

chronic diseases by using Accountable Produce is Medicine.

S. RES. 606

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 606, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran for its suppression of the right of Iranians to peacefully assemble.

S. RES. 735

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 735, a resolution designating the week of May 10 through May 16, 2026, as “National Police Week”.

S. RES. 816

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 816, a resolution honoring 35 years of independence for the countries of Central Asia and recognizing the importance of the United States growing relationship with Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan.

S. RES. 826

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 826, a resolution honoring the contributions of small manufacturers of firearms to the economy, culture, and recreational heritage of the United States and recognizing the month of August 2026 as “National Shooting Sports Month”.

S. RES. 827

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 827, a resolution recognizing the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Sporting Arms and Ammunition Manufacturers’ Institute, Inc. (SAAMI) and commending its work establishing industry standards that ensure the safe interoperability of firearms and ammunition.

AMENDMENT NO. 6744

At the request of Mr. HAWLEY, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BANKS) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 6744 intended to be proposed to S. 4668, a bill to protect the name, image, and likeness rights of, and provide protections for, student athletes and to promote fair competition among intercollegiate athletics, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr.

MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 5301. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to reauthorize the position of Farmworker Coordinator; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Voice for Farm Workers Act, which I introduced today.

Our Nation’s farmworkers are the backbone of the U.S. food supply chain. In the 2008 farm bill, Congress created the Farmworker Coordinator position: one person statutorily dedicated to serving as a liaison between the more than 2 million farm workers and the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Unfortunately, Congress has never provided the resources necessary to support a position of this magnitude. The time to fix this injustice is now.

The 2023 U.S. Department of Agriculture Equity Commission Interim Report included a strong recommendation for the USDA to fund and elevate roles for professional staff solely dedicated to farm workers’ concerns and perspectives.

That is why I am introducing this bill to expand and strengthen the Coordinator position to carry out the responsibilities necessary to better meet the needs of our farmworkers. This bill would also support increased collaboration within the Department, with farmworkers, and with relevant stakeholders to create recommendations for new initiatives and programs to support farmworkers.

As we negotiate a new farm bill, I urge my colleagues to prioritize and support the workers that ensure our families and loved ones remain fed and healthy. Farmworkers’ voices must be and deserve to be heard.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 5303. A bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to establish the Office of the Farm and Food System Workforce; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Supporting Our Farm and Food System Workforce Act, which I introduced today.

Farm and food system workers feed our Nation. We know this well in California—the agricultural heart of the Nation—where we have one of the largest populations of farmworkers and food system workers in the United States. Throughout pandemic, these workers put food on our tables and kept our grocery store shelves stocked despite facing deep-rooted inequities in the workforce and often experiencing food insecurity themselves.

Right now, just one person in the Federal Government is statutorily

dedicated to serving as a liaison between farm workers and the U.S. Department of Agriculture—the Farmworker Coordinator. While the 2008 farm bill created this position, Congress has never provided the proper resources to support or staff this position. The 2023 U.S. Department of Agriculture Equity Commission Interim Report included a strong recommendation for the USDA to fund and elevate roles for professional staff solely dedicated to farmworkers’ concerns and perspectives.

It is time that we give those who provide the food for our Nation a voice in the national conversation. We must give farm and food system workers a dedicated office within the USDA to integrate their invaluable perspectives into the decisions that directly affect their lives and livelihoods.

That is why I am proud to introduce this bill, which would create the USDA Office of the Farm and Food System Workforce to not only serve as a liaison for farm and food system workers but also to provide a platform for their concerns and interests to assist in the creation of recommendations and new initiatives for the Department.

The bill would also create a Farm and Food System Worker Advisory Committee, composed of a diverse cross-section of members representing these workers’ varied interests and perspectives—such as workers themselves, labor unions, higher education professionals, civil rights advocates, women worker-focused groups, and trusted community-based non-profits.

The legislation would also establish a Farm and Food System Workforce Interagency Council, comprised of representatives from various Federal Agencies to improve coordination, planning, program development, and policymaking across Cabinet-level leadership. The Office would also appoint staff to various USDA entities to serve as liaisons on matters related to farm and food system workers within the Department.

Finally, the bill would require annual, publicly available reports, in multiple languages, about the Office’s work, including recommendations to improve the work and livelihood of farm and food system workers, the climate change impacts on the food system, and the barriers workers face to accessing Federal programs.

During this year’s farm bill negotiations, I urge my colleagues to remember the workers behind the American food system, the workers who keep our families and communities fed and healthy. These workers deserve a seat at the table.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. LUJÁN):

S. 5304. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide increased labor law protections for agricultural workers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the Fairness for Farm Workers Act, which I am reintroducing today.

Farmworkers feed our Nation. This is especially true in California—the agricultural heart of the Nation. California is the most successful State in agricultural production and has the largest population of farmworkers. In fact, nearly half of the country's vegetables and over three-quarters of the country's fruits and nuts are grown in California.

Farmworkers put food on the tables of millions of Americans despite working through extreme weather conditions, injuries, disasters, pandemics, and more. Yet farmworkers have been unjustly excluded from labor laws. The time to address these inequities is now.

While the 1938 Fair Labor Standards Act established Federal standards for minimum wage and overtime pay, the law excluded millions of domestic and agricultural workers—workers who were and remain overwhelmingly people of color. In 2016, California recognized the need to provide farmworkers overtime protection. The California overtime law, which ensures farmworkers will have an equal right to overtime pay, serves as the model for this Federal bill.

Farmworkers in California and across the Nation deserve an end to discrimination in labor laws. We must undo the discriminatory exclusion of farmworkers by amending the Fair Labor Standards Act.

That is why I am proud to introduce this bill, which would improve the lives of farmworkers and their families, create equity in our food system, and benefit farming communities as the increased wages are spent in local businesses.

This bill will gradually implement overtime pay over the course of 4 years and bring greater equity to the American agricultural industry and greater prosperity to historically marginalized workers.

I want to thank Congresswoman GRIJALVA for introducing this bill with me, and I hope our colleagues will join us to provide a measure of long-overdue fairness for our Nation's farmworkers.

By Mr. PADILLA (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. SCHIFF):

S. 5309. A bill to amend the Food Security Act of 1985 to provide payments for alternative manure management practices under the environmental quality incentives program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Converting Our Waste Sustainably (COWS) Act. This legisla-

tion will help dairy and livestock producers reduce methane emissions, improve air and water quality, and implement more sustainable alternative manure management practices.

As the leading dairy State in the country and the second in cheese production, California is the largest producer of milk, butter, and cheeses like mozzarella, Monterey Jack, and queso fresco. Dairy operations contribute billions to California's economy but are also a significant source of California's methane emissions.

Recognizing the urgency of mitigating greenhouse gas emissions like methane, California and the dairy industry are working to reduce dairy methane emissions by 40 percent below 2013 levels by 2030, largely due to the successes of California's own Alternative Manure Management Program, AMMP.

The COWS Act would allow alternative manure management practices to be eligible under USDA's Environmental Quality Incentives Program, EQIP, to help dairy and livestock producers transition towards pasture-based management, alternative treatment and storage practices, solid separation systems, and scrape technologies.

These practices, which have proven to be effective through the AMMP, will provide more resources for the dairy and livestock industry to modernize technologies for manure management that help boost profitability, improve water quality, and reduce methane and nitrogen oxide emissions.

Reducing greenhouse gas emissions from agricultural operations is critical for addressing the climate crisis. Because of the high construction and operation costs associated with anaerobic digesters, nondigester manure management practices can provide a more cost-effective alternative for family dairy and livestock operators seeking to improve air and water quality for their communities.

I would like to thank Congressman COSTA for leading this bill in the House, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass the COWS Act.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. KIM, Ms. ALSOBROOKS, and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER):

S. 5320. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to prohibit certain securities trading and related communications by those who possess material, nonpublic information, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today, I am joined by Senators VAN HOLLEN, KIM, ALSOBROOKS, and BLUNT ROCHESTER in introducing the Insider Trading Prohibition Act, a bill that will finally define the offense of insider trading. This legislation is desperately needed because in the absence of a stat-

utory definition, the courts have cobbled together a dizzying array of interpretations of anti-fraud statutes, creating what is an inconsistent and complicated body of common law for deciding insider trading cases. What should be simple has become unnecessarily complex.

Indeed, Judge Jed Rakoff, who has presided over many insider trading cases before the Southern District of New York, wrote in a recent opinion that “the crime of insider trading is a straightforward concept that some courts have somehow managed to complicate.”

Consider the following hypothetical example. A financial analyst receives information about XYZ Corporation's earnings from a company insider, like an executive or board member, before this information is publicly released. The analyst then shares this inside information with her portfolio manager, who subsequently trades in XYZ stock.

I suspect most Americans would agree that the portfolio manager was given an unfair advantage.

But the courts are not so sure. They have left an open question whether this very trade would constitute illegal insider trading. Experts agree that this kind of judicial uncertainty is one reason among many of why Congress must clarify the law of insider trading.

Current SEC Chair Paul Atkins said in response to questions for the record that “following several high-profile insider trading cases, in 1988 Congress adopted the Insider Trading and Securities Fraud Enforcement Act, but despite the statute's name, did not define ‘insider trading’ because of lack of consensus of how to define it. Almost four decades later, the situation is even muddier as courts have applied the concept to various fact patterns.”

Former SEC Commissioner Robert J. Jackson and former U.S. Attorney Preet Bharara have written that “[t]he shoddy state of American insider-trading law affects everyone. Prosecutors and regulators are stuck enforcing laws that are ill-suited to 21st-century misconduct. Lawyers struggle to tell their clients what they can and cannot do within the bounds of the law. And ordinary Americans are left asking whether financial markets are stacked in favor of those who skirt the rules.”

Columbia Law School Professor John C. Coffee, Jr., noted that “there is general agreement today that the law of insider trading has grown overly complex and technical. As a result, it is hard for the public to understand its logic or for practitioners to give advice with respect to the scope of the prohibition. Moreover, to the extent that insider trading is judge-made law, disparities and inconsistencies among the U.S. circuit courts becomes inevitable because there is little in the way of a definitive statutory text to provide precise guidance.”

State regulators agree too. For example, Maryland Commissioner of Securities Melanie Senter Lubin has stated on behalf of the North American Securities Administrators Association that “defining the standards for insider trading liability by statute would add greater clarity and consistency to this important area of the law.”

This is precisely what my colleagues and I are doing in our bill. We are seeking to finally distill the offense of insider trading to clear bright line rules. Simply put, if a person trades a security on the basis of information that the person is aware is material and nonpublic and is aware was wrongfully obtained, then that person has engaged in unlawful insider trading.

Under our legislation, insider trading would be prohibited if a trader knows or has reason to know that her information was wrongfully obtained, for example, through theft, bribery, hacking, misappropriation, or a breach of a fiduciary duty for a personal benefit. We do not intend to restrict those who take the time to independently develop their own information from publicly available sources from trading on the independently developed information.

By cracking down on those who rig securities markets to favor the well connected, our legislation provides everyday investors with a fair shot at seeing some returns after investing their hard-earned savings. Incidents of insider trading and the perceived pervasiveness of the practice have for years served to validate the public's worst assumptions about Wall Street culture. It is time we clearly define what is appropriate under the law and take this meaningful step towards improving the integrity of our securities markets for professional traders and retail investors alike.

I would like to thank my Banking Committee colleagues for working with me on this legislation, and I urge our colleagues to join us in supporting the Insider Trading Prohibition Act.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mr. WICKER, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 5323. A bill to designate a building of the Chancery of the United States in Pristina, Kosovo, as the “Eliot L. Engel Building”; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. 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. 5323

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The building of the Chancery of the United States located at Arberia, Nr.25 Rr. 4 KORRIKU in Pristina, Kosovo, shall be designated as the “Eliot L. Engel Building”.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the

United States to the building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Eliot L. Engel Building”.

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

S. 5352. A bill to amend the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act and the Water Desalination Act of 1996 to reauthorize certain desalination programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. PADILLA. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Desalination Reauthorization Act.

This bill would reauthorize BOR's programmatic approval to provide grants for desalination projects, which will otherwise expire this year. It would also allow public-private partnerships to compete for this funding.

The bill would also reauthorize the desalination and water purification research program and amend it to authorize advanced pilot projects. Advanced pilots can cover the gap in developing new technologies known as the Valley of Death between a successfully validated laboratory prototype and a commercially viable, scalable product. During this phase, public grants typically dry out, while private investors demand proven market traction before committing capital.

The Federal cost-share under the program is limited to 24 percent of the cost of any desalination project. The bill would direct the Reclamation cannot administratively impose a maximum funding amount that each desalination project can receive, which would allow large desalination plants to receive the full 25 percent cost-share. I believe it is important that the bill support desalination projects of varying sizes. Large projects can allow multiple water districts in a region to participate and can lower the unit cost of the water produced.

The desalination projects supported by these Bureau of Reclamation programs have supplemented local supplies, provided flexibility during water shortages, and diversified the water supply.

Desalination offers a drought-proof water supply alternative, and we need to keep funding both commercial desalination projects and research to lower its costs and reduce its environmental impacts.

I would like to thank Senator Cornyn for coleading this bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 832—ESTABLISHING A PROCESS TO ASSURE THE LONG-TERM FISCAL STABILITY OF THE FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND AND THE FEDERAL DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself and Mr. DURBIN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 832

Resolved,

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF PROCESS TO ASSURE SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) LONG-TERM SOLVENCY.—The term “long-term solvency” means the financial ability of the Trust Funds to pay 100 percent of scheduled benefits for a period of at least 50

years that begins on the date of adoption of this resolution.

(2) SOCIAL SECURITY BILL.—The term “Social Security bill” means a bill introduced pursuant to subsection (c)(1)(A)(i) or subsection (c)(1)(A)(ii).

(3) TRUST FUNDS.—The term “Trust Funds” means the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.).

(b) BIPARTISAN WORKING GROUP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than August 10, 2026, the Majority Leader of the Senate shall establish a bipartisan working group (in this section, referred to as the “working group”) that shall develop recommendations and legislative language to achieve long-term solvency for the Trust Funds. Such legislative language shall not include provisions that do not change outlays, revenues, or financing with respect to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program established under title II of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401 et seq.), the supplemental security income program under title XVI of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1381 et seq.), or provisions in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 that could be altered to help achieve long-term solvency.

(2) COMPOSITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The working group shall consist of—

(i) 3 Senators from the Committee on Finance of the Senate, appointed by the Chairman of the Committee;

(ii) 3 Senators from the Committee on Finance of the Senate, appointed by the Ranking Member of the Committee;

(iii) 3 Senators appointed by the Majority Leader of the Senate; and

(iv) 3 Senators appointed by the Minority Leader of the Senate.

(B) DISCRETIONARY HOUSE PARTICIPATION.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and Minority Leader of the House of Representatives may each appoint 4 members to the working group.

(C) CHAIRPERSONS.—Not later than 14 calendar days after the appointment of all members under subparagraph (A), the Majority Leader of the Senate and Minority Leader of the Senate shall select co-chairs of the working group from members of the working group.

(3) REQUEST FOR INFORMATION.—The working group shall, for the purpose of carrying out this section, issue a request for information to the public regarding ways to achieve long-term solvency for the Trust Funds.

(4) PUBLIC LISTENING SESSIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the working group shall, for the purpose of carrying out this subsection, hold such public listening sessions, sit and act at such times and places, request attendance of stakeholders and production of books, papers, and documents, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer oaths as the working group considers advisable.

(B) PROCEDURES.—

(i) ANNOUNCEMENT.—The working group shall make a public announcement of the date, place, time, and subject matter of any public listening session to be conducted under this subparagraph not later than 7 calendar days before the date of the public listening session, unless either co-chair of the working group determines that there is good cause to begin such public listening session on an earlier date.

(ii) WRITTEN STATEMENT.—The working group shall request that each stakeholder appearing before the working group file a written statement of the proposed testimony of the stakeholder not later than 2 calendar days before the date of the appearance of the stakeholder.