocino coast came very close to losing all water supply. This year, much of Los Angeles, Ventura, and San Bernardino Counties have been placed under emergency orders limiting them to once a week landscape irrigation, with the possibility of a complete irrigation shutoff by fall.

In California, one in eight acres statewide has burned from wildfires in the last decade, with the past 2 years being the worst on record. With 95 percent of the State experiencing drought as we enter into the traditional wildfire season, we are poised for an even worse year this year.

The drought has been devastating to the aquatic ecosystem as well as our forests. As just one example, the endangered winter-run Chinook salmon depend on sufficient cold water released by Shasta Dam to rear juveniles in the Sacramento River.

With limited water available in 2021, NOAA Fisheries models predict that approximately 75 percent of the winter run chinook salmon's eggs died from elevated water temperatures. This is a species with three 1-year age classes, and a prolonged drought could threaten the survival of the species.

In order to increase drought resiliency in California and other Western States, the bill authorizes the following funding over the next 5 years: \$750 million for surface and groundwater storage projects, and supporting conveyance, including \$50 million for natural water retention and release projects; \$300 million for water recycling projects; \$150 million for desalination projects; \$250 million for environmental restoration projects; \$100 million for drinking water for disadvantaged communities; and \$150 million for low-interest loans for water supply projects.

This funding builds on the bipartisan infrastructure law's funding of \$1.15 billion for storage projects, \$550 million for water recycling projects, and \$250 million for desalination projects.

The STREAM Act, in combination with the bipartisan infrastructure law, would provide California with the Federal cost-share for approximately 1,042,000 acre-feet per year of additional water supply, or enough water for over 6 million people. This comes from the following:

Enough funding for California to finally build three major off-stream storage projects providing 370,000 acre-feet of water on average each year: Sites Reservoir, the Los Vaqueros Expansion, and the BF Sisk raise. In addition, the storage funding could provide an additional 55,000 acre-feet per year from some combination of other smaller surface and groundwater storage projects like the Sacramento Regional Groundwater Bank or Del Puerto Canyon Reservoir. All of the projects are non-Federal projects with a 25 percent Federal cost share, with the exception of the Federal BF Sisk Raise with a 50 percent Federal cost-share.

Enough funding for 532,000 additional acre-feet from water recycling projects, from the \$300 million authorized in the bill plus \$550 million in the bipartisan infrastructure legislation, with a 25 percent Federal cost-share for projects.

Enough funding for approximately 85,000 additional acre-feet from the \$150

million authorized in the bill for desalination projects, plus \$250 million in the bipartisan infrastructure legislation, with a 25 percent Federal cost-share for projects.

While virtually everyone supports water recycling projects, surface and groundwater storage projects are sometimes more controversial. I want to point out a report just released today by the widely respected Public Policy Institute of California, PPIC, which relates to the benefits of additional surface and groundwater storage as California's climate is changing.

Many climate forecasters emphasize that as climate change intensifies, California will get more of its precipitation in a few large to extraordinarily large storms fueled by atmospheric rivers, and more of the precipitation will fall as rain rather than snow. In between the bursts of atmospheric rivers, there will be longer and more intense droughts. We have definitely seen a preview of this pattern this year.

PPIC has studied these projections and estimated that there is substantial water in wet years that is not needed to maintain healthy Delta outflows but currently cannot be captured because California lacks the infrastructure to store for future dry periods. PPIC suggests that given this reality, cost-effective storage projects in appropriate locations could help improve California's drought resiliency.

PPIC also argues that these storage projects should be managed for environmental flow benefits as well as water supply benefits. This bill would help with that because Federal funding for Sites Reservoir would help provide cold water for salmon, and Federal funding for the expansion of Los Vaqueros Reservoir would provide needed water for wildlife refuges. Regarding cold water reserves for salmon in particular, these reserves will be critical to prevent salmon runs from being wiped out during the potential fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh years of devastating droughts.

The bill's funding authorizations apply not just to California but throughout the 17 Western States where the Bureau of Reclamation has a presence. Many of these States have recently benefited from the Bureau of Reclamation's storage, water recycling, and desalination programs and/or have projects currently seeking funding from these programs, including Arizona, Idaho, Washington, Oregon, Texas, Utah, Nevada, and New Mexico. I believe the Federal funding assistance authorized by this bill will be particularly important for all seven Colorado River basin States as the States negotiate the next painful round of water supply cuts from the Colorado River between now and 2026 in order to meet the challenge of an increasingly dry Colorado River basin.

In Arizona, the STREAM Act would significantly advance the Salt River Project's proposal to raise Bartlett Dam on the Verde River to counteract

the loss of approximately one-third of the nearby Horseshoe Dam's capacity from accumulating sediment. The Bartlett Dam raise would provide an additional 60,000 to 115,000 acre-feet per year or enough water for 360,000 to 690,000 people.

The bill uses financial incentives to encourage storage and conveyance projects to include environmental benefits and other public benefits such as drinking water for disadvantaged communities. This is important to ensure that the environment and disadvantaged communities are included in our drought resilience strategies.

The bill authorizes low-interest loans for sponsors of storage and conveyance projects if those projects solely provide irrigation and general municipal and industrial water supply benefits.

In contrast, the bill authorizes grants for storage and conveyance projects that include environmental benefits, drinking water benefits for disadvantaged communities, or other public benefits either as part of the project design or as part of a watershed restoration plan adopted together with the project.

This access to grants gives project sponsors a strong financial incentive to design environmental and disadvantaged community benefits into their projects. This approach builds on the experience of the Proposition 1 water bond California's voters passed by a 2-to-1 margin in 2014, which also incentivizes projects with environmental and other public benefits.

If storage and conveyance projects take these steps, they can get Federal grants both directly for the public benefits and for an equal value investment in the water supply component of the project. Thus, the Federal Government will provide \$50 million for the general water supply benefits of a project if the project also has \$50 million in fish and wildlife or water quality benefits either directly from the project or from an associated watershed restoration plan.

The bill not only increases funding for drought resiliency projects, it expedites their approvals and assists them more cost-effectively, stretching taxpayer dollars further.

The traditional Bureau of Reclamation model for approving and funding new water supply projects has involved the following:

No. 1, reclamation studies new projects in detail, which can take a decade or more for major projects;

No. 2, once Reclamation's studies are complete, Congress authorizes projects individually, which can take another 3-5 years or longer in many cases; and

No. 3, the design and construction can take a decade or longer.

One can quickly see that this model can end up taking decades to construct significant new water supply projects. This is especially the case given the limitations of Federal budgets and the increasing cost of major protein recent years. Given the tremendous challenge

posed by climate change to western water supply, we need a nimbler and more responsive model.

Mike Connor, the Deputy Secretary of the Interior during the Obama Administration and currently Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works, testified in support of a new model during an October 8, 2015, hearing before the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. Deputy Secretary Connor stated:

The traditional Reclamation business model, in which feasibility studies, consistent with the 1983 Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Resources Development, are first authorized, funded, and submitted to Congress, and then construction is authorized and funded, does not always address the needs of project sponsors at the state and local levels. Moreover, given budget limitations and the availability of other available financing mechanisms, the historic federal role in financing water storage projects through the Bureau of Reclamation must be revisited with a greater emphasis on non-federal financing.

In response to the concerns articulated by then-Deputy Secretary Connor and others, the bill we are introducing today, building on the 2016 Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act, makes five significant changes to the traditional reclamation model. These changes expedite project approvals and make more cost-effective use of available federal funding.

No. 1, Congressional authorization no longer required for non-Federal projects.

First, the bill eliminates the need for Congress to authorize individual water recycling and desalination projects and non-Federal storage projects with a Federal investment of less than \$250 million. It can take 3 to 5 years or longer for projects to get legislatively approved. In fact, zero new water recycling projects were authorized from 2009 to 2017 despite dozens of meritorious projects with approved feasibility studies.

Federal storage projects, which are often more controversial, continue to require congressional authorization, as do non-Federal storage projects with a greater than \$250 million Federal investment. The bill shortens the timeline for congressional approval of these projects through directing Reclamation to follow a process that the Army Corps of Engineers uses to notify Congress of completed feasibility studies each year to set up an orderly timeline to authorize projects.

No. 2, non-Federal funding is required up front.

Second, the bill no longer requires 100 percent Federal funding up front as was necessary under the traditional Reclamation model. Instead, the bill allows a maximum of 50 percent Federal funding for federally owned projects and a maximum of 25 percent Federal funding for non-Federal projects that are built by States, water districts, or Indian Tribes.

Federal dollars can be stretched further by the partnerships with States

and water districts that will be fostered under the bill. For example, the proposed expansion of Los Vaqueros Reservoir in California would be funded nearly 50 percent by the State of California, which has already conditionally awarded funding, in addition to potentially 20 to 25 percent by the Federal Government and the remaining 25 to 30 percent by water users.

Multipartner projects like the Los Vaqueros expansion frequently have multiple benefits. For example, much of the State and Federal funding for the Los Vaqueros expansion would go to augment the water supply of wildlife refuges that provide essential water for migratory birds on the Pacific flyway. These benefits would complement the project's water supply benefits for many Bay Area water districts.

No. 3, the new loan program is cost-effective.

Third, the low-interest loan program created by the bill for water supply projects is an exceptionally cost-effective program. This program, known as the Reclamation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, RIFIA, would use existing criteria for loans under the successful WIFIA Program, the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act.

The Office of Management and the Budget, OMB, has approved loans of \$2.3 billion for WIFIA in fiscal year 2018 backed by appropriations of just over 1 percent of that amount, or \$25 million in budget authority. OMB was able to approve loans backed by just 1 percent of the loan amount because there is a virtually non-existent default rate for water projects. Only 4 in 1,000 water infrastructure projects default, based on a study conducted by the Fitch credit rating agency.

Given OMB's experience that Federal outlays need only cover 1 percent of the loan cost for water projects, the \$125 million in authorized Federal spending in the draft bill likely could support \$12.5 billion in water project lending authority.

Federal funding of 1 percent of the loan amount will typically return 10 to 25 percent savings in the repayment cost of the loans for the water districts funding the projects. The total savings can be about 10 percent for AAA-rated districts and 20 to 25 percent for AA-rated districts.

For example, the water users who are supporting the proposed Sites Reservoir in northern California have estimated that the loans authorized by this bill would allow them to pay only \$512/acre-foot for water delivered by the project instead of \$682/acre-foot, or a 25 percent reduction in their costs.

Thus, the Federal Government can provide a loan at 1 percent of the loan amount and save the project sponsors 10 to 25 percent of the project cost. That is an exceptionally cost-effective Federal investment.

There are at least three significant reasons that the loans are so beneficial for the project sponsors:

The sponsors pay a substantially lower interest rate on their loans than they would under the alternative of municipal bond financing.

The districts would not need to start loan repayments until 5 years after substantial completion of the project, a substantial cost saver.

Loans are for 35 rather than 30 years, lowering annual debt service costs.

Significantly, the loans include all the taxpayer protections from the successful WIFIA and TIFIA, Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act, programs. In particular, the RIFIA loans would be limited to 49 percent of the project costs, and the Federal loans would have senior status in the event of any default. These provisions ensure the taxpayer won't be harmed in any default where the project retains at least 50 percent of its value, which is extremely likely for ratepayer backed water supply projects.

No. 4, Federal grants and loans work together.

Fourth, the combination of low-interest loans and Federal grants of up to 25 percent of project costs for non-Federal projects can allow water users to make up the difference where the Federal Government is no longer funding 100 percent of project costs up front. Many rural communities, and in particular agricultural communities, are not able to pay 100 percent of the cost of new water supply projects.

Under the bill I am introducing today, these communities will still have to provide a significant cost-share for improving their water supplies, and new water projects will have to be cost-effective enough to justify that investment. However, the Federal-Government can help build the best and most effective projects in increasing drought resiliency by providing assistance through both grants and loans.

Finally, the longer and more severe droughts coming with climate change will adversely affect not just farms and cities but also the natural environment. The bill includes provisions to improve species' drought resiliency as well.

The significant funding authorization of \$250 million for environmental restoration can be used to benefit many different species, including fish and migratory birds. Some authorized uses of this funding include: improved habitat for salmon, Delta smelt and other fish species adversely affected by the Bureau of Reclamation's water projects; additional water for wildlife refuges hosting migratory birds along the Pacific flyway; improved stream gauges, monitoring, and science to better understand how to restore species and to operate Reclamation water projects with reduced environmental impacts; ensuring that when Sacramento Valley rice growers sell their water and idle their crops, some water is left behind and applied to bare fields in late summer and early fall to create shallow flooded habitat during a critical

shorebird migration period; and assistance in implementing water-related settlements with State agencies and State water quality laws.

The bill would also authorize \$50 million of the broader storage funding for natural water retention and release projects.

These projects would help restore stream and river channels with natural materials like wetlands. Like many other projects prioritized by the bill, these projects could have multiple benefits, including increased groundwater recharge, improved flood protection, and increased floodplain habitat to benefit salmon and other species. I look forward to receiving comments on ways to prioritize multibenefit projects like natural water storage projects as we move forward with the bill.

The bill also authorizes pay-for-performance environmental restoration approaches that award grants contingent on the success of the restoration effort. These approaches can expedite environmental restoration and build public/private partnerships to increase the number of acres restored.

In addition, the bill makes clear that it must be implemented consistently with all Federal environmental laws, including the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, the Clean Water Act, and all other environmental laws. All applicable State laws must also be followed.

California is home to more than 40 million people, but our major statewide water infrastructure hasn't significantly changed in the past 50 years, when we had only 16 million people.

We must modernize the system or we risk becoming a desert State. Critically, this means putting in place infrastructure to allow our cities, our farmers, and our natural communities to withstand the severe droughts that we are projected to face as a result of climate change.

I hope my western colleagues will join my cosponsors and me on this bill because drought is a serious threat for all of our States.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 637—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR VIEWING WOMEN'S HEALTH AS A CRITICAL ISSUE FOR THE ECONOMY AND WORKFORCE OF THE UNITED STATES AND FOR ADVANCING THE HEALTH AND WELL-BEING OF ALL PEOPLE

Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LUJÁN, and Ms. ROSEN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 637

Whereas women constitute 50.8 percent of United States citizens and nearly ½ of the workforce in the United States;

Whereas women control 60 percent of personal wealth and are responsible for 85 percent of consumer spending and 80 percent of health care decisions;

Whereas, across races, ethnicities, socioeconomic statuses, disability statuses, and age groups—

(1) women experience many diseases and disorders differently than men;

(2) the incidence, prevalence, symptomology, and severity of disease may differ between men and women;

(3) women vary in the risks of certain diseases and the benefits of medical therapies; and

(4) for many years, women were underrepresented in biomedical and clinical research;

Whereas longer life spans of women require the need for research on the health of older women;

Whereas women and men have fundamental biological differences at the cellular level;

Whereas ¾ of patients with Alzheimer's disease are women;

Whereas heart disease is the leading cause of death in women, and women are 50 percent more likely to die the year following a heart attack than men;

Whereas 80 percent of patients with autoimmune diseases are women;

Whereas women have more stroke events and are less likely to recover from such events than men;

Whereas there are significant sex and age differences between men and women with respect to drug administration and dosage;

Whereas older women are more prone to having multiple medical problems and, as a result, may be taking incorrectly prescribed medications due to lack of information on gender and age differences;

Whereas, on January 25, 2016, the National Institutes of Health implemented a policy requiring federally funded investigators to consider sex as a biological variable in pre-clinical research;

Whereas such policy has improved inclusivity in women's health research, but disparities still remain;

Whereas the 2021 report entitled "The Case to Fund Women's Health Research: An Economic and Societal Impact Analysis", published by Women's Health Access Matters (commonly known as the "WHAM Report"), states that in 2019, of the funding provided by the National Institutes of Health, 12 percent of the funding for Alzheimer's research, 4.5 percent of the funding for coronary artery disease research, and 7 percent of the funding for rheumatoid arthritis research focused on women;

Whereas this research gap has had economic consequences, including—

(1) pushing women out of the workforce to care for their own health or to act as caregivers; and

(2) contributing to increased costs of health care because of delays in care;

Whereas the improvement of women's health relies on sex- and gender-based biomedical and clinical research;

Whereas the promise of personalized medicine cannot be realized without sex- and gender-based parity in research;

Whereas the WHAM Report states that small investments in women's health research will bring larger returns to the economy and add productive years to the workforce of the United States; and

Whereas the WHAM Report shows that doubling current funding focused on women across Alzheimer's disease, coronary artery disease, and rheumatoid arthritis is a \$300,000,000 investment that would return over \$13,000,000,000 to the economy of the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses support for viewing women's health as a critical issue for the economy and workforce of the United States and for advancing the health and well-being of all people; and

(2) supports efforts—

(A) to increase health research focused on women, particularly for diseases that differentially and disproportionately affect women;

(B) to double the current share of women's research focused on Alzheimer's disease (12 percent), coronary artery disease (4.5 percent), and rheumatoid arthritis (7 percent), which the 2021 report entitled "The Case to Fund Women's Health Research: An Economic and Societal Impact Analysis", published by Women's Health Access Matters shows is a \$300,000,000 investment that will yield \$13,000,000,000 in economic returns;

(C) to increase awareness of the value of sex- and gender-based biomedical research, including the benefits to the economy and workforce of the United States of accelerating health research focused on women; and

(D) to encourage individuals, including researchers, doctors, and patients, to advocate for sex- and gender-inclusive research across races, ethnicities, socioeconomic statuses, disabilities, and age groups.

SENATE RESOLUTION 638—COMMENDING THE GOVERNMENT AND PEOPLE OF THE REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA FOR THEIR HEROIC EFFORTS TO SUPPORT UKRAINIAN REFUGEES FLEEING PRESIDENT PUTIN'S ILLEGAL WAR AGAINST UKRAINE

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. JOHNSON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 638

Whereas, on February 18, 2022, the United States and Moldova marked 30 years of diplomatic relations;

Whereas, on February 24, 2022, armed forces of the Russian Federation began an illegal, unjustified, and unprovoked attack on Ukraine with missile strikes against densely populated urban areas, including Kyiv, the capital of Ukraine, and the regional hubs of Odesa and Mykolayiv, which lie close to Moldova;

Whereas Moldova is a country of approximately 2,600,000 people that relies heavily on remittances sent to Moldova by the Moldovan diaspora;

Whereas, in 2011, the Government of Moldova passed a law entitled "Law on Integration of Foreigners in the Republic of Moldova", which provided refugees and beneficiaries of humanitarian protection access to social security, primary and secondary education, medical insurance, cultural integration support, language classes, and employment counseling;

Whereas, prior to the most recent invasion of Ukraine by President Vladimir Putin, the Government of Moldova assessed that the infrastructure in Moldova could accommodate not more than 15,000 refugees;

Whereas, only one day after the commencement of the unconscionable attack on Ukraine by President Putin, the people of Moldova welcomed more than 16,000 refugees;

Whereas, since 2014, more than 450,000 refugees fleeing the invasion of Ukraine by President Putin had entered Moldova and more than 100,000 of such refugees chose to remain in Moldova;