United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 117th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 168 WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2022 *No. 152*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a Senator from the State of New Mexico.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Our Heavenly Father, You are our mighty fortress. Continue to be for us a bulwark that never fails.

Lord, inspire our lawmakers to do Your will. Direct them in their work. Empower them to meet each challenge and shield them from discouragement. May they not depart from Your purposes for their lives in their thoughts, words or deeds.

Lord, give our Senators the discipline to relinquish any spirit of self-importance for the spirit of self-sacrifice. Give them also the certainty that You are guiding their lives.

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 (Mr. LEAHY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 21, 2022.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable BEN RAY LUJÁN, a Senator from the State of New Mexico, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATRICK J. LEAHY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUJÁN 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

AMENDMENT TO MONTREAL PROTOCOL (''KIGALI AMENDMENT'')

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Treaty document No. 117–1, Amendment to Montreal Protocol (''Kigali Amendment'').

Pending:

Schumer amendment No. 5503, to add an effective date.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, 35 years ago this month, every nation on Earth came together for the first time in human history to sign onto a global accord to save the planet's dying ozone layer. It was a convergence unlike any before, uniting not just every member of the United Nations but, in time, also the European Union and even the Holy See.

That accord, of course, was the Montreal Protocol, hailed by then-UN Secretary General Kofi Annan as ''perhaps the single most successful international agreement to date.''

Today, the Senate will finish the work of ratifying the Kigali Amendment to the protocol when we vote later today here on the floor.

Ratifying the Kigali Amendment will require two-thirds of the Senate, and I want to thank every single Member, Democratic and Republican alike, who voted yesterday to move forward on this measure. Our country, our businesses, and our planet will benefit because of it. I hope we can see that same level of support today.

In a year where we have already seen plenty of major bipartisan bills become law, the Kigali Amendment might just be one of the most important bipartisan achievements to date—less heralded, but maybe more important—because this measure will go a long way to lowering global temperatures while also creating tens of thousands of American jobs and deal with the fact that China rarely participates in global cooperation when it comes to putting their own economy and jobs ahead of ours.

As I have explained, the Kigali Amendment will signal the commitment of the United States to phase down the use of dangerous industrial chemicals known as HFCs by 80 percent over the next 15 years. HFCs are found practically in every home in America and around the world, inside the vast majority of refrigerators, air-conditioner units, aerosols, insulating foams, and more.

Experts say that if we can meet the goals set forth by the Kigali Amendment, we can reduce global temperatures by about half a degree Celsius by the end of the century. That is huge. We struggle to get that reduction

down, to get that increase down. And this is a big, big step forward for that. Half a degree might sound like a rounding error to some, but in truth, it is very, very, very significant.

But equally significant, however, are the tens of billions in new investments that will be up for grabs if we ratify this amendment.

Every year, millions and millions of refrigerators and AC units are sold around the world, and the United States ranks near the top of refrigerator exports. All of these products will need viable HFC refrigerant alternatives moving forward, and we need to take every step available to make sure those alternatives are provided by American companies and American workers, driven by American ingenuity.

By one measure, ratifying the Kigali Amendment will generate nearly $39 billion in investments here in America in the next 5 years when combined with other steps we have taken to transition away from HFCs. It will create tens of thousands of new American jobs and increase U.S. heating, ventilation, and refrigeration exports by 25 percent in a few short years, by 2027.

Let me say that all again. Tens of thousands in new American jobs, nearly 39 billion in new investments, a surge in U.S. exports—all of that is on the table if we finish our work to ratify this amendment today. There is every reason in the world to say yes.

There is really no down side to ratification. The Kigali Amendment will not overrule or change any current U.S. law. It will require no one to replace their appliances at home. The United States will be able to lead the international process of implementing Kigali, ensuring U.S. businesses will set the terms of implementation that benefit them. And Congress will be perfectly free to change domestic policy to adapt to new technologies without having to worry about this agreement.

Even without the Kigali Amendment, the United States has already taken steps to transition away from HFCs, and U.S. businesses have been the ones leading the way. So it is no surprise that groups like the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Chemistry Council, the Air-Conditioning, Heating & Refrigeration Institute, and even companies like Walmart and Honeywell all support the Kigali Amendment.

So in many ways, this is sort of a legislative layup. It is low-hanging fruit to secure billions in growth and tens of thousands of good-paying jobs. Again, there is every reason in the world to say yes and practically no reason to say no.

So for the sake of U.S. businesses, for the sake of U.S. workers, for the sake of U.S. exporters and U.S. investment, and for the sake of leadership in safeguarding our planet, I urge my colleagues to vote yes on ratifying Kigali later today.

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. President, now on DISCLOSE. In the 12 years since conservatives on the Supreme Court ruled in Citizens United, our elections have been become rank—rank—with the stench of dark money.

Soon, the Senate will vote to erase this foulness when we hold the first procedural vote to take up the DISCLOSE Act. This has been a long time coming, and credit goes to Senator WHITEHOUSE, perhaps the Senate's most valiant enemy of dark money. I commend him; I thank him; and I stand with him in his efforts to shine a light on the corrosive power of dark money in our elections. No one has done more to shine the light on this evil, evil thing.

In free and fair elections—one person, one vote—American voters alone should have the power to determine the Nation's leaders without fear that their voices will be drowned out by powerful elites or special interests.

Sadly, unfortunately, dark money has rendered this ideal a fantasy. The idea of one person, one vote has been washed away by cascades of dark, undisclosed money pouring into our electoral system. Today, the average American—someone who might chip in $30 or $50 every now and then to support a candidate—is left practically powerless against billionaires and special interests who can cut million-dollar checks to promote candidates of their choice. Who here thinks that is a healthy democracy?

Because of today's broken campaign finance laws, many of these donations happen entirely in secret. It is a veil cast over our democracy that leaves vast majorities of voters behind.

And the problem is not just limited to our elections. Oh, no. Dark money has also corroded the judicial nomination process, as special interest groups spend tens of millions to push extremist judges onto the Federal Bench.

I believe that the awful decision in Dobbs was greatly affected by the fact that dark money is undisclosed.

The DISCLOSE Act operates off a simple premise: A healthy democracy is a transparent democracy, one where billionaires and mega-corporations don't get a free pass to exploit loopholes in campaign finance law in order to spend billions in anonymous contributions. That is the antithesis of democracy.

This shouldn't be a Democratic or a Republican view. After all, when was the last time any of us heard voters celebrate the spread of dark money? When was the last time any of us heard voters say it is better for billionaires and special interests to buy elections in secret rather than be held accountable to the public?

Of course the public doesn't think that, unless they themselves—a few, few—are cutting million-dollar checks in secret.

Even the Republican leader, who has dedicated much of his career to killing many campaign reforms, used to say in the distant past that disclosure and transparency are good things for elections. Unfortunately, that was a long time ago, and now all we hear from the other side are the absurd—and these are truly absurd—arguments that transparency somehow equates to suppressing freedom of elections. Tying logic and fairness into a pretzel knot to say that transparency is like suppressing freedom of expression is absurd. Imagine. Imagine this. Imagine being on the side of millionaires and billionaires who would no longer have the luxury of influencing our elections by cutting million-dollar checks in total anonymity. What a tragedy. Isn't that a shame? These poor billionaires and millionaires might have to disclose what they are doing.

Of course, of course, imagining being on the side of those millionaires and billionaires is ridiculous. If a multibillionaire wants to spend colossal sums on candidates who are deeply anti-choice or who support insurrectionists—which some of these dark money, special interest, MAGA Republicans do—shouldn't the public have a right at least to know, simply to know it?

If someone wants to come here on the floor and argue otherwise, God help our democracy.

Louis Brandeis said over a century ago that sunlight is the best of disinfectants. The DISCLOSE Act would put that into practice.

So if you agree that the American people have a right to know who is trying to influence their elections, support the DISCLOSE Act. If you agree that America's representatives should only have one boss, the people, and not special interests, then support the DISCLOSE Act.

Democracy cannot prosper without transparency. Dark money, hidden secrets are the hallmark of dictatorships, left and right. We, in democracy, need transparency.

I thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for all he has done. I strongly support passing this legislation to keep the dream of our Founders alive—alive—in this century.

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 Republican leader is recognized.

INFLATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on Sunday's edition of ''60 Minutes,'' President Biden made a bizarre attempt to deny the American people's pain from Democrats' runaway inflation. After the latest nationwide data reported that consumer prices are rising at 8.3 percent year-on-year, the President suggested the country should

be celebrating that they weren't rising even faster.

Working Americans aren't buying that insulting spin. Middle-class families aren't rejoicing that their daily life costs 8.3 percent more than it did a year ago and—listen to this—13.2 percent more than when President Biden took office.

In Parma, OH, one local grocer is working hard to keep her prices competitive but admits that ''[w]e have been getting hit with all of our suppliers with chicken, ground meat, everything.''

And in Fairfield County, the head of one organization that helps feed folks experiencing economic hardship put it this way:

I think things are going to get a whole lot darker and more bleak before they get a lot better. We're desperately worried about food.

Across the border in West Virginia, in Fayette County, persistent high prices have one retired grandmother worried about how the rest of her family is making ends meet.

She said:

I'm already stressed and stressed and trying to figure out how [my daughter is] going to pay to keep the lights on, get groceries, get school clothes on her kid's back.

In Perryopolis, PA, one shopper told a reporter that besides cutting back at the grocery store, she had taken on a second job of working nights at a warehouse to help feed her family of four.

This is what she had to say:

Clothing, gas, just about everything has gone up, and food is a large part of it.

Meanwhile, the head of a small manufacturer in Big Bend, WI, reports that amid price spikes and backed-up supply chains, ''trying to source products has been very difficult.''

In each of these States' cases—West Virginia, Ohio, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania—one Senator tried to spare working families from all of this preventable pain. Each of those States has one Republican Senator who warned about inflation, who voted against inflation, and who voted for amendments that would have reduced inflation.

But, unfortunately, each one of those States also has a Democratic Senator who decided to vote in partisan lockstep to plow ahead with the trillions of dollars in reckless, inflationary spending. One Senator each from West Virginia, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin cast the tie-breaking votes to bring this pain down on their citizens' heads. Now, sadly, they are all paying the price.

Working families in West Virginia are paying Washington Democrats' inflation tax to the tune of an extra $563 a month. Ohioans are paying $661 more. In Pennsylvania, inflation is squeezing folks for an extra $605; and in Wisconsin, it is $673. Families in these States are paying a painful price for the deciding vote that their Democratic Senators chose to cast.

ENERGY

Now, Mr. President, on a related matter, Democrats' runaway inflation includes skyrocketing costs to keep the lights on and to heat or cool homes.

We are also witnessing the dangerous vulnerabilities that Democrats in places like California have built into their electrical grids. California Democrats have spent years putting ''green'' lifestyle preferences ahead of the basic needs of working families. The result is a grid that is both more expensive and less reliable. We have seen the same California Democrats, who have spent years pushing their citizens to buy expensive electric cars, now begging the public not to plug them in.

Even as California teeters on the brink of an energy crisis of European proportions, Washington Democrats are pushing the rest of the country in that very same risky direction. They made their signature priority for this year spending even more of the people's money to take us even farther in the wrong direction even faster.

Last month, our Democratic colleagues rammed through a gigantic party-line bill that raises taxes on reliable domestic American energy in order to subsidize wealthy people buying electric cars or fancy, new appliances. Every Democratic Senator cast the deciding vote for that reckless spending spree.

That includes the senior Senator from West Virginia, who claims he only did so because the Democratic leader promised him that Democrats would line up behind permitting reform to make it easier to build things and complete projects in our country. But now, very predictably, this backroom deal is crumbling before our eyes. Almost 60 days after our colleague from West Virginia gave up his vote for this vague promise, it still appears the far left and House Democrats want no part of his backroom deal they didn't sign on to.

As for the Republican side, our colleague Senator CAPITO has put forward a real, actual, substantive permitting reform bill that would make the commonsense changes our country needs. Senator CAPITO's substantive bill stands in stark contrast to what every indication thus far suggests will be weak, reform-in-name-only legislation from her home State colleague.

As luck would have it, Senator CAPITO's real plan is also closer to passing the Senate than Senator MANCHIN's reform-in-name-only plan. Senator MANCHIN recently told reporters that his version may need 20 Republican votes to become law, but Senator CAPITO's plan only needs Senator MANCHIN and nine other Democrats to get on board. We are talking about real, substantive reform that is already closer to becoming law. But so far, our Democratic colleague from West Virginia has refused to back his colleague's commonsense proposal. He has shown little appetite to actually get something accomplished.

So talk is cheap. If our colleagues across the aisle want real permitting reform, Senator CAPITO's fantastic bill only needs Senator MANCHIN plus nine more Democrats to clear this Chamber. Otherwise, it would appear the senior Senator from West Virginia traded his vote on a massive liberal boondoggle in exchange for nothing.

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. President, on one final matter, finally, with all of these national crises hammering families, the Democratic majority is using the Senate schedule to demonstrate that they do not care.

The Democratic leader is not spending floor time on a bill to combat Democrats' inflation crisis or their immigration crisis or their violent crime crisis or their energy crisis, not on legislation to help American families' daily lives in any way. Instead, the Democratic leader is setting up a vote on a bill to erode the First Amendment and make political speech more difficult. Instead of trying to address the root causes of their unpopularity, Democrats are attacking the American people's ability to speak out against them.

The Democrats try to ram through political takeover bills like this zombie DISCLOSE Act once or twice every year. This legislation would give Democrats' friends in the unelected bureaucracy even more power to police the political speech and activism of private citizens.

Remember, donations to political action committees and electioneering nonprofits are already publicly disclosed. That is already the law. What Democrats want is a huge, new step that would reduce private citizens' privacy and chill Americans' constitutional rights. The same Democrats who wouldn't condemn angry mobs gathering outside the private family homes of Federal judges now believe that vastly more information about private citizens' political views should be made public.

It is no mystery as to how these things fit together. Even the liberal ACLU warned years ago that what the Democrats want to pull off ''unconstitutionally infringes on freedom of speech and the right to associational privacy.''

I don't often say the ACLU has it right, but they do here.

Instead of addressing the reasons why Americans are upset with Democrats, the Democrats are trying to legislate our citizens into sitting down and shutting up.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

ABORTION

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, in the months since the conservative majority on the Supreme Court struck down Roe v. Wade, the assault on reproductive rights by anti-choice, MAGA Republicans has been relentless.

Anti-choice States across the country have already enacted strict and rigid abortion bans that strip our rights away, threaten to jail women and their doctors, and put women's

health at risk. And just as we have always known, this threat is not just at the State level.

Last week, legislation was introduced in this very Chamber that would enact a national abortion ban, one that would strip women of the fundamental right to control their own bodies. This abortion ban—and that is exactly what it is, a nationwide abortion ban—poses a real and serious threat to the rights of women across this country. This is a dangerous nationwide government mandate that would threaten women and their doctors—threaten them—with jail time, including those in my State of Nevada.

Pro-choice States like Nevada, where the people voted overwhelmingly to protect reproductive freedoms as part of State law, would be forced—forced—to abide by this Federal mandate. Because Federal law supersedes State law, this legislation would override the will of Nevadans and the freedom—the freedom—that they have had for decades.

If anti-choice Republicans in Congress have their way and their national abortion ban passes—listen to this—then Nevada's doctors could be prosecuted; Nevada's women could be jailed; and Nevada's women could die as a result of a lack of access to care.

So let's be clear. The only thing standing in the way of their national abortion ban is the pro-choice majority in the U.S. Senate, and I will do everything I can to fight this legislation threatening our reproductive rights not just in Nevada but across the country.

That is why I helped to introduce the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Health Care Act, along with Senators MURRAY, PADILLA, and the Acting President pro tempore, Senator LUJÁN, to protect doctors in States like Nevada, where abortion remains legal and protects women from facing prosecution and potentially jail by anti-choice States. No doctor—let me repeat this. No doctor should ever be jailed for providing women with the reproductive and often lifesaving care they need wherever these women are from. No doctor should ever be jailed for providing care.

Anti-choice Republicans in the Senate have blocked these efforts in the past as they have continued to push for dangerous bans.

Today—today—we have another opportunity to protect doctors and their patients by passing this legislation—without obstruction or delay—because let's be clear: We will not—we will not—give up. We will not allow a national abortion ban to pass the Senate. We will not allow doctors to face prosecution for doing their jobs. We must—we must—protect a woman's right to choose and continue fighting against this ban every step of the way.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Republican whip.

INFLATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, on Sunday, the President appeared on ''60 minutes,'' where he was asked what he was going to do to help alleviate inflation in light of August's continued grim inflation news and the resulting stock market nosedive.

The President's response?

Well, first of all, let's put this in perspective. Inflation rate month to month was just—just an inch, hardly at all.

''Let's put this in perspective''? That might be something to say if the inflation rate had ticked up from, say, 2 percent—the target inflation rate—to 2.1 percent, but I am pretty sure that that is not the appropriate thing to say when you are talking about the sixth straight month of inflation above 8 percent and the ninth straight month of inflation at or above 7 percent and the 11th straight month of inflation above 6 percent.

Even more concerning than August's consumer price index rising 8.3 percent from the same month a year ago was the increase in core inflation—a measure of inflation minus the volatile categories of food and energy. This measure increased to 6.3 percent in August, up from 5.9 percent in both June and July, suggesting that inflation is sinking its roots even deeper into various sectors of our economy—or in the words of a CNBC headline from last week:

Inflation isn't just about fuel costs anymore, as price increases broaden across the economy.

But, of course, you don't have to take my word for it about the mess that we are in. Here is what one of President Obama's top economic advisers had to say last week after August's inflation numbers came out:

Today's CPI report confirms that the US has a serious inflation problem. Core inflation is higher this month than for the quarter, higher this quarter than last quarter, higher this half of the year than the previous one, and higher last year than the previous one.

''Let's put this in perspective.'' That is what President Biden had to say? Here is the American people's perspective: Fifty-seven percent of Americans disapprove of President Biden's handling of the economy, and 37 percent of voters say that President Biden's policies have hurt them personally, versus just 15 percent of voters who say his policies have helped them.

These numbers are no surprise. The President may somehow still believe that he is creating an economy that will ''work for working families,'' but the reality is that, in the Biden economy, working Americans are suffering. Americans' utility bills are soaring; their grocery bills have ballooned; and they are paying $1.30 more per gallon every time they fill up their car than they were when President Biden was elected. Real wages have dropped every single month since Democrats passed their $1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan spending spree—the bill, I would add, that helped plunged our economy into our current crisis. And 40 percent of Americans report having difficulty paying for their normal household expenses. Americans are dipping into their savings or working side jobs to make ends meet. They are charging more day-to-day expenses on their credit cards. In too many cases, they are having to visit food banks, which are seeing huge lines thanks to continued high inflation. What are Democrats and the President doing about this? Nothing.

Of course, last month, Democrats did pass a bill they called the Inflation Reduction Act. The problem? The bill will do nothing to reduce inflation—nothing. Again, you don't have to take my word for it. The nonpartisan Penn Wharton Budget Model said this about the bill's impact on inflation:

The impact on inflation is statistically indistinguishable from zero.

''[S]tatistically indistinguishable from zero.''

Or you could take the word of the Democrat chairman of the Budget Committee, who admitted right here on the Senate floor that the so-called Inflation Reduction Act would not reduce inflation.

But it is not just that Democrats have done nothing to help solve our inflation crisis; they are also on track to make Americans' economic situation significantly worse.

In August, President Biden announced a massive student loan giveaway that could cost anywhere from an estimated $500 billion to more than $1 trillion and that the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget notes would ''meaningfully boost inflation.'' This is a statement from the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget talking about the President's massive student loan giveaway, and they say it will ''meaningfully boost inflation'' or, as the president of the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget recently put it, ''Amid 40-year-high inflation and despite the administration constantly touting its 'fiscal responsibility,' these changes will recklessly add to the debt and make the Federal Reserve's job in fighting inflation even harder, which will amplify our risk of entering a recession.''

Many of us would argue we are already in a recession—two consecutive quarters of negative GDP growth.

Inflation has spent 8 straight months at 40-year highs, and the President has decided that now is a good time to implement a policy that will ''meaningfully boost inflation.''

The economy continues to show signs of weakening, driven in large part by the inflation crisis Democrats helped create. Major companies have recently announced job cuts. Sixty-three percent of small businesses are putting a hold on hiring, and 10 percent of those are cutting jobs. We have had negative economic growth, as I mentioned, for the past two quarters. So naturally—naturally—Democrats decided this was

a good time to raise taxes on businesses. Yes, Democrats' so-called Inflation Reduction Act imposes new taxes on businesses to help pay for their Green New Deal spending.

I say ''taxes on businesses,'' but, of course, taxes on businesses largely fall on workers and consumers in the form of fewer jobs and opportunities, lower wages, and higher prices—in other words, pretty much the exact opposite of what we need right now, with prices soaring and wages failing to keep pace with inflation.

The Inflation Reduction Act also imposes new taxes on energy that will drive up energy prices for both American families and American businesses, imposing further pain on family budgets and likely prolonging our inflation crisis even further.

The President may have wanted to build an economy ''from the bottom up and the middle out,'' as he has described it; instead, he and his fellow Democrats have helped create an economy in which working families are struggling to make it from one paycheck to the next. And thanks to the additional tax-and-spend policies the Democrats have recently implemented, working families are likely to be struggling for some time to come.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Washington.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4723

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, last week, Republicans made clear that despite the clear outcry from people across the country, overturning Roe was just their first step. Republicans want a national abortion ban. Republicans want to force my constituents to stay pregnant even when they do not want to be and to go after the doctors who provide abortion care.

I am here today to continue to say in no uncertain terms that Democrats are not going to stand for it. While Republicans are busy threatening the rights of women in every State across the country and threatening doctors with jail time, Democrats are here to defend abortion rights and defend the doctors who provide that care, because even before Republicans dropped their national abortion ban bill, I was hearing from providers in my home State of Washington who are facing a huge influx of patients due to Republicans' extreme bans.

Just yesterday, the Texas Tribune shared the heartbreaking story of a woman who learned that the pregnancy she had wanted so badly was incompatible with life, that her daughter was developing without a skull or brain. But because Republicans in Texas think they know better than this woman or her doctor, she had to travel for treatment from Dallas all the way to Seattle to get the care she needed.

Providers on the ground in my State tell me there are so many more patients being forced to make a trek like that. They are worried about caring for them, and not just because it is for so many more patients, not just because Republicans are straining resources and causing a healthcare crisis that puts women's lives at risk; healthcare professionals are also deeply worried about how Republicans' extreme laws threaten their practices. They are terrified Republicans will take away their livelihoods and even their freedom just for doing their jobs, just for providing the care their patients need—care that is, once again, completely legal in my State.

They are right to be scared. When it comes to Republicans' extreme, no-holds-barred anti-abortion agenda, the writing is on the wall, and it has been for some time. Even before this latest bill, Republican State lawmakers were already drafting legislation that would make it a crime to provide abortion care to a resident even in another State where it is legal, and they were doing this while at the same time trying to claim they didn't want to throw doctors in prison.

On top of all of that, they were standing in the way of the bill I will offer today to protect healthcare providers. This is a really straightforward bill. It simply protects doctors providing legal abortion care.

The last time I tried to pass it, the junior Senator from Indiana said he was concerned about this bill ''allowing abortions for anyone who crosses the State lines and is not a resident of that State.'' In other words, Republicans are worried about all the patients I mentioned earlier who are traveling to Washington State seeking abortion care that they urgently need. Republicans don't think they should be able to travel to Washington State to get healthcare, and they want to allow other States to target Washington State doctors, to threaten them for providing legal abortion care.

That is extreme. It is not what doctors want, and it is definitely not what the American people want. Women and men across the country do not want politicians making their healthcare decisions and throwing their doctors in prison. They want to be able to make their own decisions about their own bodies, their own families, their own future. They want doctors to be able to focus on doing their jobs, not fearing a jail sentence.

So I urge my Republican colleagues to step aside and allow us to pass the Let Doctors Provide Reproductive Health Care Act. This legislation is so straightforward. It protects doctors providing legal abortion care, and it ensures that they can practice medicine and save lives without fear of legal threats and intimidation. It makes clear that the attacks we have seen on doctors are unacceptable and that politicians should not be harassing or scaring or investigating, threatening, or punishing doctors for providing care that is perfectly legal, that patients want, and that in many cases is even necessary to save lives.

If Republicans have been doing what I have been doing, if they have been actually listening to doctors and patients, then they should reverse course and let us get this commonsense bill passed. But if they continue blocking these steps, if they continue ignoring the outcry from every corner of the country, if they continue to undermine the health of patients seeking care and the freedom of healthcare providers doing their jobs, they should know we are not going to stop pushing back. There is too much at stake.

So, Mr. President, as if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. 4723; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BRAUN. Mr. President, reserving the right object, I am glad the Supreme Court has returned the issue of life back to the people's elected representatives, where it should have stayed 49 years ago.

This legislation denies State representatives the right to make laws protecting life. This bill is an attempt to undermine State laws that protect life by allowing abortions for anyone who crosses State lines and is not a resident of the State.

Moreover, it gives the Department of Justice $40 million in grant funding to help people sue States—to help people sue States—that enact policies to protect life. The Department of Health and Human Services is given another $40 million in funding for any eligible center at Secretary Becerra's discretion. This funding is not protected by the Hyde amendment, and most likely, we are going to borrow every penny of it, like we do for most things in this place. We should not spend $80 million to undermine State laws on life or impose a legislative backdoor for abortion-on-demand across our Nation.

For these reasons, I oppose this bill, and I do object.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I am deeply disappointed. I am not surprised. We continue to see Republicans show their true, harsh colors, and the contrast with Democrats could not be more stark.

We simply want people to get the healthcare they need and let them make their own medical decisions. Republicans want to ban abortion nationwide. We want to protect doctors. Republicans want to threaten and penalize or even jail them just for doing their job, even when they are following their State's laws.

Mr. President, rest assured, I will continue speaking up for our healthcare providers, for families, for patients. And as we continue to see

this extremism, I want to assure everybody that I am not going to stop fighting.

Mr. President, someone should be allowed to travel out of their own State to get the healthcare they need. It is unbelievable that the Republicans block this bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. 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.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to oppose the Kigali Amendment. That is the United Nations treaty that is under consideration in this body today.

Two years ago, this body, the U.S. Senate, passed a bipartisan bill. The goal of the bill was to reduce hydrofluorocarbons, or HFCs, and do it domestically. We passed it. It was signed into law.

Now, these HFCs are gases that are used in refrigerators, air-conditioners, fire extinguishers, and in insulation. They also contribute significantly to greenhouse gas emissions.

So I worked in a bipartisan way to build a coalition of Senators to pass the bill. Two years later, here we are; the law is now in effect in the United States. Parts of the law are still being implemented. Yet, now, today, we are being asked to sign on to treaty obligations at the United Nations that I believe are wholly unnecessary.

We have already passed bipartisan legislation to reduce HFC consumption, and it has already become the law of the land. Many of the benefits and the jobs that are being touted are U.S. innovations, and it is the result of our domestic legislation, not ratification of some U.N. treaty. We did it here. We did it right.

I say we don't need to get entangled now in another United Nations treaty. Our own law can be amended if we would like. It can be repealed. It can be replaced. Depending on the impact and cost, the United States can make changes quickly. It is much harder, if not impossible, to do it with an international treaty. In fact, when you take a look at the Kigali treaty and amendment, there is actually no way to withdraw from it if we ratify and join in.

When I take a look at this, it is especially bad because it doubles down on the practice of treating China—yes, China—as a developing country. And the key word here is ''developing.'' China is not a developing country, but this treaty says they are a developing country, and it makes a big difference in terms of the treaty and the way that China is treated internationally because it gives China special treatment.

And I will tell you, Mr. President, they don't deserve the kind of treatment that they would get with this. Under this treaty, China would get an extra 10 years—an extra decade—to produce HFCs. Well, this places us, the United States, at a competitive disadvantage to China for 10 additional years.

Interestingly and, I think, surprisingly to people when they hear this, the United States would also be expected to give more American taxpayer dollars to a U.N.—United Nations—multilateral fund that is set aside to help developing nations. The key word here again is ''developing.'' And they want to treat China like a developing country. So it would send more U.S. dollars to China because they have access to this U.N. multilateral fund.

Well, the United States is already the largest contributor to this fund. We have given over 1 billion of American taxpayer dollars to this United Nations so-called—it is a slush fund.

But what about China? Do they contribute? Oh, no, China has actually taken $1.4 billion out of the fund that we have contributed to because we are a developed nation and China is still, theoretically and legally, by this treaty, developing.

When you take a look at the debt that we have as a nation and you go and talk to any high school class or any junior high school class, as I have done in Wyoming—we did it in Wheatland, WY, with a bunch of really smart kids—they say: OK, when we have this debt, who are we borrowing the money from?

Do you know what they say? Oh, we are borrowing it from China.

So we borrow from China to give to the Multilateral Fund under this Montreal Protocol. And what happens then? The Fund gives it to China. The United States borrows from China. We give it to the United Nations. The United Nations gives it to China. So we are further in debt to China. This makes zero sense. Even to the high school kids it makes zero sense.

With ratification of the Kigali Amendment to the U.N. treaty, more and more American taxpayer dollars will be going to communist China.

Now, this is happening despite the fact that everyone knows that China is not a developing country and shouldn't be labeled as a developing country or be treated as a developing country. China is the second largest economy in the world. China is our greatest economic and geopolitical rival.

The United States should not let China play by a special set of rules that is designed to give a helping hand to truly developing nations. China doesn't fit. But this is exactly what is outlined in the Kigali Amendment. And that is why I have filed at the desk an amendment to what is being discussed on the floor of the Senate today. My amendment says the United States will not ratify this treaty until China is defined, rightly, as a developed country—not a developing country but a developed country—because they truly are. No special treatment for China, period. Everyone should stand up for that in this body, each and every Member.

So Senators have some decisions to make: Are you going to vote to allow China to play by a whole different set of rules? Are we going to put America at a competitive disadvantage? Are we going to vote to continue to give American taxpayer dollars to China?

Now, Members and my colleagues and friends on the other side of the aisle say: Oh, it is not about China. This is about HFC, the chemicals involved. Again, we have already passed bipartisan legislation to reduce HFCs. The law is still going into effect. There is no excuse for any Senator to give China a handout at the expense of the American taxpayers and the American hard-working families—no excuse whatsoever.

We should not be outsourcing our environmental policy. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and, once again, say no special treatment for China.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2:30 p.m. today, Wednesday, September 21, all postcloture time in relation to Treaty Document No. 117–1 be considered expired; that the Schumer amendment No. 5503 be withdrawn; that the Sullivan-Lee amendment No. 5518 be the only amendment in order to the resolution of ratification and the Senate vote on adoption of the amendment; that upon disposition of the Sullivan-Lee amendment, the Senate vote on adoption of the resolution of ratification, as amended, if amended, all without intervening action or debate; further, that upon disposition of the treaty, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Bennett nomination and that at 5:30 p.m. the Senate vote on the motions to invoke cloture on the Bennett and Prabhakar nominations in the order listed; that if cloture is invoked on either of the nominations, the confirmation votes be at a time to be determined by the majority leader in consultation with the Republican leader; further, that the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 484, S. 4822, be at 11:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 22.

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

The Senator from Alaska.

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, there has been much made in the Biden administration about the value of diversity, and I agree that having diversity in any organization is positive. You get different viewpoints. But diversity encompasses much more than race or gender or religious orientation. Those are all important. Diversity actually means having people around you with varied experiences. As I mentioned, in my mind, that is certainly important, but it is particularly important in the Oval Office, particularly important in the White House. It is particularly important in the leadership of our Federal Government.

Let's take the example of military experience in this administration. You would think the Biden administration would think it is important to have members in his Cabinet or senior White House officials who have served in the military. After all, he is the Commander in Chief, a very important part of his responsibilities. But, in fact, virtually no one in this administration, with the exception of Secretary Austin, at the highest levels—Cabinet officials, senior White House officials—have any significant military experience at all.

Why does this matter? The President doesn't have it, of course. His Secretary of the VA, Chief of Staff, National Security Advisor—just go down the list. Nobody has any experience.

In the Federal Government of the United States, why does this matter? It matters because it is obvious by the people this President surrounds himself—the people who are giving him advice on big decisions for America—that this President doesn't prioritize military, our national defense, and our troops and their families. This manifests itself in many, many ways.

First, most importantly, it matters in how we fund our national defense. I was on the floor last week, speaking about this very topic. This is President Biden's first budget. You can see this here, what he proposed. It has the increases through every Federal Agency. This was a multitrillion-dollar budget. And it says this is what we are prioritizing as the Biden administration. You can see, heck, double-digits. That is Education and Commerce. And EPA is over 20 percent, and Interior over 15 percent—on and on and on, all the green. It is just a massive expansion of Federal Agencies, except two Agencies: Department of Defense and Homeland Security, the two Agencies that actually protect Americans.

If you look to this line of inflation, which when the Biden administration put out their budget last year was about 4.5 percent, these are actual inflation-adjusted real cuts by about 2 to 3 percent to our military. That was the Biden budget not prioritizing our troops, our national security at all. My view is that that is the No. 1 job of this government. It is not the President's view, not his team's view.

In the interim—that was last year's budget—we had a war in Ukraine. We had the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and the Secretary of Defense testify in front of the Armed Services Committee that we are probably seeing the most dangerous time globally in any time in the last 40 years.

So what about the Biden budget this year?

Mr. President, you did it again.

This is actually EPA, a 25-percent increase—wow.

But here we go, all the big double-digit increases. When you get down to the Department of Defense, with now the 9 percent Biden inflation, we are talking a 5-percent real cut to our military. That is not prioritizing our military.

You are starting to see how this inflation and other things are really impacting our troops. The Army, last week, in an article, suggested that the American military members who are having trouble making ends meet because of high levels of inflation should go on food stamps. You heard that correct. We are going to give the EPA a 25-percent raise. We are going to cut defense spending by a 5-percent real cut, and if you are a soldier struggling because of high inflation to actually put food on the table, you can go get food stamps. That is the perfect example of not prioritizing our military.

I want to unpack this further. The Army is saying that, if our troops don't have enough food to eat, they should look at going on food stamps. But the President finds it absolutely essential to forgive $560 billion in student loan debt just a couple of weeks ago. Who are the preponderance of Americans who will benefit from that lawless bailout? High-earning Americans, the elite—White House staffers, certainly. They are going to get a half-trillion-dollar bailout, and our troops are being told to go on food stamps. This should shock every single American.

So we know the President and his team don't prioritize the military. Look at these budgets or our troops or our national security. But that doesn't mean they don't find the military useful. I am going to put up a picture of a recent speech that, I will tell you, every time I look at it, my blood boils, and so should every American's blood boil.

It is this picture.

Now, every President gives partisan speeches. Now, I don't think it is wise for every President to give the kind of partisan speech that President Biden gave on September 1 in Philadelphia in which he vilified millions, tens of millions of his fellow Americans who don't agree with his administration's policies. Some of you may have seen that speech. The President told the country that many of his fellow Americans, all of whom are Republican, don't ''respect the Constitution,'' are ''destroying American democracy.'' He gave this speech against a blood-red backdrop, fists clenched—look at him—yelling that millions of his fellow Americans embrace anger—while he embraced anger in his speech—and chaos. This President who continually issues lawless Executive orders, like shutting down the ANWR in my State, his half-a-trillion-dollar student loan bailout, then says that Republicans are ''against the rule of law.'' He went on and on—the insults, very partisan, somewhat deranged, attacking tens of millions of his fellow Americans.

Now, look, Presidents do that. I don't think it is a good idea. But here is the thing about this speech: To make matters worse—look at this—he did all this, a clearly partisan speech, while being flanked by two Active-Duty marines as his political props. Look at that. Look at that—in my view, a sickening abuse of authority from a Commander in Chief who has never served in the military—I think he got five Vietnam deferments—and knows nothing about the Marine Corps' ethos of honor, courage, commitment.

Remember when General Milley, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs—and was Chairman under President Trump as well—released a video where he apologized for standing beside the President, then-President Trump, when that could have been perceived as political.

This is what General Milley said:

> I should not have been there. My presence in that moment and in that environment created a perception of the military [being] involved in domestic politics.

I thought that was a good speech by General Milley. He made a mistake; he apologized; and that was the right thing to do.

This is much worse. This is much worse. These marines, unlike General Milley, they are being ordered to stand next to the President of the United States while he rants against millions of his own fellow Americans.

The President certainly didn't apologize for this speech. In fact, when criticized by both Democrats and Republicans for the politicization of the military with these marines propped up next to him, the Biden administration actually doubled down in terms of their use of these two Active-Duty marines as political props in a very partisan speech.

Here is what the spokesperson at the White House said:

> The presence of [the] Marines at [that] speech was intended to demonstrate the deep and abiding respect the President has for [these servicemembers] . . . [for] the ideals and the unique role our independent military plays in defending our democracy, no matter who is in power.

This is Orwellian doublespeak. What a bunch of nonsense.

Here is the fact: The presence of these marines was meant to politicize the President's speech and politically benefit from the honor and respect the few and the proud have earned in the hearts of Americans over decades, over millennium. This should disturb every single American, whether you are Democrat or Republican. This was just wrong.

Let me provide another example of the politicization of our military by

the Biden administration. Now, this is something that hasn't gotten a lot of attention. Some people were like, hey, it wasn't a really big deal. I actually think it was a big deal.

We have some of the best service academies in the world. They are the best in the world—the U.S. Naval Academy, West Point, Air Force Academy, Coast Guard Academy. Each of our military service academies has board members, some of whom are appointed by the President of the United States for 3-year terms.

Now, I am honored to serve on the U.S. Naval Academy Board. I was appointed as a member of the Armed Services Committee. Here is the tradition in our country that every single President has abided by: When they come into office, they let the Board members finish out their terms. So, for example, when President Trump was elected, the Obama administration officials, who were President Obama's appointees, finished out the terms on the Naval Academy Board, the West Point Board, and the Air Force Academy Board. That is what we do.

The point is not to politicize the service academies. That has always been the tradition, every single President—except for Joe Biden. When President Biden came into office, he looked at West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, and somebody said to him ''You know what, Mr. President, let's fire all the Trump appointees. Let's fire them right now, all 18 of them'' to clearly politicize the service academies of America. So that is what they did—something that had never been done before by any President in the history of the country—and they did it regardless of qualifications of the current members serving on these boards. Let me give you some examples.

Retired Army LTG H.R. McMaster was fired off the West Point Board. Ironically, the same day he was fired by President Biden's White House, he was honored by the West Point Association of Graduates as the distinguished graduate of the year of West Point. So one President fires him, and West Point gives him a great honor. GEN Jack Keane, a former Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, was fired from the West Point Board; retired Army COL Douglas Macgregor; an Afghanistan war veteran, clinical psychologist Meaghan Mobbs; a Bronze Star recipient and businessman, David Urban; a retired Army lieutenant general, Guy Swan—18 qualified people, all fired.

The politicization of the service academies of America was undertaken by this administration—the first President, the first White House ever to do it, all fired by Joe Biden and not allowed to fulfill their terms.

Of course, the Biden administration loves to use our military to push other agendas that have nothing to do with lethality in winning our Nation's wars—many, many examples. Let me give you just a couple. From the beginning, issuing Executive orders not focused on how we have a stronger military but using taxpayer dollars to establish a committee within the Pentagon to do what ended up being witch hunts on so-called extremists in the military, of which—when they came back with their report, they said they had actions of .005 percent. They also issued Executive orders to use taxpayer dollars to mandate transgender transition surgeries for Active-Duty soldiers. Importantly, they become nondeployable when that happens.

So back to my original point, no one in senior positions in the White House or the Cabinet—with the exception of Secretary Austin—has significant military experience, and on so many of these issues, there is no adult in the room.

Think about these White House conversations where they are talking about, hey, let's cut the defense budget, and we will grow the EPA by 25 percent. Well, that is a great idea, Mr. President. Let's make sure we give a partisan speech at Independence Hall, and, oh yeah, let's grab a couple Active-Duty marines to stand right next to the President as his props. That is a great idea, Mr. President. Let's come in and politicize the service academies and fire all the Trump administration appointees—even American heroes like H.R. McMaster, General Keane—despite the fact that no President had ever done that before. Great idea, Mr. President.

This is really problematic, what we are seeing right now, and that lack of prioritization extends here in the U.S. Senate, unfortunately, as it relates to our military.

As we know with regard to defense budget cuts, in the 2020 NDAA, we had a debate right here on the Senate floor where my colleague the junior Senator from Vermont proposed an amendment to dramatically cut our military, almost by 15 percent, across-the-board cuts. He even actually wrote an op-ed in POLITICO. Remember, this is when Democrats were pushing to defund the police. Here is the op-ed. It is actually called ''Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.''

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the op-ed ''Defund the Pentagon: The Liberal Case.''

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

DEFUND THE PENTAGON: THE LIBERAL CASE

(By Senator Bernie Sanders)

Fifty-three years ago Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. challenged all of us to fight against three major evils: ''the evil of racism, the evil of poverty and the evil of war.'' If there was ever a moment in American history when we needed to respond to Dr. King's clarion call for justice and demand a ''radical revolution of values,'' now is that time.

Whether it is fighting against systemic racism and police brutality, defeating the deadliest pandemic in more than a hundred years, or putting an end to the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression, now is the time to fundamentally change our national priorities.

Sadly, instead of responding to any of these unprecedented crises, the Republican Senate is on a two-week vacation. When it comes back, its first order of business will be to pass a military spending authorization that would give the bloated Pentagon $740 billion—an increase of more than $100 billion since Donald Trump became president.

Let's be clear: As coronavirus infections, hospitalizations and deaths are surging to record levels in states across America, and the lifeline of unemployment benefits keeping 30 million people afloat expires at the end of the month, the Republican Senate has decided to provide more funding for the Pentagon than the next 11 nations' military budgets combined.

Under this legislation, over half of our discretionary budget would go to the Department of Defense at a time when tens of millions of Americans are food insecure and over a half-million Americans are sleeping out on the street. After adjusting for inflation, this bill would spend more money on the Pentagon than we did during the height of the Vietnam War even as up to 22 million Americans are in danger of being evicted from their homes and health workers are still forced to reuse masks, gloves and gowns.

Moreover, this extraordinary level of military spending comes at a time when the Department of Defense is the only agency of our federal government that has not been able to pass an independent audit, when defense contractors are making enormous profits while paying their CEOs outrageous compensation packages, and when the so-called War on Terror will cost some $6 trillion.

Let us never forget what Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower, a former four-star general, said in 1953: ''Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.''

What Eisenhower said was true 67 years ago, and it is true today.

If the horrific pandemic we are now experiencing has taught us anything it is that national security means a lot more than building bombs, missiles, nuclear warheads and other weapons of mass destruction. National security also means doing everything we can to improve the lives of tens of millions of people living in desperation who have been abandoned by our government decade after decade.

That is why I have introduced an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act that the Senate will be voting on during the week of July 20th, and the House will follow suit with a companion effort led by Representatives Mark Pocan (D–Wis.) and Barbara Lee (D–Calif.). Our amendment would reduce the military budget by 10 percent and use that $74 billion in savings to invest in communities that have been ravaged by extreme poverty, mass incarceration, decades of neglect and the Covid–19 pandemic.

Under this amendment, distressed cities and towns in every state in the country would be able to use these funds to create jobs by building affordable housing, schools, childcare facilities, community health centers, public hospitals, libraries and clean drinking water facilities. These communities would also receive federal funding to hire more public school teachers, provide nutritious meals to children and parents and offer free tuition at public colleges, universities or trade schools.

This amendment gives my Senate colleagues a fundamental choice to make. They can vote to spend more money on endless wars in the Middle East while failing to provide economic security to millions of people

in the United States. Or they can vote to spend less money on nuclear weapons and cost overruns, and more to rebuild struggling communities in their home states.

In Dr. King's 1967 speech, he warned that ''a nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death.''

He was right. At a time when half of our people are struggling paycheck to paycheck, when over 40 million Americans are living in poverty, and when 87 million lack health insurance or are underinsured, we are approaching spiritual death.

At a time when we have the highest rate of childhood poverty of almost any major country on Earth, and when millions of Americans are in danger of going hungry, we are approaching spiritual death.

At a time when we have no national testing program, no adequate production of protective gear and no commitment to a free vaccine, while remaining the only major country where infections spiral out of control, we are approaching spiritual death.

At a time when over 60,000 Americans die each year because they can't afford to get to a doctor on time, and one out of five Americans can't afford the prescription drugs their doctors prescribe, we are approaching spiritual death.

Now, at this unprecedented moment in American history, it is time to rethink what we value as a society and to fundamentally transform our national priorities. Cutting the military budget by 10 percent and investing that money in human needs is a modest way to begin that process. Let's get it done.

Mr. SULLIVAN. So that was the liberal case, defund the Pentagon. The junior Senator from Vermont wrote that. The majority leader put out a tweet saying he was a proud supporter of the defund the Pentagon amendment. That was right here on the Senate floor.

Of course, there is the National Defense Authorization Act, the No. 1 bill that focuses on national defense for our Nation. That passed out of committee, the Armed Services Committee, in June in a very strong bipartisan vote, 23 to 3. It passed the House in July. We will have pay raises for our troops so the Army doesn't have to tell them go line up for food stamps because they are hungry. And we need to bring it to the floor right here.

So what are we doing? As far as I can tell, the majority leader doesn't want to bring up the Defense Authorization Act until December—December. That is why I joined a letter led by Senator TUBERVILLE, with whom I serve on the Armed Services Committee, signed by 20 of my colleagues, to say to the majority leader: Mr. Majority Leader, we have a dangerous world right now. Bring the NDAA to the floor. It is going to pass. It has great support.

By the way, I know the Democrat Senators feel this way, too, on this topic.

So we need to get this body back to what is important for our country—bolstering our economy, fighting inflation, bringing down energy costs, unleashing American energy, and definitely passing the legislation that funds our military, that provides pay raises for our troops during this very dangerous time.

So I again ask the majority leader to bring the NDAA to the floor. We need it.

I call on the President and his administration—the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief—to truly prioritize our military and their families, and that begins with putting an end to using them in a disgraceful way as political props for your partisan agenda.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). The Senator from Kansas.

ADVANCED AIR MOBILITY COORDINATION AND LEADERSHIP ACT

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, American aviation—something we care about greatly in Kansas but across the country—it is entering a new era of innovation and of growth. Industry and government in this circumstance need to work together to make certain the United States stays competitive and remains the leader in this arena.

In today's technology and research and development, there are unmanned vehicles. They are autonomous. They will be flying passengers and cargo from point to point in the United States.

These vehicles will take off vertically and land vertically, and it is important for us to begin the preparation for that development in our airspace, at our airports, in our communities, and across the country.

Bipartisan legislation, which I have introduced along with Senator SINEMA, the Advanced Air Mobility Coordination and Leadership Act, has been waiting Senate approval for weeks.

This legislation would instruct the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Transportation to lead a working group comprised of members of various government Agencies and the civil aviation industry—a public-private effort.

Their objective would be for them to review the steps needed to mature AAM past its initial operations, ensure a robust domestic supply chain, identify current Federal policies that can be leveraged to advance this industry.

I thank Senator SINEMA for her help in moving this bill forward. It has been approved by the Commerce Committee, and the advocacy groups have been engaged in helping us develop the legislation and helping us work its way through the committee and through the Senate.

I also thank a number of Kansans who have provided information and support for this endeavor.

This legislation is crucial to ensuring the United States remains a leader in the aviation sector for years to come, and I am anxious for it to become law with the President's signature.

Therefore, as if in legislative session, I ask the Chair lay before the Senate the message to accompany S. 516.

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

The bill clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 516) entitled ''An Act to plan for and coordinate efforts to integrate advanced air mobility aircraft into the national airspace system, and for other purposes'' do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, now I move to concur in the House amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that the motion be agreed to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO MONTREAL PROTOCOL (''KIGALI AMENDMENT'')—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I rise today to remind our colleagues of the incredible opportunity that we have before us today—incredible opportunity that we have before us today.

Later today, this body, the U.S. Senate, will have the opportunity to vote to ratify the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol.

What does that mean?

Kigali, as it is affectionately known, is a global treaty to phase down the use of hydrofluorocarbons, also known own at HFCs. For years, HFCs have been widely used as a key component that are called refrigerants, but a key component in modern air conditioners, in refrigerators, and other cooling products. Yet, the United States is already transitioning away from using HFCs. We might want to ask, why?

Well, one reason is that American companies are at the forefront of developing the next generation of coolant technology, the next generation of refrigerants.

This transition away from HFCs is expected to stimulate literally billions of dollars in economic investment in this country—billions of dollars; create tens of thousands of jobs; and significantly increase U.S. exports, all using technology developed in this country—all by using technology developed in this country; putting Americans to work, using technologies developed by Americans.

Now, first, some history on how we got here.

HFCs came about to replace ozone-depleting substances, which created a hole in our ozone layer. I said to some of my colleagues yesterday at a luncheon where we were, Mr. President, that I first remember hearing about the hole in the ozone, I think, when I was in the Navy overseas, and reading about it in Time and Newsweek that I got in the mail while we were deployed and saying: I wonder what this is all about. What could be causing that? It turned out to be a big deal and one that still plays out today in the debate before us as well.

But in 1988, this very body, the U.S. Senate, voted unanimously to ratify the Montreal Protocol, an international agreement to phase out ozone-depleting substances that was negotiated under President Ronald Reagan's leadership.

Since then, the global consumption of ozone-depleting substances has declined by—get this—by 97 percent, while our economy has continued to grow.

Now, that is good news. That is really good news. But, unfortunately, there is some bad news.

The HFCs that have been used for years now to replace the ozone-depleting substances have been found to also be bad for our environment.

So in 2016, the global community got together and amended the Montreal Protocol to also phase down HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons.

This is not the first time we have ratified an amendment to the Montreal Protocol. The Kigali Amendment before us is the fifth amendment to the Montreal Protocol ratified by the United States.

The Kigali Amendment was transmitted to the U.S. Senate on November 16, 2021—almost a year ago—300 days, in fact, ago. Each day that has passed without ratification represents a further delay in supporting American businesses, in supporting American workers, and in growing our economic and national security interests and protecting our economic and national security interests.

Thanks to American innovation, we now have HFC alternatives that are cleaner and more energy efficient than HFCs. And the best part—here is the best part: These cleaner, more efficient HFC alternatives are being manufactured, as I said, right here, right here in the U.S. of A.

In recent years, the American industries' leadership on transitioning away from HFCs created an excellent opportunity for bipartisan action at the Federal level. And to that end, our friend and colleague Senator NEELY KENNEDY and I introduced something called the AIM Act, the bipartisan American Innovation and Manufacturing Act. That was in 2019.

Our bill proposed phasing down HFCs in our country by 85 percent over 15 years—not overnight, not in 1 year, not in 2 or 3 years but phasing down by as much as 85 percent within 15 years, the same timeline as the Kigali Amendment before us.

So 16 Democrats and 16 Republicans joined the AIM Act as cosponsors with Senator KENNEDY and myself. Additionally, a broad coalition of organizations, from the National Association of Manufacturers to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the American Chemistry Council, endorsed our bill, along with a lot of other American companies.

In December 2020, the AIM Act became law under a divided Congress and a Republican administration. It was a bipartisan win—a bipartisan win. It was an American win as well.

Now it is time to build on that success. Now it is time to seize on the opportunity before us and ratify the Kigali Amendment.

The Kigali Amendment is good for our economy. Implementing the AIM Act, paired with ratification, will help generate nearly $40 billion of new growth in investment in the U.S. economy by 2027.

It will also create roughly 150,000 American jobs—150,000 new American jobs—and increase U.S. heating, ventilation, air-conditioning, and refrigeration exports across the world by at least 25 percent over that same time period.

In addition, Kigali ratification is good for consumers. As EPA's data shows us, transitioning away from HFCs means average prices will be lower for consumers—lower for consumers, not higher. Something I think we all support in this body.

Ratifying Kigali will also build on our bipartisan success in the AIM Act by allowing the Federal Government to better protect U.S. companies from illegal dumping and smuggling of HFCs into our country from adversaries like China.

And then, lastly, Kigali ratification will ensure U.S. companies continue to have access to international markets so that modern, efficient, economical air-conditioners and refrigerators across the world will be stamped ''Made in America,'' not ''Made in China.''

So today, we, the U.S. Senate, have an opportunity to make that vision a reality; to build on the decades-long bipartisan record of success from the Montreal Protocol to the passage of the AIM Act a couple of years ago; to show our Nation and to show the world yet another time that bipartisan solutions are lasting solutions. This is a bipartisan solution. This is a bipartisan solution, and it demands bipartisan support.

I hope our colleagues will join Senator KENNEDY and myself and many of our colleagues, and, frankly, a whole ton of businesses across the country and organizations who support what we are doing, and join us in supporting the ratification of the Kigali Amendment.

Let's seize the day or, as we say in Delaware, ''Carper diem. Carper diem.''

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

IRAN

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, tens of thousands of Iranian citizens are taking to the streets in dozens of cities across Iran as we speak. The chant that is echoing across that ancient land is: ''Death to the dictator.'' Yet Joe Biden and the Democrats in Washington would rather make another disastrous deal with the ayatollahs and those who declare ''death to America'' and who are, at this very moment, working to assassinate American citizens on our sovereign soil. Barack Obama's betrayal of the Iranian people during the Green Revolution is replaying before our very eyes.

The latest revolt against the ayatollahs was inspired by yet another reprehensible crime by this theocratic dictatorial regime against its own people.

Last week, the ayatollahs' thugs, known as the morality police, arrested a 22-year-old woman on the street for the heinous crime of allegedly not wearing a head scarf in public. They threw her into a police van; they brutally beat her on the way to the detention center; they inflicted terrible injuries on her, from which she soon died.

Countless Iranians were immediately horrified by this cold-blooded murder and are now taking to the streets to protest their illegitimate outlaw regime. They are burning hijabs and protesting the oppression under which they have suffered every day for 43 years. In the murder of this young woman, we see the true face of the ayatollahs, a regime which our President hopes to enrich with hundreds of billions of dollars and to appease with yet another terrible nuclear deal. In fact, just minutes ago, President Biden stood before the world at the U.N. General Assembly, stating at great length that he would continue negotiations toward this dangerous deal while offering only the briefest and emptiest of words to reproach the ayatollahs for the murder of this young woman for the grave crime of refusing to wear a headscarf in public and only the briefest of words for the thousands of protesters—at latest reports, seven of which have been murdered and many more shot and beaten—I would say this does feel a lot like deja vu, a replay of Barack Obama's betrayal of the 2009 Green revolutionaries. And why did he betray them in 2009? Was he caught flatfooted? Was he overwhelmed by events? Was he simply new to the job? naive? even incompetent? No. He betrayed those Green revolutionaries in cold blood because his one overriding objective was his terrible nuclear deal with Iran.

He wanted a deal because he believed America was to blame for the decades of tension and conflicts with Iran; that America had sinned and we needed to atone for our sins against Iran and to pull in our horns; and therefore he stood idly by so as not to offend the mullahs and their street militias as they beat the Iranian people.

And, today, for the very same reason, Democrats are once again selling out those brave Iranian protesters so they can once again try to buy the friendship of the oppressive ayatollahs. The U.S. Congress should stand with the Iranian people and prevent another betrayal by a Democratic President. And

you wouldn't think it would be that hard. I mean, on face value, you would think self-professed progressive Democrats would stand up as one against a so-called morality police who arrested a woman for the grave crime of not wearing a scarf over her hair in public and then beat her so severely that she died in custody.

Imagine what would happen if this had occurred in, say, Saudi Arabia. Imagine what these Democrats would be saying if a country in Western Europe enforced its laws in this way. You would expect that Democrats could marshal just a tiny bit of outrage—the tiniest bit of outrage possible when the ayatollahs arrest a woman for not wearing a headscarf in public and then beat her to death. But, no, they don't.

And to be honest, you don't even have to imagine these things either. We see how the Democrats have treated Iran for 13 years—as if America is at fault and we are the problem and Iran deserves an apology and hundreds of billions of dollars and to be brought into the civilized world. Look at how they treated Saudi Arabia as a pariah for years. In fact, look at Barack Obama's entire response to the Arab Spring in 2011. It was just like his response to the Green Revolution in 2009 in Iran. The Iranian people rise up in protest, silence; the people of Egypt rise up in protest, Barack Obama withdraws political support for Egypt's leader and demands his immediate resignation; protests in Libya where Muammar Qadhafi had been scared straight by George Bush and had come out of the cold, Barack Obama attacks his government and overthrows him militarily; protests in Syria, silence.

What is the common thread in those responses in 2009 in Iran and 2011 in Egypt and Libya and Syria and 2022 in Iran? It is very simple. If you are pro-American, you get condemned—maybe overthrown. If you are anti-American, you get rewarded with hundreds of billions of dollars and a blind eye toward your grave crimes against your people and your aggression against America and our allies throughout the region. Again and again, the Democrats excuse the crimes of our enemies while they obsess over the flaws of our friends.

As Jeane Kirkpatrick, the legendary Ambassador to the United Nations, once said—and it is true today of so many Democrats—''they always blame America first.''

We cannot allow Joe Biden to repeat the mistakes of Barack Obama and once again betray the brave people of Iran, which I would remind you is a mortal enemy of the United States. So I call on my colleagues to join me in standing with the people of Iran, with the brave people of that ancient nation who stand in the streets today chanting ''Death to the dictator,'' not with the dictator and the ayatollahs who still to this day chant ''Death to America.''

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, China is not a developing nation. China is the world's second largest economy. China is the world's largest manufacturer, and China is the world's No. 1 creditor. Yet this body, the U.S. Senate, is poised to ratify a treaty that ignores those facts and treats China with kid gloves. Simply put, the Kigali Amendment places America at a competitive disadvantage, using American taxpayer dollars to subsidize Chinese companies.

The Kigali Amendment restricts supplies of compounds called hydrofluorocarbons or HFCs, which are refrigerants used in most air-conditioning and refrigeration systems. The rationale is that HFCs leaking out of equipment and into the atmosphere add to climate change. However, even the EPA admits that HFCs contribute only five one-hundreths of 1 degree Celsius to projected increases in global temperature.

As a developing nation, designated as such under the Kigali Amendment, China is eligible to receive funding from the $4.5 billion Multilateral Fund, of which the United States is, not surprisingly, the largest contributor.

If this treaty is ratified, the United States will be required under the treaty to meet strict deadlines for phasing out HFCs, while China is given an additional 10-year timeline to come into compliance with the same standards. It is doubtful, given its track record, that China has any intention of actually meeting its environmental obligations under this treaty.

Treating China as a developing country gives it an unfair advantage in the existing HFC market and allows China to continue production, allowing that country to continue to undercut the HFC market well into the 2040s. As the world's largest emitter of greenhouse gases, China has a long history of disrespecting and disregarding environmental standards and has continually increased its emissions and investments in coal-fired powerplants since the 2015 Paris climate agreement.

Under this treaty, Chinese-based HFC producers will get the largest share of the controlled market in future supplies needed to keep existing cooling systems running. As it has done under past environmental treaties, China will continue to produce supplies that are not allowed under the updated environmental standards.

This is part of a conspicuous trend on China's part. China wants to get ahead by playing by a different set of rules than the rest of the world—and certainly a different set of rules than the United States has to live under. We know China ignores the rules and has little respect, if any, for international norms, and yet we continue to allow China to dominate markets with the financial support of American taxpayer dollars.

This is a point where it just goes too far. We can't give them that. They haven't earned that. There is nothing about their behavior to suggest that they deserve this treatment. We shouldn't give it to them here.

To that end, later today, the Senate will likely vote on an amendment offered by Senator SULLIVAN and me. Now, it will not fix all of the flaws in the Kigali treaty; it will, however, begin to address the issue of China receiving special treatment at the expense of the American people. It will require the Secretary of State to propose the removal of China's designation as a developing nation to the Vienna Convention. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of our amendment and acknowledge the fact that China is not a developing nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the crisis at our southern border continues to break records. For the first time ever, the United States has encountered more than 2 million migrants at our southern border in a single fiscal year, and that doesn't even include data for the month of September.

Now, my State, the State of Texas, has a 1,200-mile common border with Mexico where most of these migrants show up, although some go to Arizona, some to New Mexico, and some to California. But the vast majority of these 2 million migrants have showed up on our backdoor step. This includes a hodgepodge of people, from asylum seekers to economic migrants, to criminals, to drug smugglers.

In each of the last 6 months, the U.S. Customs and Border Protection has logged more than 200,000 migrant encounters—for each of the past 6 months, 200,000 a month. The media used to lose its collective mind when 100,000 immigrants arrived in a single month, but I guess the public has become desensitize to these numbers because they are so huge, and we have now been operating at twice that level for 6 consecutive months.

Communities in my State of Texas have struggled to carry the weight of President Biden's border crisis, and nobody seemed to care. But the moment the burden reached the liberal enclaves of Manhattan and Martha's Vineyard, the outrage machine fired up.

Earlier this year, Texas Governor Greg Abbott began transporting migrants to other States and cities to ease the burden on communities in Texas. After all, what are we supposed to do? Two million migrants show up at the border. Are they supposed to stay there? Well, most of them have been in contact with relatives and other people in other cities around the country, and so they eventually make their way to their destination. And, if they are asylum seekers, they are given a notice to appear for a future court hearing, which probably will never occur because of the huge backlog in our immigration courts.

So Governor Abbott did what any reasonable person would do and began

sending these migrants to other places where they eventually will end up at their final destination, wherever that may be. You can imagine 2 million migrants showing up on your border and what the strain on local health systems is like, what the strain is on emergency response services. The more migrants that show up on our backdoor step, the lower the capacity to care for taxpayers who pay taxes to make sure those services are available.

At the same time, nongovernmental organizations—we call them NGOs—along the border are expected to pick up the Federal Government's slack and care for the migrants, which harms those charities' ability to support more Texans and other Americans who rely on them.

To state the obvious, the burden of this crisis should not fall on our border communities. The Federal Government, after all, is charged with the responsibility of managing our international borders, and that includes migration.

Simply stated, the Biden administration has refused to deal with this crisis or, frankly, even to really acknowledge it. But that doesn't change the fact that my State—or any other State, for that matter—should not be left to manage the fallout alone.

Now, since April, more than 11,000 migrants have voluntarily boarded buses from Texas to Washington, DC; New York; and Chicago. In the past, the leaders of these cities have made it clear that they would welcome migrants with open arms. They self-designate as a sanctuary city. Well, now this is their opportunity to provide that sanctuary and those services and relieve some of the burden on the border States that have borne the disproportionate burden for all this time. But you would have thought that something nefarious was going on or a genuine public emergency had occurred. They don't care a whit about 2 million people showing up on the Texas border. But when they show up on a bus in Washington, DC, or Chicago or New York, they howl like a dog that has been hit with a rock.

After ignoring the border crisis during the entirety of the Biden administration, the arrival of a few thousands migrants in these sanctuary cities has put them into an absolute panic. The Democratic Mayor of Washington, DC, for example, declared a public health emergency after her city received only a few thousand migrants. Two million migrants at the border in my State, Arizona, New Mexico, and California, and they didn't raise a peep. But a few thousand migrants to show up here in Washington, DC—roughly the same number that arrive on the southern border every single day—you would have thought there was an emergency.

The Democratic mayor of New York said that his city is ''nearly to the breaking point.'' This is a city of 8½ million people. Yet the mayor said his city is near the breaking point even though it has welcomed only a few thousand migrants. Give me a break.

Our colleague from Illinois, the majority whip, called the transportation of these migrants ''cruel and inhumane.'' Giving people a bus ride to their ultimate destination strikes me as not cruel and not inhumane. The White House Press Secretary had the temerity to say it was ''shameful and reckless.'' Well, what is shameful and reckless is the Biden administration's border crisis that it simply ignored for the last 2 years.

Vice President KAMALA HARRIS even went so far as to call this ''the height of irresponsibility'' and a ''dereliction of duty.'' I doubt Vice President HARRIS recognizes the many layers of irony in that statement. After all, last March, she was designated as the border czar for the Biden administration, but she wouldn't visit the border. She was charged, by the President of the United States, with finding solutions to address this ongoing crisis. If she wants to talk about dereliction of duty, her refusal to acknowledge, much less address, the border crisis is a prime example of irresponsibility and dereliction of duty.

But what is even more misleading about her statement is the fact that transporting migrants to cities far from the southern border is nothing new. In fact, the Biden administration has been doing it all along. Here is a chart. It shows the cities that have been receiving migrants from the Biden administration since the President became President of the United States in January of 2021: In Washington State, Yakima, if I am pronouncing that correctly; Minneapolis; Denver; Phoenix; Yuma; even Atlanta; White Plains; Scranton; Baltimore; Harrisburg; Allentown; Jacksonville, FL; Birmingham, AL; Houston, TX; Brownsville; San Antonio; Dallas—all of these cities have been the recipients of migrants transported by the Biden administration.

In April of last year, the Associated Press published a story with the headline ''Unaccompanied children from border arrive in Pennsylvania.'' The following month, the local news station in Chattanooga, TN, posted a story with the headline ''Late-night flights carrying migrant children arrive in Chattanooga.'' Here is another headline from October of last year: ''Biden administration quietly flies illegal immigrants to New York in the middle of the night.'' We didn't hear the howls of protest from Mayor Adams or the Governor when the Biden administration was doing what they are now complaining about. Though they don't talk about it very often, the Biden administration has a history of transporting migrants to cities far from the U.S.-Mexico border, and they didn't call it shameful or reckless then.

Just to be clear, when somebody claims asylum at the border and passes an initial test of a credible fear of persecution, they are then given a notice to appear for a future court hearing that may be years off, with millions of cases in the backlog. That is called a notice to appear, and it shouldn't surprise anybody that, over the years, after people have already made their way into the interior of the United States, that many of them don't show up for their court hearing. This is part of what the Border Patrol said is a lack of consequences associated with entering the United States in an irregular fashion. Oh, by the way, 90 percent of the people who do show up for their court hearing are not granted asylum. They don't qualify.

As I have stressed on many occasions, Mr. President, communities in my State do not have the capacity, the infrastructure, or the resources to handle this crisis alone. As New York City, the largest city in America, raises alarms over a few thousand migrants, I can't help but think about what happened when 15,000 Haitian migrants showed up under a bridge in Del Rio, TX, a town of 35,000 people. The group of migrants who showed up under that bridge in Del Rio equated to more than 40 percent of the city's population. Can you imagine what a challenge that was just to feed people, provide them humane treatment, sanitation. But if you extrapolate that 15,000 in a city of 35,000, that would be the equivalent of more than 3 million people showing up in New York City or 280,000 arriving in Washington, DC, in the course of just 1 week.

So whether they intended to do so or not, the mayors of Washington, DC and New York City—and Chicago, for that matter—have shown that the weight of this crisis is extraordinarily heavy, and they are only experiencing a tiny fraction of what Texas communities have faced every day for the last year and a half. And do you know what? Apparently the Biden administration simply doesn't care. As these mayors now know, caring for these migrants who cross our border is a herculean task because of the sheer volume of people coming across.

Legal immigration is part of the secret to our success as a country. We naturalize a million people a year. But these are people who have chosen to jump ahead of those waiting in line to enter the country lawfully, and we simply don't have the resources in place at the border or other places to deal with this vast tsunami of humanity—food, clothing, shelter, medical care, translation services, legal services, sanitation. Communities in Texas apparently have been expected to bear the entire brunt and the entire burden. It is time consuming, it is labor intensive, it is extraordinarily expensive, and it is dangerous.

The criminal organizations that are getting rich moving these migrants into the country for $5-, $10-, $15,000 a person are flooding the Border Patrol with these migrants, diverting necessary resources from the Border Patrol from interdicting the drugs that

are entering our country that killed 108,000 Americans last year alone. Seventy-one thousand of those 108,000 died of fentanyl overdose, a synthetic opioid. Precursors come from China, get to Mexico, are manufactured there, and are smuggled into the United States. And fentanyl has taken far too many lives in every State and in every city in this Nation, and yet the Biden administration has not awakened to the fact that they are being played; that part of this business model, if you want to call it that, of flooding the border with migrants is to divert the Border Patrol and law enforcement officials from stopping these drugs, this poison, from coming into the country.

Then, yes, in every city in the Nation, we have seen a spike in crime. Do you know who the distribution network is in the United States for the drugs that the cartels smuggle across the border? It is gangs in every city and in every State in the country. And who is responsible for most of the gun violence and crime in our cities? It is these gangs that are the principal distribution network for the drugs that come across the border. Yet the Biden administration has not connected the dots. I don't know why. The DEA, or the Drug Enforcement Administration, the FBI Director—there are a lot of people in the administration who could inform the President and the Vice President of what the facts are, but they apparently are not even curious, or, if they know, they don't seem to care.

From El Paso to the Rio Grande Valley, as I said, Texas shares a 1,200-mile border with Mexico out of our total border of 2,000 miles. The communities situated along that border simply cannot handle the monumental job of dealing with this flow of migrants and the failure of the Federal Government to live up to its responsibilities. But this isn't a partisan matter.

My friend Oscar Leeser, who is the mayor of El Paso, TX—he is a proud Democrat—he has been busing migrants to get them off the streets of El Paso to the cities where they want to go.

He said a few days ago:

People are not coming to El Paso, they're coming to America.

It is only fair for other parts of the country to bear the burden that we have borne alone in my State and in other border States, as long as the Federal Government is simply advocating its responsibility to deal with illegal immigration and to fix this crisis. They know what to do. They simply are refusing to do it, presumably because some of their political supporters don't believe in anything except open borders.

The Biden administration has completely abdicated its duty to secure the border, and it has failed to supply border communities with the resources they need to try to manage this fallout. The truth is, no matter what the resources were, the numbers are just overwhelming. And that is the point. The cartels get rich; they smuggle drugs and additional migrants; and that is the point. So it is not going to stop until the Biden administration wakes up out of its deep sleep and deals with the reality of what is happening at the border.

In the last 12 months, Customs and Border Protection has encountered more than 2.3 million migrants at the southern border, and that total grows every single day. All you have to do is turn on your TV set and see people streaming across the border, many of them turning themselves in, getting into this asylum system where they ultimately melt into the great American heartland, never to be heard from again, successfully making their way into the country.

Our amazing men and women at the Border Patrol are grappling with staffing shortages and poor morale. How would you like to be a police officer where the mayor and city council say: Well, we had to hire a police force, but we are really not going to fund that police force or we are not going to do anything to recruit more people to serve in that police force. And do you know what? We really don't care whether they enforce the law or not.

That is the message that the Border Patrol is receiving from the Biden administration. So, of course, morale is bad. Of course, it is hard to recruit. The agents are outnumbered, they are overwhelmed, and, frankly, disgusted with the lack of leadership.

Border communities are buckling under the weight of vast humanitarian needs, and now even the self-proclaimed sanctuary cities don't seem to want to help. Unfortunately, the Biden administration appears to have no intention of fixing the problem. And it sure seems like they don't think anybody else should have to help either.

It is leaving Texas and other border States to buckle under the weight of a crisis that we had no hand in creating. It is forcing Texas taxpayers to make up for the failure of the Federal Government to perform its responsibilities. And what is worse, President Biden, Vice President HARRIS, and Members of this body are trying to paint my State as the enemy for trying to deal with the hand that it has been dealt while they continue to refuse to lend a helping hand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor and kick off the process that will culminate tomorrow with our vote on the DISCLOSE Act.

The DISCLOSE Act will get rid of dark money in our politics. President Biden gave a good speech about it yesterday to help stir interests and progress in this area.

There are problems with dark money in and of itself. It contributes to what has been called the tsunami of slime in our politics, because when the slimy ad has a fake, phony front group's name on it and no actual real entity or company or association is accountable for that, well, then you can lie to your heart's content, you can smear to your heart's content, and there is no accountability.

So there are reasons for getting dark money out of our elections on their own: just giving disproportionate power to special interests, sliming up our elections, allowing a lot of bad actors powers that they don't deserve, and putting enormous power in the hands of people who are, A, politically active enough to be willing to spend that kind of money and have a motive in legislative outcomes to spend that kind of money that regular citizens can't begin to match.

But there is a lot more to it than that. There is a lot more to it than that, because, like corruption, dark money is used to achieve other goals. And those other goals have had very important policy effects in our country.

Climate change we are dealing with daily now in floods, in fires, in droughts, in species moving about—particularly in Rhode Island, our ocean fisheries are moving about. The oceans are acidifying. We are putting essential operating systems of our planet in danger and onto a course that mankind has never seen before in the entire history of humankind.

When I got here in 2007, this was addressed as a bipartisan problem. There were three different bipartisan Senate bills, all of which were very consequential. It would have made a huge difference. Senator McCain ran for President carrying the Republican Party banner with a significant and serious climate platform, and it looked like democracy was responding to this problem in a responsible way. All of that activity came to an instant shuttering halt in January of 2010.

What happened in January of 2010? What happened in January of 2010 was that the U.S. Supreme Court let loose one of the worst decisions it has ever rendered—the Citizens United decision—and that decision allowed unlimited money to flow into politics.

Of course, if you can spend unlimited money in politics, you suddenly have an unprecedented motive to hide it. If the most you can give is $3,500 or $5,000 from your PAC, it is not worth putting a lot of effort into hiding that; plus, nobody really cares. But if you can give $35 million, plus, let's say you are a polluting fossil fuel company and you don't want people to know that, now it is worth putting quite a lot of money into the apparatus of hiding who you are. It is an expensive apparatus. It is a real apparatus. Senators have gone to the floor before to describe it. We have used this graphic.

This is the web of climate denial that has been chronicled by scientists who study as a phenomenon climate denial and how the money flies around

through these different groups and how they use it to hide what they are doing on climate.

Well, once that got launched, that was the end of bipartisanship on climate. We lost a decade. I think history will show that the lost decade from January 2010 until now is one that these pages and children across the country will pay a very steep price for.

Why would they be willing to do it? Well, the fossil fuel industry has an annual subsidy of $660 billion, basically, from being allowed to pollute for free—$660 billion.

If you are protecting a $660 billion subsidy, how much would you be willing to spend any given year to protect it? If you spent $6.6 billion a year, you would still be earning 100 times your investment. Sure enough, we have seen dark money explode into expenditures by the billion. And as that happened, climate progress ended.

Look at voter suppression. Across the country, there was a wave of Republican State legislatures passing voter suppression laws. Was it an amazing coincidence that they all happened to do that at the same time? Evidently not, because there is actually a tape from Heritage Action—one of the dark money groups behind those voter suppression campaigns—where the person briefing the big donors admitted this:

> We're working with these state legislators . . . in some cases we actually draft [the bills] for them or we have a sentinel on our behalf give them the model legislation so it has that grassroots, you know, from-the-bottom-up type of vibe.

The whole thing was a dark money fake fed into these State legislatures by dark money and no small amount.

> This is a $24 million investment—

The speaker said—

> We . . . started . . . right after the November election. . . . we've driven hundreds of 1000s of calls, emails, placed letters to the editor, hosted events, and run television and digital ads.

So voter suppression is an artifact of dark money.

And, last, Court capture. I have got a series of speeches that I have given so far—18 of them. When I do, I put my ''Scheme'' poster up because this was a scheme; indeed, a scheme and a half.

At this point, what we know is that at least $580 million was spent on phony front groups using dark money out to capture the Court. We don't know how much additionally went into political coffers to reward people for their Court-packing enterprise or to threaten to punish people if they didn't go along with the Court-packing enterprise, but it was quite a show.

This is just one little node of that $580 million Court capture enterprise. It shows two groups, which is the current, sort of, best practices—worst practices, better to say—in political influence. You have a 501(c)3 and a 501(c)4 side by side, same location, same staff, indistinguishable in any real sense. And then in this case, they pushed what they called fictitious names so that their phony front groups had phony front groups that had names like Judicial Education Project and Honest Elections Project Action. But here is one that was somewhat significant, the Judicial Crisis Network, because Judicial Crisis Network took $15 million checks, $17 million checks and turned that money to TV ads to stop the confirmation of Justice Garland and to push through the confirmation of Justices Gorsuch, Kavanaugh, and Barrett. So dark money flows into all these other areas.

If you like climate denial, you love dark money. If you like voters having their votes suppressed by partisan legislators, you love dark money. And if you like a captured Court that dances to the tune of the dark money donors who stocked it, you love dark money. And that is before we even get to its pernicious, insidious, clandestine effect in our elections.

With that, I see that my time has expired and that Senator GRASSLEY is here for his time, so I yield the floor to my friend Senator GRASSLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). The Senator from Iowa.

FENTANYL

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, roughly 175 Americans will die from fentanyl poisoning. Many of them won't even know that they have taken the fentanyl. They will think they have taken Xanax for anxiety or oxycodone for pain. That is what Devin Anderson—you will see his picture here in a minute—of Shelby, IA, thought when he took a fentanyl pill marked like an oxy.

Devin had fought hard for his sobriety. He had enrolled in treatment and moved back home, but he was struggling with anxiety. To cope, he took a pill from a friend.

Devin's coworker came to pick him up for work in the early morning of February 24 of this year. Devin wasn't ready, so his coworker called him. When Devin didn't answer, he called again. Devin's 14-year-old brother heard the phone ringing. He went downstairs to investigate and found Devin unresponsive.

Devin was 23 years old when he died. His mom wants you to know that Devin was a kind person and he was loved by his friends.

In 2021, fentanyl killed more Americans between the ages of 18 and 45 than any other cause. That is more than COVID–19, cancer, and car accidents combined.

Six months ago, I stood where I am now and asked for a permanent solution for fentanyl scheduling. Today, we are absolutely no closer to a permanent solution than we were back then, 6 months ago.

While Congress has been waiting to take action, the cartels have not. The cartels have simply rebranded, coloring fentanyl like candy to addict America's children. Fentanyl is in our schools, like in Blackwood, NJ, where a 12-year-old overdosed on a schoolbus after his uncle made him clean a fentanyl trap house; or in Chipman Junior High School in California, where a 13-year-old brought 150 fake Percocet pills laced with fentanyl, with 4 out of every 10 fake pills containing a potentially lethal dosage of fentanyl. Both of these schools are hours away from the Mexican border, but despite Customs and Border Protection's efforts, fentanyl has reached our children's hands.

So when the Vice President tells the press that our border is secure, we all know that is just plain wrong and irresponsible, and that attitude, that the border is secure, ends up killing.

In the Federal Government's absence, parents like Arletha and Robert Gilliam have been forced to fill the void. Their daughter Ciara died last month because of fentanyl. And you see Ciara right here. By all accounts, Ciara had a big heart. As her dad puts it, if you were in a bad mood, Ciara would make sure that that bad mood didn't last very long. Even though she had graduated from Iowa's Ankeny Centennial High School and lived on her own, she still FaceTimed her mom every day.

But on August 23 of this year, no one could get hold of Ciara, so her grandparents drove by her house. Her car was in the driveway. Ciara's grandparents knocked, both on her doors and her windows, with no response. Finally, Ciara's grandpa crawled through her bedroom window. There, he found her dead on her bedroom floor. Fentanyl shut down her organs, and she went to sleep. She never woke up again. She was only 22 years old.

Ciara's parents are now searching for answers they never should have had to find in the first place. They have offered a $50,000 award to locate the dealer who supplied the fake pill that killed their daughter. They deserve better than that. They deserve congressional action, and they deserved it in 2017 when the DEA, the Drug Enforcement Administration, first scheduled fentanyl.

Grieving parents are the unsung heroes in the fight against fentanyl. Time after time, they push through their heartbreaks to share their stories, as you have heard me tell for two families, and now they demand action so that more kids don't die. It is time for Congress to match the efforts of those parents.

The Department of Justice has been very clear:

> The permanent scheduling of FRS is critical to the safety and health of our communities and class-wide scheduling provides a vital tool to combat overdose deaths in [America].

End of quote from the Department of Justice.

For those whom we have lost, like Ciara and Devin, and for the countless lives that we will save if we take action, it is time that we give them the

tool they need, and that is the scheduling of fentanyl—and on a permanent, long-term basis.

COMBATING VIOLENT AND DANGEROUS CRIME ACT

Mr. President, on another subject—and a shorter subject for anybody waiting to talk—it is dangerous to live in many places in America, especially in blue cities. Like inflation, violent crime remains very high. For example, compared to 2019 midyear figures, America's largest cities have seen a 50-percent increase in murders and a 36-percent increase in aggravated assaults. And it is no mystery what is causing this spike in crime. Blue city progressive, pro-criminal prosecutors and radical bail reform laws fuel this spike, a spike in violent crime, by letting dangerous, repeat criminals go unpunished and, in some cases, even uncharged.

The recent tragedies in Memphis, TN, earlier this month underscore the dangers that families face at the hands of chronic criminals. And remember the words ''chronic criminals'' because the fact is that the majority of violent crimes are committed by a relative handful of repeat offenders like the two in Memphis. For example, criminals in Chicago charged with shootings and murders have, on average, 12 prior arrests. In Oakland, CA, only around 400 people, or just one-tenth of 1 percent of Oakland's population, were responsible for a majority of the city's murders. Now, just think, one-tenth of 1 percent of the population of that city is responsible for a majority of the murders in Oakland.

Federal law enforcement has a unique and very vital role in targeting repeat violent criminals, but for the last 2 years, the Senate's ability to actually pass bills that expand criminal law to reduce violent crime and target repeat violent criminals has hit a brick wall. It is just impossible to get any consensus even though we all know it is a very major problem.

In July, as part of my effort to promote a solution to this problem of major crime caused by a very small number of people in each community, I introduced a bill that I entitled ''Combating Violent and Dangerous Crime,'' which is cosponsored by 26 of my Republican colleagues in the Senate. The House companion bill was introduced September 15, with seven Republican cosponsors.

The bill has seven simple solutions that will help to reverse this violent crime spike by putting dangerous criminals in jail and keeping them there. These commonsense solutions will fix real problems and bring immediate relief and increased safety to communities plagued by the scourge of violent crime.

Given the unprecedented increase in murders, we can and we should make it easier to prosecute murders. This bill will do that.

Mr. President, 2021 was the deadliest year to be a law enforcement officer since 9/11. We should make it easier to prosecute people who attack law enforcement. This bill will do that.

Carjackings are way up nationwide—200, 300, and even 400 percent in some cities. We should deter carjacking with sufficient sentences. This bill will do that.

Dangerous drugs are being marketed to young people as colorful candy—I just spoke about that—and these children are dying from overdoses. We should make it so that no children die from fentanyl made to look like candy. This bill will do that.

Bank robbery, kidnapping—the list of violent crimes that would be strengthened by this bill goes on and on.

I stand ready to work with Democrats who want to provide relief to their constituents from this crimewave. So if any of them are open to any of these provisions, I want them to know that I am ready to work with them. Let's partner together to make the American people safer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

INFLATION

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, over the past week, Americans were hit once again with a grave inflation report. Worse, the American people got more evidence of just how out of touch the White House and congressional Democrats are with the damage inflation is doing to families across the country.

We were all hoping President Biden's crushing inflation might show signs of easing and give folks a chance to catch their breath after months and months of watching their paychecks shrink. That is not what happened at all. Inflation is up 8.3 percent from a year ago—a disastrous number.

We are feeling the inflation in every aspect of our lives, from paying utility bills to gassing up cars, to rent and insurance, and, especially, to the basics like food. Grocery prices are up 13.5 percent from this time last year, which is a crushing blow to most Americans who visit their local store once a week, like I do. Milk is up 17 percent. Bread and chicken are up 16 percent. Eggs are up an outrageous 40 percent. And the list goes on and on.

I do my own shopping for my family, and I see this weekly, and it is incredible. This is a reality, but President Biden appears to be living in a very, very different reality. When the latest bad inflation numbers were released last week, the President and Washington Democrats threw a party on the White House lawn. That is right, a party—a lawn party. The President and Democrats celebrated as the rest of us watched the Dow plummet and received an inflation report confirming that this is the worst year for food and electricity inflation since the fallout from President Jimmy Carter.

What exactly did they celebrate? Their latest reckless, Big Government spending bill.

I don't have to remind you that, just over a year ago, the Democrats rammed through their $2 trillion spending spree despite economists warning that it would be a catalyst for rampant inflation. Economists warned us then, and they are warning us now, about the misnamed Inflation Reduction Act; namely, that it won't do anything to ease inflation, but it will certainly add to the deficit.

Apparently, hosting a big party is preferable than heeding these nonpartisan warnings and getting to work to get our Nation back on the right track.

When the ''Inflation Act'' was on the floor, Republicans tried countless times to adopt solutions to tackle inflation, crime, and secure our border. But our efforts were consistently shut down because not one Senate Democrat could spare a penny from the Green New Deal. No, they have their own priorities, and they are awfully out of touch with the priorities of American families.

On Sunday, we were given more evidence that the President is living in a completely different world than the rest of us. The President appeared on ''60 Minutes,'' where he discussed several challenges currently facing our Nation, only, according to him, our Nation is doing swell. And indeed, the President seemed to paint a rosy picture of little to no inflation and suggested we should be relieved by the new inflation numbers.

When asked what he could do better and faster to help Americans get some relief at the grocery store checkout line, he claimed inflation was up ''hardly at all.''

''Hardly at all''? Say that to parents paying 40 percent more for a dozen of eggs just to feed their children breakfast. Say that to workers who are watching their savings dwindle month after month because their paychecks can't keep up with these prices. Say that to the Americans who are just barely getting by in this economy.

President Biden, you may not have to visit the grocery store or pay an electricity bill, but my constituents do.

Time and time again, the President and his allies in Congress have proven he is out of touch with American priorities and in denial about the real suffering and fears of the American people. They are right to question whether they can still afford the leadership they are getting out of the White House and the Democrat-led Congress.

It is high time for the President and Democrats to align their priorities with those of the people, allow real solutions to be considered on the Senate floor, and get out our economy back on its feet.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I think you all might remember when the Biden administration's so-called

experts claimed that inflation was ''transitory.'' It ended up that they couldn't have been more wrong by using that word.

Since President Biden took office, Iowans have seen prices rise 13.7 percent. That adds an extra $666 to their monthly budget. Couple that with falling real wages, and Iowans have been strapped very thin.

This combination of rising prices and falling real wages has hit rural Iowa communities particularly hard. As a result, according to a report issued by Iowa State University, the disposable income of rural Iowans fell 33 percent over the past 12 months alone. It is no wonder, then, that the high cost of living is the number one concern that I hear about from Iowans as I travel all of our 99 counties.

However, here in DC—and remember, DC is an island surrounded by reality—here in this town, the primary concern of President Biden and congressional Democrats has been enacting their very partisan agenda.

They have refused to work with Republicans on sensible policies to tame inflation and provide targeted relief. In the process of doing that, they haven't even followed the advice of their own brethren. And I will use Larry Summers as an example, that Harvard professor and former Secretary of Treasury. He said, way back in January, before this President was sworn in, that the economy was turned around: Don't spend any more money or you are going to have inflation.

And, immediately, within 60 days of being in office, this new President and this new Congress passed a $2 trillion appropriations bill to feed the fires of inflation.

So instead of taming inflation, they rebranded the reckless tax-and-spending spree that they had pursued for more than a year as a bill recently passed called the Inflation Reduction Act, which I call the ''Inflation Enhancement Act''—never mind that outside experts uniformly concluded the bill's hodgepodge of the Green New Deal and the subsidies that go with that program and the tax hikes would do nothing to address inflation today.

Of course, if you want to stop inflation, now caused by excessive government spending, the first thing you should do is stop spending; or another way you can say it—and common sense dictates this: When you are in a hole, quit digging.

Instead, Democrats doubled down with Big Government spending and coupled it with job-killing tax hikes. The National Association of Manufacturers said they would lose about 217,000 jobs. Democrats' policy decisions made even less sense given that, only a week before, we learned our economy had shrunk for two straight quarters, indicating recession.

And everyone knows, as President Obama once said—and this seems to be the third term of the Obama Presidency, but this is what he said when he was actually President:

The last thing you want to do is to raise taxes in the middle of a recession.

And yet it was done in that bill in August by more than $300 billion. The last thing our economy needed was another tax-and-spending spree, but Democrats just couldn't let go of their wish list.

What is more, at the height of hypocrisy, Democrats touted the Inflation Reduction Act as an example of fiscal responsibility. Yet the supposed savings they claim will result from the bill was then immediately dwarfed in just 1 day of actions by President Biden's unilateral student loan announcement, which will cost American taxpayers at least $500 billion. And some people are saying it could cost up to $1 trillion.

When President Biden announced that he was wiping out $10,000 to $20,000 of student loan debt for people making as much as $150,000 or $250,000 for households, that likely illegal action will send the bill for this student loan giveaway to Americans who did not attend college or people who graduated from college already paying off their college expenses. And at the same time, it is going to fuel the fires of inflation.

So much, then, for the lip service about deficit reduction and inflation. But we now know that that inflation was not transitory. It is persistent. Iowans are sick and tired of paying the price for the failures of this Biden economy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

BIDEN ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to discuss how consumers are paying more for less reliable energy as a result of the policies of the Biden administration and congressional Democrats. North Dakotans are paying 60 percent more for gasoline since January of 2021, and diesel remains at nearly $5 a gallon.

Prices are high because we have a supply problem. Our friends and allies in Europe are facing an even worse supply crisis, and unless the Biden administration changes its approach, American families and businesses will continue to face these inflationary pressures.

Fortunately, the solution is clear. More energy supply means consumers pay less. More supply is what helps us get prices under control, get inflation under control, and consumers relief.

In 2019, the United States was producing nearly 13 million barrels of oil a day. Today, that production is down at about 11.8 million barrels a day. That is because the policies of the Democrats in Congress and the Biden administration include blocking energy production on Federal lands, and that is curtailing supply. Our vast supply of taxpayer-owned oil, gas, and coal resources on Federal lands are a national strategic asset. Yet President Biden and his ''keep it in the ground'' allies treat our NG reserves as a liability.

Recent analysis by the Wall Street Journal shows that the Biden administration leased only 130,000 acres for new oil and gas production in the first 19 months of this administration. Let me repeat that number. The Biden administration has only leased 130,000 acres for new oil and gas production in its first 19 months. For comparison, President Reagan leased 47.6 million acres during the same time period. The Biden administration, in just under 2 years, leased 130,000 acres. The Reagan administration leased 47.6 million acres during the same amount of time.

That is the point. We need to take the handcuffs off our producers if we are going to produce more energy here at home. And nobody produces energy better, more cost effectively, more dependably, and with better environmental stewardship than America. We do the best job of anybody in the world. New energy leases are needed to grow oil production and supplies for the long-term, otherwise production will continue to fall, and that means higher energy costs for our consumers.

Instead of defending previously held lease sales, the Biden administration is relying on litigation from environmental allies to block permits needed for energy development. That only further increases our reliance on adversaries like Russia, Iran, and Venezuela, countries with little or no regard for environmental stewardship or human rights. They are our adversaries. How in the world can we put ourselves subject to their energy production? Energy production is part of national security. Energy security is national security.

Natural gas prices also remain high and families are being hit with higher utility bills. Electricity prices are up nearly 16 percent compared to last year. As we approach the winter months, natural gas bills are up 33 percent over the same period, and with winter coming on, they are going to go up more.

The Biden administration's policies are undermining our energy security, and because the cost of energy is built into our entire economy, inflation has been driven to record heights. Everything you buy has an energy component in it. When energy costs go up because the administration won't let us produce more here at home, it causes inflation in everything you buy—everything you buy, not just at the gas station but in the grocery store or anywhere else because of the energy component.

Despite these challenges, President Biden and congressional Democrats doubled down by passing their partisan

tax-and-spend bill that will make it more expensive to produce energy in the United States. The bill includes a new tax on natural gas. That doesn't make energy cheaper; that makes it more expensive. The bill includes a new tax on natural gas and also makes oil and gas production on Federal lands more expensive through higher fees and royalty rates. So they are driving up the cost of energy.

In addition to levying $739 billion in new taxes on hard-working families, the bill was loaded with $370 billion in Green New Deal spending. Instead of tax hikes and wasteful spending, President Biden needs to take the handcuffs off our domestic energy production. Instead of higher taxes and fees, more mandates, and less energy development, we need to take the handcuffs off our domestic energy producers to lower energy costs and help reduce the burden of inflation, which harms every American but particularly those low-income Americans who are struggling with the higher cost of everything from putting food on the table to gas at the pump, to anything and everything they buy. We need to change this policy direction, and it needs to happen now.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Wyoming.

INFLATION

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I come to the floor today to talk about the Biden economic crisis that the American people are facing every day.

Last week, Democrats threw a big party at the White House; even Hollywood celebrities flew in to celebrate. If you take a look at what was going on, on the split-screen television all across the country, they saw Democrats celebrating and the stock market collapsing; people's savings, retirements evaporating; Democrats dancing.

It was the worst day on Wall Street since the pandemic, and by the time the party at the White House was over, $1.6 trillion was erased from the value of those who hold American stocks.

So why did this happen? The reason that this happened was because just hours earlier the world found out that inflation in America went up once again.

Prices people have to pay for things are up more than 13 percent since the day Joe Biden took office. Costs which economists predicted would go down last month, actually went up instead.

Well, the economists made a prediction, but the American people know what they are facing every day when they go to the grocery store, pay their rent, pay their energy bills, try to buy back-to-school supplies for their kids.

Inflation is now going up after the Democrats passed a reckless tax-and-spending bill. This is nothing to celebrate even though they were down at the White House celebrating. The American people aren't celebrating; they are suffering. They are suffering the worst inflation in over 40 years.

Prices have risen faster than wages for 17 consecutive months—17 months in a row, prices rising faster than wages. With each passing month, the American people can afford less and less. Now people have cut into their savings, borrowed money, just to get by.

Credit card debt is climbing. Reports across the Nation are more and more people are buying on layaway. People on fixed incomes cannot keep up; they are falling further behind. And it is no wonder then that many seniors are delaying their retirements.

Rising costs are hitting our troops. Right now, our troops are watching their paychecks disappear, melt away. According to a recent report, the Army is now recommending our troops sign up for food stamps.

The U.S. Army—can you imagine such a thing?—is recommending troops sign up for food stamps. After the deadly and disgraceful evacuation of Afghanistan, people knew Joe Biden had very little respect for our men and women in uniform. What we are seeing today is a national failure by Joe Biden and the Democrats. Our heroes in uniform should not have to rely on welfare in order for them to serve the Nation.

Our soldiers should not have to find themselves in a battle against Joe Biden's inflation.

Now, the U.S. Senate still hasn't passed a defense bill this year. We are waiting to go. Senator SCHUMER says, well, we will do that next month. It just shows that Democrats do not prioritize our national defense. It always goes to the bottom of the list—leave it for last. Democrats have other priorities like their James Taylor concert last week at the White House on the lawn.

Democrats have been too busy paying off the climate activists to pay our troops. The Senate ought to get to work on a defense bill immediately. We should ensure that our troops, whether they are serving at F.E. Warren Air Force Base in Wyoming, Luke Air Force Base in Arizona, or Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada, or Buckley Space Force Base in Colorado, that they get a raise so they won't further be hurt by Joe Biden's inflation.

Now, many Democrats seem oblivious to the pain and suffering that they have caused American families. When Joe Biden took office, inflation was essentially nonexistent. A gallon of gas was $2.39. In today's prices, it is almost $3.70 a gallon, higher in States like Nevada, Washington State, and others.

When Joe Biden took office, economists were predicting an economic boom. Now our economy continues to shrink, and just in a matter of months, Joe Biden took us from recovery to recession.

And recovery right now is nowhere in sight. Consumer confidence is worse today than it was during the lockdowns of 2020, hard to believe but true. This summer, we saw the lowest consumer confidence ever recorded in the history of polling for these sorts of things.

Families feel very stressed about the future, and prices continue to climb. Now, ultimately, this means that we are going to have layoffs at a time when people are running out of savings.

A poll last week showed that people across the country are cutting back on spending on just about everything just to keep up, just to avoid falling further and further behind. Some are cutting back on groceries. Some are growing their own, trying to grow their own food instead of going to the grocery store.

At the same time, the Federal Reserve is getting ready to raise interest rates again, maybe as soon as today.

This year, we have already seen the largest rate hikes in 40 years. Rates are going higher and higher and higher as the Democrat-caused inflation wildfire continues to burn.

There is no end in sight and no relief for the pain being caused to American families. Mortgage rates have almost doubled this year. They are the highest they have been since the great recession, and they are going to go even higher.

At the same time, mortgage applications have dropped significantly. More and more people are giving up on the American dream of even owning their own home. To make matters worse, it doesn't look like interest rates are coming down any time soon.

You know, it is very easy to cause inflation, very difficult to get rid of. Last March, Joe Biden caused inflation with the stroke of a pen on a bill that every Democrat in this body voted for, and working families all across the country have suffered ever since.

Interest rate hikes are designed to slow down the economy. And yet we have an economy that is already shrinking, and they want to slow it down some more. It shrank for the first 6 months of this year. That has always been the definition of a recession. The administration is even trying to redefine recession while we are in the middle of one because they don't want to own it, but they do.

The pain and suffering that people are being subjected to has no end in sight, and the policies of this President and the policies of the Democrats who have all voted for it—every one of them—have brought us inflation and recession.

The wealthy elites that run the Democratic Party are doing just fine. It is the hard-working men and women all across the country who are suffering. Republicans are committed to help lower prices for working men and women all around America.

Certainly, in my State of Wyoming, it is a major concern, major discussion. It is what I hear about. What I heard about Friday at our Victoria's football game and the tailgate party is what things cost, trying to just stay ahead, trying to keep ahead, trying to fall less far behind.

We are committed to getting the economy back on track. It is time for the Democrats to get their priorities straight. We need to pass a defense bill to take care of our troops. We need to stop the reckless spending and the tax hikes.

These are the policies that have caused the cost of everyday items to continue to go up. The Democrats need to stop strangling American energy. That is what is driving up the price, not just at the pump but electric bills, home heating, natural gas, all of the things that the American people need and want, energy that is affordable, available, and reliable.

The American people deserve much better than what we have been getting from the Democrats, and the Democrats—let me point out—are in full control of the House, the Senate, and the White House.

It is their policies and their positions that brought us 40-year high inflation, food going up faster and faster, 13 percent inflation since the day Joe Biden and the Democrats took over. It is time for a change.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

AMENDMENT NO. 5518

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I call up my amendment No. 5518 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. SULLIVAN], for himself and Mr. LEE, proposes an amendment numbered 5518 to the resolution of ratification to Treaty Document No. 117–1.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To ensure that the People's Republic of China is not treated as a developing country)

In section 1, in the section heading, strike ''**DECLARATION**'' and insert ''**DECLARATIONS AND A CONDITION**''.

In section 1, strike ''declaration of section 2'' and insert ''declarations of section 2 and the condition of section 3''.

In section 2, in the section heading, strike ''**DECLARATION**'' and insert ''**DECLARATIONS**''.

In section 2, strike ''following declaration'' and all that follows through the period at the end and insert the following: ''following declarations:

(1) The Kigali amendment is not self-executing.

(2) The People's Republic of China is not a developing country, and the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations should not treat the People's Republic of China as such.

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. CONDITION.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following condition: Prior to the Thirty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, the Secretary of State shall transmit to the Secretariat of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer a proposal to amend Decision I/12E, ''Clarification of terms and definitions: developing countries,'' made at the First Meeting of the Parties, to remove the People's Republic of China.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, about 4 years ago, I was part of a meeting with several Senators—there were about 11 of us—here in the U.S. Capitol with the Chinese Ambassador. And in the meeting, I had raised a number of issues about the lack of reciprocity that China has with regard to the United States: market access on our trade; their ability to invest here but we couldn't invest there; the fact that they have all kinds of journalists in America and we can't have journalists over there—just across the board on so many things—Confucius Institutes in American universities, no equivalent in Chinese universities. No reciprocity on so many topics.

And I will never forget the response of the Chinese Ambassador to the United States. With 11 U.S. Senators right there, he said: Well, Senator, I agree there is a lack of reciprocity in a number of areas, but that is because China is a developing country.

China is a developing country. That is what he said just 4 years ago. And my response was: Mr. Ambassador, with all due respect, can you please stop using that talking point about your country being a developing country? It is kind of an insult to all of our intelligence. And to be honest, you are not a developing country. The American people know it; the world knows it; and you need to stop telling everybody and using that as a crutch.

What does that have to do with the amendment that I just called up?

Well, today, before we vote on the Kigali treaty, I have an amendment that I am asking all of my colleagues here in the Senate to support. I am not talking about the merits of the Kigali treaty itself. There is an element of this treaty that raises a principle that is at stake right now that is so important with regard to China, the United States, and the rest of the world.

This treaty that we are getting ready to vote on continues to classify China as a ''developing country.''

Why does that matter?

Well, as I mentioned, it is a facade. China is not a developing country; it is the second largest economy in the world. It is one of the most industrialized countries in the world. It has one of the biggest militaries in the world. The World Bank even now considers China an upper middle income country.

But what China keeps trying to do in international organizations and in international treaties is continue to get the same benefits as truly developing countries, such Ghana, Somalia, Nigeria, Bangladesh. These are the countries that need global assistance, not China.

So my amendment today is very simple to this treaty. It first says that the U.S. Senate concludes:

The People's Republic of China is not a developing country, and the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations should not treat the People's Republic of China as such.

And then my amendment goes one step further, and it makes the advice and consent of the Senate for this treaty contingent upon the Secretary of State of the United States going to the U.N. and the Vienna Convention Secretariat to file an amendment to the treaty that clarifies that China should be taken off the annex that defines it as a developing country.

So we have a declaration—China is not a developing country—and then it says to the Secretary of State, before you get the advice and consent of the U.S. Senate, you shall go to the U.N. and file an instrument that says China should be removed from the list of countries to this treaty that are called developing countries.

And, again, this matters. This matters, for example, on this treaty.

Why?

Because in this treaty, the developing country annex gives those countries under that annex much longer time to implement the treaty, and it actually gives them funding from the U.N. to implement the treaty.

Now, where does that funding come from?

Most of it comes from the United States. So, in essence, right now, the way the treaty is organized, the United States gives the U.N. money to help implement the treaty, and a lot of that money is going to go to China.

Does anyone in the U.S. Senate think that makes sense? Does anyone in America think that that makes sense?

It does not.

Furthermore, on this treaty and on so many other international agreements, whether at the U.N. or other places, when you give China more time for implementation, particularly as it relates to the global environment, all you are doing is harming the global environment.

China is a developed country. China is an industrialized country. The U.S. Senate, the international organizations where China is a member, need to start recognizing this.

So I am proud to say I worked closely with Senator BARRASSO and Senator LEE on this amendment. I actually wish it were stronger.

Senator BARRASSO was here on the floor, talking about his amendment. I actually think that is the preferred way to go, but we couldn't get agreement in terms of the Barrasso amendment, so I am encouraging all of my colleagues to vote on this principle: The U.S. Senate, on any international agreement or any international treaty, should no longer agree to the obvious. China is not a developing country; it is an industrialized country, and we should make clear in the Senate and in

international organizations that that is the view of the United States, and we need to encourage the Secretary of State, which is exactly what my amendment does, to make sure the U.N. and other countries agree with us on that.

I encourage all of my colleagues to vote yes on this amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to conclude my comments before the vote.

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

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise today to once again urge my Senate colleagues to take the bipartisan, practical pro-manufacturing step of providing advice and consent to ratifying the Kigali Amendment.

Each of the four previous amendments to this treaty, the Montreal Protocol, have enjoyed overwhelming bipartisan support in the Senate, and Kigali should be no different.

Our companies are clear. They want us to approve this treaty so that they can maximize their export potential of cutting-edge chemicals that they have pioneered. They want us to approve the treaty. It will generate billions of dollars in economic activity and create thousands of jobs here at home in the United States.

They are also clear that if we fail to ratify, they stand to lose. They will be locked out of export markets in key products. American workers will suffer, which is why the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and impacted industries all support the action we are prepared to take.

Now, I have heard the concerns that some colleagues have raised about China and how it benefits from its antiquated status as a ''developing country'' under the Montreal Protocol. Frankly, it is a fair point to raise, but it should have no bearing on whether we join Kigali.

The simple fact is, whether we join Kigali or not has no impact on whether China is treated as a developing country—none. On the other hand, ratifying Kigali will have a major positive benefit for us because China has doubled down on yesterday's chemicals, and we, the United States, lead on all the alternatives. Joining Kigali will turn the world away from China and its companies and towards our competitive strength. It is good for the United States and our businesses, and it is bad for China. However, I also recognize the plain fact that China is no longer a developing country, and I agree that it should not enjoy advantages under the Montreal Protocol that it received because of decisions made more than 30 years ago.

I have been a steadfast champion of addressing the challenges China presents as they are, not as we hope for them to be. I led passage of the Strategic Competition Act and my Taiwan Policy Act, which was recently voted out of the Foreign Relations Committee on an overwhelming bipartisan basis. So I have no problem acknowledging that China should no longer qualify as a developing country, and for that reason, I support the Lee-Sullivan amendment.

The Senate's constitutional role on treaties is both unique and vital. What we are doing today will directly, positively—if we adopt ratification—impact American workers, American businesses, and American consumers. It will meet our challenge against China. It will create greater security at home. It will create great prosperity. There are few things that we do in the Senate that can improve our economy, create jobs, and meet the challenge of China in this one dimension.

For all of those reasons, I urge my colleagues to support providing advice and consent for the Kigali Amendment after the Sullivan amendment is considered.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, as the current ranking member of the U.S. Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works—EPW—Committee, I submit these comments to provide the Senate with additional information on the existing domestic authority to phasedown the production and consumption of hydrofluorocarbons, HFCs. The EPW Committee has jurisdiction over air pollution, and in the 116th Congress, managed the development of the domestic authority to implement the Kigali Amendment, See 218 Cong. Rec. S7926, daily ed. Dec. 21. 2020, statement of then-EPW Chairman JOHN BARRASSO, then-EPW Ranking Member TOM CARPER, and Sen. JOHN KENNEDY).

As the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations clearly states in Senate Executive Report 117–2, no further legislation is required to implement the Kigali Amendment and the Amendment is not self-executing. New authority is not granted to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency—EPA—through ratification.

In section 103 in division S of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021, the American Innovation and Manufacturing—AIM—Act of 2020, P.L. 116–260, was enacted. That law established a new, national program administered by the EPA to phasedown the production and consumption of certain HFC substances due to their significant global warming potential. Specifically, the AIM Act requires the EPA to implement an 85 percent phasedown of the production and consumption of regulated HFC substances, requiring levels to reach approximately 15 percent of their 2011–2013 average annual levels by 2036.

The AIM Act provides all the necessary authorities to phasedown the production and consumption of HFCs in the United States in line with U.S. obligations under the Kigali Amendment and is already being implemented by the EPA. In October 2021, the EPA issued a final rule establishing the allowance allocation for 2022 and 2023, along with establishing a trading program for HFCs. 86 Fed. Reg. 55,116, Oct. 5, 2021. As stated in that final agency action, the Kigali Amendment and the AIM Act have ''a nearly identical list of HFCs to be phased down following the same schedule,'' Id. at 55,124. The EPA is currently developing regulations to update allowance allocations and the trading program for 2024 and later years.

I thank my colleagues at the U.S. Senate committee on Foreign Relations for providing a clear Congressional statement that no new legislation is required and that the Kigali Amendment is not self-executing. As Congress has already enacted the required domestic implementing legislation, I support ratification.

Mr. MENENDEZ. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays are ordered.

Under the previous order, all postcloture time has expired.

AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

Under the previous order, amendment No. 5503 is withdrawn.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 5518

The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 5518.

The yeas and nays have been previously ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 342 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Barrasso	Cornyn	Hickenlooper
Bennet	Cortez Masto	Hirono
Blackburn	Cotton	Hoeven
Blumenthal	Cramer	Hyde-Smith
Blunt	Cruz	Inhofe
Booker	Daines	Johnson
Boozman	Duckworth	Kaine
Braun	Durbin	Kelly
Brown	Ernst	Kennedy
Burr	Feinstein	King
Cantwell	Fischer	Klobuchar
Capito	Gillibrand	Lankford
Cardin	Graham	Lee
Carper	Grassley	Luján
Casey	Hagerty	Lummis
Cassidy	Hassan	Manchin
Collins	Hawley	Markey
Coons	Heinrich	Marshall

McConnell	Rosen	Sullivan
Menendez	Rounds	Tester
Merkley	Rubio	Thune
Moran	Sanders	Tillis
Murkowski	Sasse	Toomey
Murphy	Schatz	Tuberville
Murray	Schumer	Van Hollen
Ossoff	Scott (FL)	Warner
Padilla	Scott (SC)	Warnock
Paul	Shaheen	Warren
Peters	Shelby	Whitehouse
Portman	Sinema	Wicker
Reed	Smith	Wyden
Romney	Stabenow	Young

NOT VOTING—4

Baldwin	Leahy
Crapo	Risch

The amendment (No. 5518) was agreed to.

VOTE ON RESOLUTION OF RATIFICATION (NO. 117–1)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The question occurs on agreeing to the resolution of ratification, as amended.

Mr. CARPER. 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 Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 69, nays 27, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 343 Ex.]

YEAS—69

Bennet	Hassan	Portman
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Reed
Blunt	Hickenlooper	Romney
Booker	Hirono	Rosen
Boozman	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Brown	Kaine	Sanders
Burr	Kelly	Sasse
Cantwell	Kennedy	Schatz
Capito	King	Schumer
Cardin	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Luján	Sinema
Casey	Manchin	Smith
Cassidy	Markey	Stabenow
Collins	McConnell	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warnock
Ernst	Murphy	Warren
Feinstein	Murray	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Wicker
Graham	Padilla	Wyden
Grassley	Peters	Young

NAYS—27

Barrasso	Hagerty	Paul
Blackburn	Hawley	Rounds
Braun	Hoeven	Scott (FL)
Cornyn	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Johnson	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	Lummis	Toomey
Fischer	Marshall	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—4

Baldwin	Leahy
Crapo	Risch

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). On this vote, the yeas are 69, the nays are 27.

Two-thirds of the Senators present, a quorum being present, having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

The resolution of ratification, as amended, is as follows:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein).

SECTION 1. SENATE ADVICE AND CONSENT SUBJECT TO DECLARATIONS AND A CONDITION

The Senate advises and consents to the ratification of the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the ''Montreal Protocol''), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (''The Kigali Amendment'') (Treaty Doc. 117–1), subject to the declarations of section 2 and the condition of section 3.

SECTION 2. DECLARATIONS

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following declarations:

(1) The Kigali amendment is not self-executing.

(2) The People's Republic of China is not a developing country, and the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations should not treat the People's Republic of China as such.

SEC. 3. CONDITION.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following condition: Prior to the Thirty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, the Secretary of State shall transmit to the Secretariat of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer a proposal to amend Decision I/12E, ''Clarification of terms and definitions: developing countries,'' made at the First Meeting of the Parties, to remove the People's Republic of China.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, this is a very good day. We have just passed the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on a strong bipartisan basis. This is a win-win-win: win for U.S. jobs, win for U.S. investment, and win for U.S. leadership in the fight against climate change.

We have talked a lot about how this amendment will help U.S. businesses, U.S. jobs, and U.S. competitiveness overseas, but let's talk about how important this amendment will be for protecting our planet.

Ratifying the Kigali Amendment, along with passing the Inflation Reduction Act, is the strongest one-two punch against climate change any Congress has ever undertaken.

Let me say that again: Ratifying the Kigali Amendment, along with passing the Inflation Reduction Act, is the strongest one-two punch against climate change any Congress has ever taken.

In fact—amazing statistic, folks—people don't pay attention to this one, but it is vital. Experts say that phasing out our use of HFCs will help prevent up to half a degree Celsius of warming by the end of the century.

That is worth repeating as well. Experts say that phasing out our use of HFCs will help prevent up to half a degree Celsius of warming by the end of the century.

It is an easily overlooked victory, but a massive one, all coming from eliminating this family of dangerous chemicals, which are a thousand times more deadly per molecule than carbon dioxide.

And on top of it all, ratifying this amendment will give U.S. businesses a huge leg up. It will open exports to new international markets, generate tens of billions in new investments and help create tens of thousands of good-paying jobs, and we will get a much needed edge against Chinese businesses that still lag behind in developing viable HFC alternatives.

Under Kigali, our exports will increase while China will lose out. So, once again, ratifying the Kigali Amendment is a win-win-win: a win for U.S. jobs, a win for U.S. investment, and, most of all, a win for our global campaign to defeat the climate crisis and preserve our planet for future generations.

I want to thank my colleague from Delaware who has been such a persistent advocate on this legislation. And there are so many others—the Senators from New Mexico and Hawaii and Delaware—who have worked so hard on it as well. I thank them for their steadfastness. The globe, our globe, is rejoicing today because of this legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I want to thank our leader for his leadership.

None of this would have happened without your leadership. I want to thank your staff.

I want to thank the relative respective staffs on our side here and the Senators especially on the Environment and Public Works Committee.

I want to especially thank our friend JOHN NEELY KENNEDY from Louisiana, who has been a great partner, and his staff and other folks on the other side of the aisle.

My mother used to say to my sister and me when we were kids, she would say that things happen in threes. I remember she would say things happen in threes, and given what the leader just said, I am thinking about threes and especially with respect to making sure that this planet is going to be around for our children and grandchildren.

But if you go back to the bipartisan infrastructure bill signed into law roughly 10 months ago by the President, we did a whole lot there, you will

recall, with respect to roads, highways, bridges, water, wastewater, water infrastructure, flood control. But that legislation had the largest—at that point the largest climate title that we had ever put in a bill of any consequence here in the U.S. Senate. That is No. 1.

No. 2 would be the IRA, the Inflation Reduction Act, that was signed into law just last month by the President and championed by any number of folks, including our colleague from West Virginia, JOE MANCHIN. I want to thank him and the majority leader for their good work. That was No. 2 because the investments, the clean energy investments we make in the Inflation Reduction Act, are just extraordinary—extraordinary.

Then, today, to pass the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol—people might be wondering, who are watching, and say: What in the world is that? And I will just walk you back in time.

People might remember that I was a naval flight officer in the Vietnam war, and near the end of the Vietnam war, maybe after I had moved to Delaware, I remember hearing something about speculation about a hole in the ozone and there might be a hole in the ozone. At first, people dismissed it. I dismissed it. But over time, the concerns persisted, and the hole in the ozone grew and grew.

Somewhere along about 1985, some updated scientific information, evidence, emerged that said there is a hole in the ozone, and it is big, and it is getting bigger.

Our President at the time, as I recall, was not a Democrat; he was a Republican—Ronald Reagan. Under his leadership, we as a nation joined in the Montreal Protocol. It was finalized in 1987, where we actually say that what is happening here is exactly clear, and what that is, is there is a hole in the ozone. It was being created by materials that are in our air-conditioners or refrigerators and our coolers. We call them refrigerants, and when they leaked out of the air-conditioners, refrigerators, and coolers, they actually created the hole in the ozone.

So the question is, Do we have to give up our refrigerators, our air-conditioners, our coolers, our freezers? Do we have to give those up in order to take care and address the hole in the ozone? As it turns out, we did not, but what we had to do was replace something called CFCs, chlorofluorocarbons, which were refrigerants at the time and contributed to the hole in the ozone. What we had to do was replace those CFCs with something new. Science and the scientists came up with that something new. What they came up with was not CFC plus 2; they came up with HFCs, hydrofluorocarbons.

What I know about chemistry you can fit on a fairly small thumbnail, but HFCs came along, and, guess what, the hole in the ozone started getting smaller. We stayed cool. The air-conditioners worked, freezers worked, refrigerators worked, and the hole in the ozone started getting cooler.

What didn't get cooler was our planet because HFCs, as Senator SCHUMER suggested, are about 1,000 times worse than carbon dioxide with respect to global warming. We finally have realized that, and the question is, Can we do anything about it? If so, can we do it to make sure we stay cool or cold, if you will, and at the same time address climate change?

Some people say: You know, we can't do good things for this planet or we can't clean the air, clean the water, address the climate change, and create jobs and economic opportunity. But, as Senator SCHUMER suggested, that is just not true. This is sort of like having our cake and eating it, too, because we can create jobs.

A lot of them we are talking about creating with the phasedown of HFCs and for the next 15 years talking about creating literally tens of thousands of jobs not in some other country but here. We are talking about creating these jobs using technology developed here, and we are talking about the ability to export this technology and sell products using this technology all over the place.

I forget exactly what the economic value is from these activities, but it is in the tens of billions of dollars here, with American technology, created by American workers. Who wouldn't be for that? Who wouldn't be for that?

Some of our Republican colleagues offered an amendment today. Senator LEE and, I think, Senator SULLIVAN joined together on an amendment. I think most of us voted for that, and it has been adopted and added to this package.

The other thing I would mention is that about a month ago, you may recall, we stayed up all night during a vote-arama, working on the reconciliation legislation that led to the IRA, the Inflation Reduction Act.

I remember the next day going home. I was just dog-tired. I went home on the train and got off the train, and before I went home, I drove to Wawa, which is a convenience store. We love Wawa. They are all up and down the east coast, especially in Delaware. I stopped at Wawa to get a cup of coffee. I got a small cup of coffee and went to the cash register, the cashier, to pay for it, and the lady at the cash register said: Your money is no good here.

I said: No, no. I want to pay. I want to pay for it.

She said: No, no. I am mindful of what you have been up all night doing. Your money is no good here.

I said: Could I get a larger cup of coffee?

She said: No, but your money is no good here.

She also went to say—she said: I have a son. I have a daughter. I want to make sure they grow up on a planet that is fit to grow up on and that they can grow old on.

I think that is a sentiment that almost any father or mother or grandfather or grandparent would feel and have. I would just say to them today: I know sometimes you look at what is going on here and our inability to work together. We have come together. We have come together on something that is extremely important for us, my generation, but even more important, for those who follow us.

Bipartisan solutions are lasting solutions. This is a good bipartisan solution, and for everybody who has been a part of this, I want to thank you. I want to convey our thanks as well to the President and his administration for their help in getting this done.

This is a day, as my colleague from Delaware, Congresswoman LISA BLUNT ROCHESTER, would say—she would say: This is a day the Lord hath made. Let us rejoice and be glad in it.

Amen.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1950

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, while we are standing here right now in Washington, DC, in the middle of an afternoon, protests are happening all over Iran right now.

The latest news reports coming out from social media and the very limited media that can get out of Iran—massive protesters are in the streets of 20 different cities in Iran right now. The latest count is nine people have been killed in those protests by Iranian forces trying to be able to shut down the protests that are now breaking out all over the country—including, by the way, protests in Tehran.

What is going on? This has been a simmering issue for a long time in Iran. As I have stated several times on this floor and in committee hearings, our opposition with Iran is not with the Iranian people. The Iranian people live in oppression underneath the Iranian regime, which pushes their thumb down on them and limits their progress in the world and in their own country.

The spark of this latest group of protests that are happening in the streets all over Iran is a young lady who was murdered in police custody in Iran named Mahsa Amini.

Mahsa Amini, a 22-year-old Iranian woman, died in custody because she broke Iran's hijab law. In other words, she wasn't wearing her head covering, and so—brace yourself—the morality police arrested her. The morality police in Iran detained her, where she was apparently beaten to death while she was in prison. Now, the police and the regime have come out and said she had sudden heart failure, but with multiple injuries around her head, that is not sudden heart failure.

The nation—once again—of Iran is rising up to say: This has to stop.

Americans would be surprised at the number of social media posts that are getting out of Iran right now, where

large crowds—large crowds—are gathering in cities, tearing down the pictures of the Ayatollah, and chanting in the streets of Tehran, ''Death to the dictator.''

I have friends in Iran who have actually sent me some of the social media posts to be able to show me that this is what the street looks like today. This is breaking out across Iran.

Now, what is interesting is that, at the same time, the President of Iran has been allowed to be able to come into the United States to be at the U.N. General Assembly to be able to speak out for the regime's benefit to the rest of the world. It will be a remarkable side-by-side of what is happening in Iran on the streets right now and the Iranian leadership at the U.N. General Assembly.

At this same moment as well, Iran is working with Russia and has delivered hundreds of unmanned aerial vehicles that are weaponized, little kamikaze drones that are literally taking out Ukrainian artillery right now in the field in Ukraine. The Iranians haven't just supplied these weaponized drones to Russia; they have brought Russian leaders into Iran to be able to train them on how to be able to attack Ukraine with these weapons.

Right now as well, the Russians are calling up additional reservists to be able to fight the Ukrainians and to be able to continue to take the fight to them. Protests are also erupting in Russia right now from Russian moms who are furious that their husbands and their sons are being called up to be able to fight in Ukraine to replace the thousands of casualties that Russia has suffered in Ukraine.

Now, why do I connect the dots in all of these—what is happening in Iran on the streets, what is happening on the streets in Russia, and what is happening right now in Ukraine? Because in the middle of that moment internationally that is happening, the U.S. Government has partnered with Russian diplomats to negotiate with Iran a restart of the nuclear deal with them. I can't make this up. So the United States is using Russia as its proxy to negotiate with Iran to be able to restart a nuclear negotiation with them.

Listen, the JCPOA, this nuclear deal, as it is commonly called, when it was put in place in 2015, was then set aside to say: It is not accomplishing its purposes.

In 2015, when it was put in place—let's just review real quick what happened in the days after that.

Planes full—literal planes full—of pallets loaded with cash were sent to Iran as soon as this deal was signed. It was a government suddenly flush with cash. How did that regime use that cash? They bought munitions to be able to fight against Americans in Iraq.

From 2015 to 2017—that period immediately after the JCPOA was signed and planes full of cash were sent to them—munitions fired against American troops in Iraq increased 341 percent. During that same time period, terrorist incidents increased 183 percent. There were 58 incidents involving Iranian vessels in the gulf that put American troops at risk. Iran used its money not to be able to help the Iranian people but to attack us and to attack our allies.

Our Nation withdrew from this nuclear negotiation 4 years ago. After that happened, Iran's exports of crude oil declined by more than 2 million barrels a day, cutting off a major supply of money into the regime. Iran's defense budget was then cut 28 percent because of those revenue shortfalls. Iran's currency lost 70 percent of its value as the pressure was applied to Iran to actually join into nations around the world, to actually become a nation like the rest of the world.

I am bringing this into the Senate today. It is an issue that I have brought multiple times. We should have ongoing dialogue with Iran. They are ambitious to become a nuclear weapons-capable nation. They are the single largest State sponsor of terrorism in the world. They are the destabilizing force in all of the Middle East. Every nation in that entire region has to prepare themselves for an inevitable, erratic, irrational attack from Iran; and every nation fears the day that they gain a nuclear-capable weapon.

But the gaps in the nuclear negotiations are large. Let me list some of them. The nuclear negotiation excludes any conversation about their terrorist activities. It is just simply not limiting their terrorist activities, just limiting their nuclear capability. They are building long-range weapons capable of carrying a nuclear weapon. Why would you need to build a long-range heavy missile unless you are carrying a nuclear tip? The two are connected—their terrorist activities, their missile ambitions, and their nuclear ambitions. We should connect those in all of our relationships.

My amendment in my sense of the Senate that I bring is very clear today. One is to acknowledge what we all know is actually happening. The second is to say, we can't have any kind of sanctions relief, especially preemptively in negotiations on lifting energy petroleum sales coming out of Iran. The next section of it, the third section of it, is simply not releasing any of the sanctions on the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps. They are the core of the terrorist activities in the area. They are the trainers for those who actually attacked Americans in Iraq. We should not lift sanctions on them. The fourth on this is not providing relief to the financial institutions in Iran so they can't continue to extend their terrorist activities and their financial activities behind the scenes. The goal of this is to be able to put pressure on the regime but to protect the Iranian people as much as possible.

The final statement that is in this sense of the Senate is to affirm our long-term friendship with the people of Iran and our understanding that they are living under the thumb of this regime.

My friend that I had mentioned before who is from Iran has reached out to me in the last 24 hours with this simple question. The Iranian people are on the streets, trying to gain their freedom, trying to be able to speak and live their faith as they choose to. And here is this question: What are the Americans going to do to stand with us? That is a fair question for this body.

The Iranian people who are begging for their own freedom do not want the American response to be sending cash to the regime so they can oppress their people more or lifting the sanctions at this moment so that the regime can continue to advance its terrorist activities or just disengaging from its missile ambitions that destabilizes the region or to continue to be able to use Russia as a proxy for the United States of America while Russia is literally using Iranian drones to attack the Ukrainians.

Let's speak with a clear voice to the Iranian people on the streets. They want to hear the United States say: We stand with your passion for freedom, and not: We stand with the regime in what they are trying to do to you.

So saying all that: As if in legislative session, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be discharged from further consideration of S. 1950 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; I ask further that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. I have such respect for my colleague from Oklahoma. We are often on the same side of issues related to matters of national security and the Middle East, but I disagree with his analysis that he has presented here today. Let me make just a remark or two about his immediate request and then make a few remarks about the broader work to try to protect the world from a nuclear weapons-armed Iran.

First, as I understand it—and I just had a few days to take a look at the underlying legislation—it would significantly remove the administration's discretion to waive sanctions or to enter into certain oil sales or authorize business with Iranian financial institutions in that only a treaty entered into by the United States would provide that authority to the administration.

I think that is generally bad policy.

We can imagine a whole set of diplomatic engagements with any nation, including Iran, in which an executive may wish to toggle sanctions or licenses in order to provoke some behavior beneficial to the United States.

That is, in fact, why we regularly build waivers into our sanctions statutes. So to suggest that on Iran policy, the President is going to have no ability to impact sanctions or licenses until a treaty is entered into ties the administration's hands—both Republican and Democratic administrations—in a way that I simply don't think is helpful.

I understand my friend's argument.

He is not a supporter of the JCPOA, and he does not desire for the United States to enter back into a nuclear agreement with Iran. And at the heart of this request is the essence of President Trump's Iran policy—the idea that if we just keep hammering Iran with sanctions that either their behavior will get better or they will at some point choose to come to the table and do a comprehensive deal—the nuclear program, their ballistic missile program, their support for terrorism.

Now, I think that was a credible argument back during the Obama administration. Many people said Obama shouldn't give Iran anything until Iran comes to the table on everything.

This Congress went a different way. We ended up taking a vote that, by our rules, allowed for the nuclear agreement to go forward. But we now have the benefit of the opposition's argument to the JCPOA having been tested for 4 years. Trump basically took that philosophy—keep sanctioning Iran; don't worry about the fact that it is unilateral, and eventually Iran will come to the table on everything. He tested that for 4 years, and it was an unmitigated disaster—an unmitigated disaster. Not only did Iran not come to the table on everything, they came to the table on nothing. Their behavior in the region got much worse and much more adversarial to U.S. interests.

Just look at the reality on the ground in a place like Lebanon or Yemen or Iraq or Syria. At the end of Trump's term, did Iran have more or less influence in those places? Unquestionably more. More integrated with the Houthis—by the end of Trump's term, they were in charge of the Lebanese government. There was less separation between the Iraqi power structure and Tehran.

At the end of that 4-year period of time, testing maximum pressure, Iran was more deeply involved with its proxies than ever before. They were not negotiating with the United States on any of the conditions that the Trump administration laid down for us, and they were shooting at us.

There was not a single attack on U.S. servicemembers by Iranian proxies while the United States was in the JCPOA. Let me say it again: Not a single attack on U.S. servicemembers by Iranian proxies when the United States was in the JCPOA. They occur with regularity today. Attacks against U.S. forces in housing and on bases in Iraq and Syria restarted once we withdrew from the deal. In this year alone, there have been attacks in February, March, April, May, June, July, and August.

And so, I am not sure why we have to do a lot of guessing now as to whether we are better off with or without a nuclear agreement with Iran, because here's what we got for maximum pressure: American troops under fire, more support for proxies, no hopes of negotiation, and—the icing on the cake—an Iranian nuclear program that is now weeks away from having enough fissile material to produce a nuclear weapon. Compare that with a year away during the time of the agreement.

So we tested this theory that we just hit them with sanctions, hit them with sanctions, and, eventually, they capitulate. It didn't work by, I think, all objective measures. It didn't work. And so it makes sense that the Biden administration wants to engage and try to put back together a deal that was good for the United States and our allies.

And, lastly, I will say this. The Senator from Oklahoma is right. The Iranians are bad people. You can just see what they are doing right now in the streets of Tehran in brutally repressing another wave of protests. Listen to what the President said on TV just this week—denying the Holocaust. These are our adversaries. This is an enemy. But all throughout American history, we have understood there are times when it makes sense to sit down across the table with your enemy and adversary and engage in diplomatic conversation that is good for you and good for the world. It is true that if Iran was further away from a nuclear weapon, it would be good for us and it would be good for other countries in the world, including Russia, which is why Russia is sometimes part of these negotiations. But I don't know that because something is good for everybody, it shouldn't be acceptable to the U.S. Congress.

And so I am going to object to this request because I believe that the JCPOA is the right thing for the security of this Nation; because I believe in diplomacy even with your adversaries; because I think we have tested the proposition that maximum pressure will work better than a nuclear agreement, and we now know the results; and I also believe that some of the details of this resolution would ultimately bind the hands of American Presidents in a way that, you know, probably isn't good precedent for the long-term security of the Nation.

So, again, I think my colleague comes to the floor with good faith objections and longstanding objections. I come down in a different place, and for that reason, I would object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague. We have a lot of agreement in areas in Lebanon and other areas in the region that we work diligently together to be able to resolve—very, very difficult areas in this region.

But I do want to say: Facts are stubborn things. When my colleague makes a statement that we can see what happens during the time of the JCPOA and we can see what happens during the time of sanctions, I am welcome to be able to look at those facts. During the time of the JCPOA, as I mentioned before, from 2015 to 2017, munitions fired against American troops in Iraq increased 341 percent. Many of those munitions were Iranian-provided. So to be able to say that there were no attacks on Americans during the JCPOA is just factually not correct.

I can take you to a multitude of members of the U.S. military that will speak specifically of munitions that were fired on them and all kinds of improvised explosive devices created by the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and shipped into Iraq to be able to attack them specifically during that time period. So it is not factually correct there were no attacks on Americans during the time of the JCPOA. In fact, all the folks that look at these issues saw that terrorism increased 183 percent during that time period.

During the time of the sanctions, Iran suffered real consequences in their economy, including a dramatic drop in their own defense spending by 28 percent during that time period. I received a personal outreach from an individual who is a leader in Lebanon, who my colleague and I both know well, who reached out to me personally and said whatever the United States is doing right now to cut off funding to Iran, keep doing it because it is also cutting off funding to Hezbollah and to Lebanon. They are not getting their paychecks right now, and that is helping the stability of our government.

So there was a real effect during that time period. We can discuss strategic aspects of which one is more effective, the agreement or the heavier sanctions, but we can't just ignore it and say there was no benefit during that time period in the last several years on the pressure that was put on Iran during this time period.

The fact still remains, the people of Iran are asking the question. They are on the streets chanting for freedom. What is the Senate going to do to stand with them? And, currently, it is nothing. I would like for it to be something, to stand with the people of Iran as they speak out against the repressive regime that they are under the thumb of.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. WHITEHOUSE.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that with respect to the resolution of ratification, the motion 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.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make grammatical, technical changes to the resolution of ratification with respect to Treaty Document No. 117–1 in order to reflect the addition of material.

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

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here today as we close in on the vote on the DISCLOSE Act scheduled for tomorrow to urge my colleagues to vote yes on that measure. I have introduced the DISCLOSE Act in every Congress since Leader SCHUMER first unveiled it in 2010 on the heels of the wretched Citizens United decision.

Every Congress, just about every time I have set foot in Washington, I have sounded the alarm on the ever-growing tsunami of slime that Citizens United unleashed into our elections. I rise once more today to urge this Chamber to end the flood of dark money drowning our democracy.

This is not inevitable. As late as 2006, the amount of dark money sloshing around in our elections was only $5 million. In 2020, it had crossed the billion-dollar threshold. Big special interests don't spend a billion dollars without expecting return on investment, and that has damaged our democracy.

Voting to clean up that mess presents clear choices: whether or not billionaires and big corporations can purchase influence in secret, whether or not Americans deserve to know who is buying that influence, whether or not corruption has a place in our American democracy.

Twelve years after Citizens United, the evidence is in. Dark money powers up corporations and megadonors to pump billions into phony front groups. Those groups, often with soothing names like People for Puppies and Prosperity, then spew bile and slime into our elections. We often can't know exactly who paid for that bile and slime, but when corporations and the ultrarich keep getting what they want from a dark money-funded Congress, well, you see that over and over and over again; and Americans' suspicions grow. Their gut tells them the corporations and billionaires are behind the phony ads in an effort to rig our political system.

And Americans' instincts are right. Academic studies show that economic elites and business interests command huge influence in government policy while regular people have statistically little or none. Studies also show that politicians elected to Federal office with the support of dark money are more likely to support legislation aligned with big corporate interests. Regardless of what the American people want, the big donor interests win time after time.

Dark money isn't limited to elections either. I have come to the floor now 18 times to expose a decades-long, right-wing scheme to capture the Federal judiciary and its crown jewel, our Supreme Court. This scheme included a $580 million secretive campaign of dark money and phony front groups to pack the courts with judges selected to green-light donor-friendly policies, running multimillion-dollar ad campaigns to keep the confirmations of those judges and Justices on track.

Now, the result is the Court that dark money built is delivering big for its donor puppeteers. In a matter of days, the FedSoc Six on the Supreme Court overturned Roe v. Wade, manufactured new polluter-friendly legal doctrines, and threw out centuries-old gun safety regulations—all things big donors wanted; all things majorities of Americans did not want. What is more, one rightwing donor just dumped $1.6 billion to supercharge the dark money operation that captured the Court and cement that dark money network's hold over the Federal judiciary. And guess what. We wouldn't know who that donor is if someone hadn't tipped off the press—ProPublica and the New York Times. Think about that. We only know this because we get occasional little glimpses of these megadonors' covert schemes. That means this is only the tip of the iceberg. And where that $1.6 billion goes on its way out into our political system will be obscured in dark money channels.

No wonder Americans' trust in the government is cratering. Fifty-eight percent of voters say our government needs major reforms or a complete overhaul. Just a quarter of Americans say they have confidence in the Supreme Court. That is down 11 percent just from last year. Americans know something is deeply amiss in our democracy.

Mr. President, I believe to restore trust in government, we need to flush dark money out of government. Year after year, poll after poll, overwhelming majorities of Americans say: money in politics and wealthy political donors are the root of Washington's dysfunction. Election cycle after election cycle, even during COVID, voters listed political corruption among their most important issues. Americans no longer trust that their voices matter here, not as much as the dark money voices of big corporations and billionaires. And it is time to listen to them. It is time to rid our system of the corrupting influence of unlimited dark money.

Even the Citizens United Justices recognized that unlimited political spending without transparency would corrupt. Even the Justices who opened the floodgates of unlimited political spending knew that if it was not transparent, it would corrupt. They just wouldn't do anything about it.

The DISCLOSE Act hinges on a very simple idea: that Americans deserve to know who is spending to influence their vote. If you agree with that simple idea, vote for the DISCLOSE Act. If you believe that corporations and billionaires shouldn't hide behind phony front groups while spending gobs of money on elections, you should vote for the DISCLOSE Act. If you oppose corruption, you should vote for the DISCLOSE Act. It is time for every Member of this body to go on record about this poison in our system. And with any luck, with 10 Republicans joining us, we can return to a Congress that serves America again, and Americans deserve that.

I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague, Senator MERKLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, when I was in grade school, I had basic civics education. We learned about the fact that the vision of America was based on individuals standing up for their ideas in the public square. They could say: Here is what I think should take us forward, and here are the arguments behind it.

And someone else could say: Not so quick. I don't think that is the right path. We should do something else.

But in the course of this debate, those people gathered in the square could decide which way to go, partly based on whether they admired the thinking and the ideas being presented by the individuals, perhaps also what they knew about the individuals who were making those comments. But this is a basic competition of ideas freely expressed by members of the community and debated openly.

Well, I thought that was a beautiful thing; and it really goes to the notion of freedom of speech and the power that flows up from the people because it is the people gathered and discussing ideas who are making decisions. And in a republic, like our Republic, those decisions also involved whom you vote for because of that set of ideas; and that person is sent to a State legislature or the House of Representatives or the U.S. Senate to fight for those ideas. Isn't that a beautiful concept of complete transparent debate?

You know who else agreed with this idea who is no longer with us? Antonin Scalia. Now, I don't know that I have ever quoted Antonin Scalia before, former Supreme Court Justice who passed away a few years ago. He had this to say about disclosure. He said:

> Requiring people to stand up in public for their political acts fosters civic courage, without which democracy is doomed.

And then he continued:

> For my part, I do not look forward to a society which, thanks to the Supreme Court, [on which he sat] campaigns anonymously . . . hidden from public scrutiny and protected from the accountability of criticism. This [he said] does not resemble the Home of the Brave.

So here is a very conservative Justice saying that, without transparency, without public accountability, democracy is doomed.

I love the revolutionary idea that flows up from the people or, as Abraham Lincoln put it, that we are of the people, by the people, for the people.

Seven weeks from now, Americans are going to go to the polls, and they are going to cast their vote on initiatives and on individuals running for office based on what they have heard. And here is the challenge. A lot of what they have heard is not about people standing up in public with the courage of their convictions but about secret campaign spending where there is no accountability—the exact kind of influence that Antonin Scalia said dooms our democracy.

Citizens United, the decision in 2010, is something we talk about quite a bit. What it basically said is that if you don't give money directly to a candidate but instead run a campaign on their behalf, you can spend as much as you want. So unlimited spending—unlimited. This created super PACs that can collect unlimited spending from corporations, unlimited spending from individuals, and run unlimited campaigns on behalf of someone—super PACs.

But here is the thing, when they made that decision, the Court thought that perhaps Congress would act to make sure that all of those donations were disclosed. They weren't making a decision that they liked secrecy. After all, Antonin Scalia who voted for Citizens United said:

With secrecy, democracy is doomed.

Well, we haven't acted because we have a triple veto baked into the way the Senate acts that says you need a supermajority to get a bill to the floor, a supermajority to close debate on amendments, and a supermajority to go to a final vote on a bill.

Colleagues across the aisle have said: We wanted to protect that secret money because we think it helps us.

That secret money is all about not government of, by, and for the people; that secret money is about government of, by, and for the powerful. So they are using their veto for the powerful to corrupt our country, to corrupt the core vision of government of, by, and for the people. That is what this DISCLOSE Act is all about, to say that we only thrive if the money is legitimate in campaigns.

Let me explain this. There are two standards that my Republican colleagues have been fighting for: one standard for ordinary people and a completely different standard for the rich and powerful.

For ordinary people, they have supported public disclosure. So for ordinary people in America who spend $200 on a campaign, it is publicly disclosed. Everybody knows who you gave the money to.

But if a billionaire doesn't write a $200 check but writes a $200 million check on behalf of running a campaign for an individual, it is secret. It is secret—secrecy for the rich and powerful, disclosure for ordinary Americans.

This is all about the equivalent of a stadium sound system by the powerful that drowns out the voice of ordinary people. That drowning-out effort, as my colleague just pointed out, has gone higher and higher and higher. The sound system from the stadium has gotten louder and louder and louder, drowning out the voices of people. In 2010, it was some 60 million in dark money. In 2016, collectively over the years they had reached a billion dollars, and, in 2020, over a billion dollars in a single year.

And now we have Barre Seid, who donated his company, $1.6 billion, into the dark money network. This money, spent without accountability, is used to smear candidates.

There is a saying—a saying I heard as a little kid—and that saying was: The lie gets halfway around the world before the truth gets its pants on. But in our social media world, it is more like the lie gets three times around the globe before the truth gets out the front door. The truth is being hammered constantly by the smear campaign from dark money.

So this is what we have: a vote coming up on whether you believe in secret money smear campaigns or you believe in public accountability and preserving the vision of government of, by, and for the people.

This is so important to our future. I wonder what Antonin Scalia, lying in his grave, might be thinking when he sees the outcome of Citizens United, an outcome he did not intend.

You know, I had the experience of being the target of one of these smear campaigns in 2014. The Koch brothers were bragging, and they held a meeting. They said: We are going to put a lot of money—millions of dollars—into an organization called Freedom Partners. And Freedom Partners, along with the network, is going to spend $200 million in the 2014 campaigns.

They came to Oregon, and the press reports said that they were putting $3.6 million into television ads attacking me.

Now, I was in a different position than many targets because the Koch brothers had bragged about this money. So they did not take advantage of the anonymity that they could have. I decided to call them out. I put up an ad and said: Where is this money from? It is out-of-State oil and coal billionaires who have come to our State who want to elect my opponent because they share an agenda, and here is the agenda they have advertised: great investment for them, terrible choice for Oregon.

That was my response. I was able to respond because, in that case, the Koch brothers had chosen to waive the secrecy. They wanted people to know what they were doing. They wanted people to tremble and fear over the fact that they could write a check for $3 million, or $5 million, or $10 million, or $50 million.

This is even more evil when it is secret because then you can't respond about the source and what they are all about.

We have seen some recent examples. The Elections Project—what is that dark money up to? That dark money is up to trying to override article I, section 4 of the Constitution. They want State legislatures, without any influence from Congress or from Governors, to be able to write election rules. That is not what the Constitution says.

In addition, they want State legislators to be able to ignore the vote in their State and reassign electors for President to whomever they want. That is what that dark money group is doing.

How about Heritage Action? Jessica Anderson, the executive director, was caught on video bragging about her organization's role in passing voter suppression laws in Georgia. That is what that dark money is up to. They are trying to stop Americans from voting. How un-American is that? How unpatriotic is that? How ''destroying the freedom and rights of Americans'' is that? That is what Heritage Action is up to in trying to destroy democracy here in the United States of America.

Then we had the dark money groups coming together and saying that they were going to have an under-the-dome-type strategy to stop the DISCLOSE Act. What does ''under the dome'' mean? It is a reference to the dome over the Capitol. ''Under the dome'' is about using the triple veto here in the Senate to stop the DISCLOSE Act.

We twice had 59 votes to try to hold a debate on the DISCLOSE Act, but not 60—1 vote short. Now they are trying to do it again, to use the Republican caucus under the Senate rules—an under-the-dome strategy to support the sleazy, terrible, dark money attacks corrupting elections in America.

I say ''corrupting'' because how can an individual, if they can't see who is donating the money, if they don't know what is true and what isn't, because the highest percentage of these ads are actually putting fake facts forward; they are putting lies forward—that is why I call them a smear campaign. If smear campaigns are inundating the airways, how can citizens make an informed judgment? They can't. That is why Antonin Scalia said this type of secrecy would destroy democracy, and on this, he was right.

Let's pass the DISCLOSE Act. Let's save the vision of government of, by, and for the people.

I yield to my colleague from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. SMITH). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank my colleague, and I know that Senator VAN HOLLEN is here as well.

I am going to be brief. I particularly want to thank our colleague from Rhode Island because he has been relentless in terms of making this case day after day. I want to put this in very personal kind of terms because all of us who have the honor of serving in the U.S. Senate can relate to this issue.

Senator WHITEHOUSE has added a reform to his proposal that is very personal to me and I think embodies the accountability and the transparency that Oregonians and people in Minnesota, Michigan, and Maryland are calling for. Here is how I would start it: A number of years ago, I authored legislation that millions of Americans now understand is called Stand By Your Ad. Stand By Your Ad stipulated that as an elected official or a candidate, you would have to actually put your name behind these attack ads where you go after your opponent. And, now, day after day, in these next 50-plus days, we are going to see plenty of these ads.

The law worked well, and it is still on the books today, much to the chagrin of some officials who would like to take a quick hit on their opponent—an official or a candidate—and then scamper off without any accountability.

I do want to make clear, because of the good work of the Senator from Rhode Island, that Stand By Your Ad doesn't mean as much today because we now know the premium is ongoing for these secret, incredibly negative ads on your opponent because the people paying for dark money ads aren't required to put their name behind what they are saying.

That is an extraordinarily strong hit against openness and accountability and transparency in our democracy. Oregonians and people across the country are rightfully disgusted by it. It is extraordinary the lengths that those who are orchestrating these dark money attacks will go in order to make their case when there is no accountability.

I see my seatmate from the Finance Committee. We have worked together for years to change the Medicare statute that barred Medicare from negotiating to hold down the price of medicine. Big Pharma protected this negotiating ban like it was the Holy Grail. My colleague and I would come to the committee day after day and talk about: How is this common sense? Everybody in America negotiates in order to get the best possible deal.

But we looked, particularly in this session, at the start of the debate as a classic study in dark money. Big Pharma, and groups associated with it, spent enormous sums of money attacking me personally in Washington, DC, media. There was scary music, and there were attacks about how anybody who wanted these reforms was like a leech and taking away cures from the American people.

The striking part of all of this, and why what Senator WHITEHOUSE has had to say is so important, is that the ad wasn't even directed at me, because it was in Washington, DC. I am barely a household word in my own household, let alone in Washington, DC.

And what was the point of these extraordinarily large sums attacking me in Washington, DC? The point of it was to scare my colleagues—Senator STABENOW, Senator VAN HOLLEN, all of my colleagues here—because there was so much money at the hands of these extreme groups associated with Big Pharma that wanted to undermine a commonsense reform backed by millions of Americans that Medicare should negotiate.

At one point, someone said: Oh, there is so much opposition to this effort to negotiate.

I said: Are you kidding me? The opponents of negotiating on Medicare must be in a witness protection program because we can't find anybody who thinks you shouldn't negotiate.

Yet Big Pharma was willing to spend huge sums of money—dark money—not really to damage me politically, because my constituents live in Oregon, but to scare other Senators.

So people, of course, are going to get bludgeoned with these dark money ads every time they turn on the television, the radio, or watch a video online. I just don't think that Americans should be forced to guess or wonder what special interest is funding these ads that come from murky groups that have these radical names like the Coalition for Prosperity and Justice. We all know that they are not going to tell you who they really are.

My colleague from Maryland has been very patient. We had some glitches in the schedule, and we want to hear from our friend from Michigan as well.

I want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for basically taking the ''Stand By Your Ad'' concept and kind of reconfiguring it in the DISCLOSE legislation. Senator WHITEHOUSE's bill would require the heads of corporations, unions, or other organizations to identify when they are behind political ads, the same way Stand By Your Ad works under the original version of the law that I authored.

And remember—and I want this to be the takeaway about this issue—Senator WHITEHOUSE's proposal and extending ''Stand by Your Ad'' in this kind of fashion treats everybody the same. This is quintessential good government. It is not about going after somebody on the right or somebody on the left. This is about common sense. It is not a radical, leftwing proposal.

The American people ought to know who is trying to influence their votes. By the way, when we authored the original ''Stand by Your Ad'' proposal, it used to be bipartisan. And as my colleague from Rhode Island has mentioned, of late, it has been the Republicans who have been protecting dark money and protecting the basic kind of disclosure that I think our system of government has been all about.

The American people have strong differences of opinion on issues. There is no question about that. But I have had more than 1,020 open-to-all townhall meetings. What nobody disputes is that openness and accountability is what the American system is all about.

So, Senator WHITEHOUSE, our thanks to you for spending years and years at it because you are taking us, in a significant way, back to what I think used to be common sense, used to be accountability, used to be something that transcended the kind of thing that Big Pharma was doing early on where they didn't even pretend—they didn't even pretend—it was about an individual legislator; it was about scaring off all Members of Congress.

We can do better. Senator WHITEHOUSE's proposal moves us in that direction, and I want to thank my colleague from Maryland, who also was trying to deal with the scheduling kind of challenge, and look forward to working with him and my seatmate on the Finance Committee and Senator WHITEHOUSE, another exemplary member of the Finance Committee.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following Senators be permitted to speak prior to the scheduled vote: myself for up to 10 minutes, Senator STABENOW for up to 10 minutes, Senator CANTWELL for up to 5 minutes, and Senator MENENDEZ for up to 5 minutes.

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

DISCLOSE ACT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, I too want to thank the Senator from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE, for his laser focus on the issue of disclosure and transparency. And I want to thank my colleagues here on the floor: Senator WYDEN; Senator STABENOW; and Senator MERKLEY, who was here before; and others within our caucus.

In fact, every member of our Democratic Caucus supports the DISCLOSE Act. We support it because the stakes are so high for the future of our democracy. Billions of dollars that have crept in and now are gushing into our political system to influence our elections pose a grave threat to our Republic and to the future of our democracy.

Make no mistake, these are corporations and very wealthy people who are spending billions of dollars in secret money to influence people's votes so that they can get their way at the expense of the public interest. You have got a very few people with very deep bankrolls who are using their funds to try to shape our democracy and bend our democracy to suit their interests at the expense of everybody else.

And, as President Biden said in his remarks on this earlier this week, even foreign entities—foreign entities that are not allowed to contribute to political campaigns are engaged in these political expenditures—under current law, use dark money, front groups, to try to influence our elections and steer the course of our democracy here in the United States from overseas. That, by itself, should scare the hell out of every Senator and every American.

Madam President, I want to talk a little bit about how we got here. How

did we get to a place where, in the United States of America, for elections, special interests can spend billions of dollars to influence people's votes without telling the voters who they are? And make no mistake, they are not telling voters who they are because they don't want voters to know who is behind these ads.

Well, the story begins with the infamous 5–4 decision in the Supreme Court case of Citizens United. That decision opened the spigots and then floodgates to corporate spending—corporate spending in Federal elections. That is when the Supreme Court said: For spending in elections, we are going to say corporations are people too. Corporations can't go into the ballot box and push the lever, but for purposes of influencing everybody else's vote, we are going to say corporations are people too.

And that unleashed a huge amount of money into politics. The only way to address that part of Citizens United is, of course, either to have a Supreme Court that will reverse the terrible Citizens United decision or through constitutional amendment. I support that, but that is not happening anytime soon. But there is something that we can do right now and which we are going to vote on tomorrow, and that is the issue of secret, dark money because we can change that through our votes tomorrow.

After Citizens United, what you began to see was not just more money, not just a gusher of money from corporations and corporate entities going into elections, but more and more secret money flowing into elections. And you can see the pattern here of, back in 2006, about $5 million a year going into secret money in different ways; in 2020, $1 billion in that year alone. So the trajectory is increasing by the year, and as my colleagues have said, we also have the situation where one individual just contributed $1.6 billion that is going to flow in subterranean ways through our election process—one individual, $1.6 billion.

Now, here is a point I want to emphasize. Even in that really terrible Supreme Court decision, 5–4 decision, in Citizens United, the Justices—eight of the nine Justices in that decision called for more transparency in elections. Here is what Justice Kennedy wrote on behalf of eight of the nine Justices: that the disclosure of political expenditures ''provide shareholders and citizens with the information needed to hold corporations and elected officials accountable for their positions and supporters.''

He went on to say that, with disclosure, ''citizens can see whether elected officials are 'in the pocket' of so-called moneyed interests.''

This is Justice Kennedy. He voted for the notorious Citizens United decision, which opened the gushers of money, but he said, as this money flows through our system, we have a public interest in making sure voters know who is spending that money. And he says right here that it is important for citizens to know whether their elected officials are in the pockets of special interests.

So this vote is pretty clear in former Justice Kennedy's terms, which is, if you want dark money, you don't want the public to know who is supporting you in your campaigns, if you support continuing dark money.

So after that Citizens United decision, the alarm bells went off, as they should, and many of us said: We have got to pass a law to require disclosure. All this money is going to flow through the system. My God, at the very least, let's make sure that voters know who is spending the money.

So back in 2010—I served in the House of Representatives at the time—I authored the original DISCLOSE Act. My chief cosponsor was a Republican, Mike Castle from the State of Delaware, at the time. And we passed it. We passed that in the House of Representatives back in 2010. But when it came to the Senate, it hit a brick wall of Republican opposition.

And I must say, given what Republicans had said before the Citizens United decision about disclosure, it was a complete, 180-degree flip-flop and turnaround because the position that the Republican Senate leader Senator MCCONNELL had taken for decades was, We don't need all these regulations to regulate political money, but we should have disclosure; we should have disclosure.

In fact, when he was on ''Meet the Press'' back in the day, in the year 2000, this was a hot issue because of McCain-Feingold. So he was asked why he voted no on one of these campaign finance provisions, and he said the following:

> We need to have real disclosure. And so what we ought to do is broaden the disclosure to include at least labor unions and tax-exempt business associations . . . so you include the major political players in America.

He went on to say—Senator MCCONNELL:

> Why would a little disclosure be better than a lot of disclosure?

Well, I agreed with Senator MCCONNELL in 2000. We want full disclosure and full transparency. But what happened was, as soon as the Citizens United decision came down and a gusher of money started flowing through the system, including through corporations, all of a sudden, all of a sudden: Hey, I didn't mean what I said about disclosure. I can have my cake and eat it too—lots of money and nobody knows where it comes from.

And, in a twist of history, when we passed the DISCLOSE bill out of the House, it came to the Senate, and the Senate version of that bill got 59 out of 100 votes. Every Democrat voted for it. It would have been 60 except for a terrible twist in history, which is Senator KENNEDY passed away. And Senator BROWN took his place, and Senator BROWN voted against cloture on the DISCLOSE Act.

But, my colleagues, here is the fact: 59 out of 100 Senators wanted to move forward there, and but for the anti-democratic filibuster, we wouldn't have secret money in politics today. But here we are, and we have to deal with it in the here and now.

And it is interesting to hear the Republican leader. He said back in 2012, after we tried to move the DISCLOSE Act, on this Senate floor: Dark money is a ''problem that doesn't exist.''

Then, to take things even further, he rallied Republicans, and so, in the Republican national platform in 2012, it read: We ''oppose passage of the DISCLOSE Act,'' by name. We don't want the American people to know who is spending this money. We like dark money in politics.

So that brings us to today because what we saw since that vote in 2010 and then those comments by the Republican leader back in 2012 is this huge gusher of secret money flowing. And, interestingly now, it has also caught the attention of some of our Republican colleagues who have been complaining about secret money in politics, complaining that Democratic political organizations are spending secret money in politics.

As we know, Senator MCCONNELL distributed to reporters an email entitled ''Democrats Let the Dark Money Flow and Like Its Power''—and like its power. And Senator HAWLEY tweeted about dark money from foreign groups, writing:

> But who is funding this overseas dark money group—Big Tech? billionaire activists? foreign governments? We have no idea. Americans deserve to know what foreign interests are attempting to influence American democracy.

This is Senator HAWLEY, the Senator from Missouri. And I don't say this often on the Senate floor, but I agree with Senator HAWLEY's question here. And tomorrow he and every Member of this body will have a chance to vote to say that, yes, we should know about what foreign entities and interests are spending money in our elections, because there is all sorts of money—in fact, about $300 billion a year in foreign money—being laundered through our whole economy, and we don't know how much of that these days is flowing into elections. As President Biden said, we need to pass this to do that.

And if you look at some of the titles of this bill that Senator WHITEHOUSE has put forward, they are pretty simple. There are whole sections of the bill to get at the question of foreign money in our elections. I don't know why anyone is going to oppose that.

Here we are, 12 years later, after that vote in 2010 that got 59 out of 100 votes. It would have had 60, except that Senator Kennedy passed away. And our Republican colleagues, who are now complaining about secret money, have a chance to work with us and vote with us to get rid of it. Whether it is Democratic money, Republican money, somebody else's secret money, get rid

of it. Require transparency. That is what the DISCLOSE Act is all about.

So this is another chance for every Member of the Senate to align themselves with the overwhelming majority of the American people. Eighty percent support transparency disclosure, and they do it because they know how important it is to our democracy. Let's vote for this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, first of all, I want to thank Senator VAN HOLLEN for his incredible work over the years and his leadership both in the House and in the Senate. And thank you for taking on this fight and working so hard to expose the bright light of truth and transparency about what is happening around secret money.

And I want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his dogged focus on the issue of secret money influencing elections. Thank you for all of your wonderful work, and to all of our colleagues who have joined us on the floor and to all of my Democratic colleagues, all of whom are supporting the DISCLOSE Act.

The Members of this Chamber have a choice to make, and it is really pretty simple: You can be on the side of the American people or you can be on the side of the rich and powerful.

We can pass the DISCLOSE Act, let the public know what is happening, put limits around it, stop all of this; or you can vote against it and vote with the powerful and the wealthy.

The DISCLOSE Act is going to keep our elections in the hands of voters, not the highest bidders. That is really the bottom line. And you don't have to look very far for examples of why we need to pass this legislation.

Colleagues have all been talking today about, stunningly, how a conservative group has received a $1.6 billion donation from a single donor—one man, $1.6 billion; and one mission—one mission—to put his finger on the scale of our democracy.

If you don't think that guy isn't going to have an undue influence on our elections in the coming years, then I have a bridge across the Straits of Mackinac I would like to sell you.

And this very rich man isn't alone, unfortunately. As my colleagues have said, in 2006, there was less than $5 million in dark money spent on our elections—5 million. Then, in 2010, the Supreme Court handed down its Citizens United decision, which opened the floodgates, and it didn't take long for the water to rise. In 2012, more than $300 million was spent in secret money—dark money—in elections, and in 2020, more than $1 billion was spent in dark money in elections. And now we know, in 2022, that we have one person who has already given $1.6 billion to try to influence this election.

If you laid those billion-dollar bills end to end, they would extend around the Earth nearly four times—extend around the Earth four times. That is how much we are talking about here, and we don't even know where all this anonymous spending is coming from.

But we do know this, and Senator WYDEN—Chairman WYDEN—spoke earlier. When we took on Big Pharma to lower prescription drug prices, not one Republican voted yes. When we took on Big Oil to lower energy costs and attack the climate crisis, not one Republican voted yes. When we took on corporations that pay zero in taxes, not one Republican voted yes.

The American people deserve to know why. How much dark money is coming in from those powerful interests to protect their profits?

Dark money could also be coming from foreign actors who wish to harm our country.

What has been reported, though, again, is that dark money is coming in from one really rich guy—one really rich guy who wants to make our Nation a little bit more toward his liking.

American voters deserve to know who is spending huge—huge, huge—sums of money to influence our democracy. And under the DISCLOSE Act, they will know that. It will strengthen the foreign money ban to make sure foreign actors can't influence our elections. It requires corporations and other groups to disclose their donors. Right, left, Democrat, Republican: Disclose your donors.

And it expands disclosure requirements to online ads and other types of ads as well. As for all of those campaign text messages that are blowing up your phone, you deserve to know who is sending them.

These changes are popular. They are common sense, and they are really important. They are really important if we think America deserves to know who is influencing our elections. It is time to make sure our American democracy actually works for the American people.

Again, the Members of this Chamber have a choice to make: We can stand with the American people or we can stand with the rich and powerful. Democrats have made that choice. I have made that choice. We stand with the American people who just want a fair shot to work hard and get ahead. Americans want to know that this is their democracy and that it works for them, not just a few rich people.

I urge my colleagues to support the DISCLOSE Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

NOMINATION OF ARATI PRABHAKAR

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I rise today to support the nomination of Dr. Arati Prabhakar to be the Director of the Office of Science and Technology. Since 1976, the Office of Science and Technology Policy has worked to ensure that the United States leads in science and technology, to promote STEM education, and to make sure that our science Agencies share the common purpose of benefiting all Americans.

Dr. Prabhakar is very well qualified for this job. As an engineer, physicist, leader, venture capitalist, and pioneer, she has had a trailblazing career, accomplishing a lot in a time period where she was Director of the Defense Advanced Research Project Agency, DARPA, and the first woman to lead the National Institute of Standards and Technology, NIST.

And under Dr. Prabhakar's leadership, DARPA kick-started the development of a rapid-response mRNA vaccine platform. This platform was the basis for the fast, safe, and effective COVID–19 development.

Under her leadership at NIST, she worked to expand the Manufacturing Extension Partnership to boost the competitiveness of small- and medium-sized American manufacturers.

Just last year, the Manufacturing Extension Partnership program helped our domestic manufacturers capture $3.9 billion in new sales. In my State alone, that translated into over $186 million and more than 2,000 jobs created or retained.

Perhaps even more impressive, back in the 1990s, when Dr. Prabhakar was just in her twenties, she helped launch DARPA programs that made essential leaps forward in semiconductor manufacturing technology. Dr. Prabhakar's programs laid the groundwork for five generations of chip manufacturing technologies to help demonstrate leadership right here in the United States.

Dr. Prabhakar is now ready to lead again, and now we are asking for her to lead this important Agency. We have just passed the CHIPS and Science Act, which is a renewed commitment to domestic semiconductor research and manufacturing and U.S. leadership in the next generation chip technology.

Dr. Prabhakar has the exact experience we need to advise the President on semiconductor manufacturing, on bringing the supply chain and security that we need here in the United States, and on continued growth in science and technology jobs that come along with it.

The CHIPS and Science Act directs the National Science Foundation to invest in translational research, including through a new NSF tech directorate.

Before her nomination, Dr. Prabhakar was an important voice in support of this effort of a tech directorate, reaching out to House and Senate colleagues and helping to shape the directorate in its focus on big national and security challenges.

And the CHIPS and Science Act reflects our commitment to diversity in science, to make sure that the engineering, math, and STEM fields are included and that we continue to grow a workforce that is needed.

The important aspect of science is not always thought of in every aspect of growing the next generation. That is why I am so encouraged that Dr.

Prabhakar is very committed to increasing the talent pool that we need in our country.

For the first time in our country's history, the President has elevated the Office of Science and Technology Policy Director to a Cabinet-level post, meaning there will be a scientist in the room for our Nation's most important discussions.

And for the first time in history, with the support of my colleagues here today, Dr. Prabhakar will be the first woman and person of color to serve as the Senate-confirmed OSTP Director.

Dr. Prabhakar will have a lot to do, including developing the whole-of-government science and technology strategies for issues ranging from security to commercial space exploration. And at a time of growing competition, OSTP needs to tell the President and advise our leaders what we need to do to maintain our competitiveness as a nation.

I know, coming from an innovation State, how important the Office of Science and Technology Policy strategies can be in helping our Nation attract and keep the best and brightest and prioritize collaboration between academia and industry. And since Washington has been a STEM leader—in fact, I think we are the most STEM-focused State in the Nation; that is, by number of people involved in STEM——we know that this partnership between the existing workforce and the workforce of tomorrow needs to grow.

I know that, as a former DARPA Director, Dr. Prabhakar will help us with this engine of innovation and growing STEM education in America. Moreover, I know that Dr. Prabhakar will, on many issues, help to improve the participation of women and girls in the issues of STEM.

This is such a big, important issue for us today. But just being at the helm of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, being a woman, being there at the Cabinet level, and advising the President of the United States, I know she will help to deliver a message that young women all across America need to be involved in the sciences to help our Nation in the next phases of innovation. I am so excited that she will be in this position.

I ask my colleagues to support her as a devoted, experienced, and exceptional public servant. These are the kinds of people who we need in government. These are the kinds of people who can make America stronger, safer, and more competitive. I urge my colleagues to support the confirmation of Dr. Prabhakar as the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam 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 AMANDA BENNETT

Mr. MENENDEZ. Madam President, I rise today in support of Amanda Bennett to be the Chief Executive Officer of the U.S. State Agency for Global Media.

When autocrats around the world have been cracking down on independent media; when regimes silence opposition with repression and fear; when they shut down the internet, as we have seen in countries like Cuba and Iran; when they actively target the United States and like-minded democratic nations with disinformation campaigns, it is critical for the United States to have a champion of democracy and free speech leading the U.S. Agency for Global Media, someone who can meet the challenge posed by the spread of digital authoritarianism around the world.

Ms. Bennett is prepared to take on that task. She has over two decades of experience in journalism, including as the director of Voice of America. For 23 years, she worked at the Wall Street Journal, including as a correspondent in Beijing, where she came face-to-face with China's authoritarianism. She has seen how their state security forces watch and detain journalists to suppress the truth.

As a former director of Voice of America, she understands the importance of the U.S. Agency for Global Media's networks and American public diplomacy efforts.

Over the course of her career, she served on the boards of the Lenfest Institute and Committee to Protect Journalists.

In short, Ms. Bennett is without a doubt the right person for this position. She will be a tireless advocate for the journalists working at USAGM and an effective steward of its operations. She will also be an invaluable ally to USAGM's independent partners, including Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty and Radio Free Asia. She will defend the importance of Radio and TV Marti. And she will be accountable to Congress in these efforts.

It has been almost 2 years since the Agency has had a Senate-confirmed CEO at the helm. It is in dire need of steady leadership that supports independent media.

I enthusiastically support Ms. Bennett. I respectfully urge my colleagues to support her confirmation as well.

TREATY DOCUMENT NO. 117–1

Madam President, finally, before I yield the floor, I would also like to celebrate the Senate's historic vote today to approve the Kigali Amendment to the Montreal Protocol.

In approving the Kigali Amendment, the Senate took an important step that will have enormous economic and trade benefits for American manufacturing and jobs, but it was also the single most important climate action the Senate and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have taken in more than 30 years. As wildfires ravage the West, hurricanes devastate Puerto Rico, and catastrophic flooding inundates the Midwest, strong action to fight climate change has never been more urgent.

By voting for the Kigali Amendment today, we voted for maintaining a livable planet with clean water to drink. We voted for a stable food supply for all of humanity. We voted, in a strong bipartisan coalition, to keep American innovation and business at the forefront of the transition to clean energy.

Finally, I want to express my gratitude for the support and cooperation of the Foreign Relations Committee's ranking member, the senior Senator from Idaho, Senator RISCH. His partnership and the tireless efforts of his staff were essential in the Senate's success on Kigali.

I want to thank my staff on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: Damian Murphy, staff director; Andrew Keller, chief counsel; Josh Klein; Josh Kretman; Julia Greensfelder; and Megan Bartley. They were essential in getting it to the committee and making us successful.

I urge a positive vote.

I yield the floor.

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 bill 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. 1055, Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Christopher Murphy, Ben Ray Luján, Chris Van Hollen, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeff Merkley, Jack Reed, Jeanne Shaheen, Elizabeth Warren, Tammy Baldwin, Christopher A. Coons, Tina Smith, Michael F. Bennet, Jacky Rosen, Edward J. Markey, Angus S. King, Jr.

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 Amanda Bennett, of the District of Columbia, to be Chief Executive Officer of the United States Agency for Global Media, 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 Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The result was announced—yeas 60, nays 37, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 344 Ex.]

YEAS—60

Barrasso	Graham	Portman
Bennet	Hassan	Reed
Blackburn	Heinrich	Romney
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Blunt	Hirono	Rounds
Booker	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	Kelly	Schatz
Burr	King	Schumer
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Cardin	Leahy	Sinema
Carper	Luján	Smith
Casey	Manchin	Stabenow
Collins	Markey	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Van Hollen
Cornyn	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Duckworth	Murray	Warren
Durbin	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Padilla	Wyden
Gillibrand	Peters	Young

NAYS—37

Boozman	Hoeven	Rubio
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cotton	Kennedy	Shelby
Cramer	Lankford	Sullivan
Cruz	Lee	Thune
Daines	Lummis	Tillis
Ernst	Marshall	Toomey
Fischer	McConnell	Tuberville
Grassley	Moran	Wicker
Hagerty	Murkowski	
Hawley	Paul	

NOT VOTING—3

Baldwin	Crapo	Risch

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 60, the nays are 37, and the motion is agreed to.

CLOTURE MOTION

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

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. 1097, Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

Charles E. Schumer, Cory A. Booker, Tim Kaine, Robert P. Casey, Jr., Gary C. Peters, Jack Reed, Chris Van Hollen, Alex Padilla, Debbie Stabenow, Ben Ray Luján, Christopher Murphy, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher A. Coons, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Baldwin, Edward J. Markey, Raphael G. Warnock.

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 Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 345 Ex.]

YEAS—58

Bennet	Hickenlooper	Reed
Blumenthal	Hirono	Rosen
Blunt	Kaine	Rounds
Booker	Kelly	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Burr	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Luján	Sinema
Carper	Lummis	Smith
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Cassidy	Menendez	Tester
Collins	Merkley	Tillis
Coons	Moran	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	Murkowski	Warner
Duckworth	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Padilla	Wyden
Hassan	Peters	
Heinrich	Portman	

NAYS—38

Barrasso	Hagerty	Romney
Blackburn	Hawley	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sasse
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Scott (FL)
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Toomey
Ernst	Manchin	Tuberville
Fischer	Marshall	Wicker
Graham	McConnell	Young
Grassley	Paul	

NOT VOTING—4

Baldwin	Crapo
Cramer	Risch

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). On this vote, the yeas are 58, the nays are 38.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Arati Prabhakar, of California, to be Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

S. RES. 753

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I rise today to say a few words about the state of democracy, both in terms of the upcoming election in Brazil as well as here in the United States.

It is no great secret that, today, democracies around the world are under great threat from rightwing extremism. That obviously includes our own, as we all saw tragically on January 6, 2021, when there was an attack on this very building by those seeking to overturn our Presidential election.

One of the countries where democracy is now under threat is Brazil, the largest nation in Latin America and one of the largest democratic countries in the world. On October 2, less than 2 weeks from now, Brazil will hold its Presidential election. According to many polls, it appears that the two major candidates in that election are President Jair Bolsonaro and former President Lula da Silva. If no candidate in that election receives over 50 percent of the vote, there will be a runoff election between the top two candidates on October 30.

Mr. President, over the past many months, Brazilians from all sectors of society have publicly expressed serious concerns about ongoing efforts in that country to undermine democracy, including close to 1 million Brazilians who signed an open letter released on July 26, 2022, defending the democratic institutions of Brazil and the rule of law.

And there is, in fact, a very good reason as to why the people in Brazil are concerned about their democracy, and that is that the current President and candidate for reelection, Jair Bolsonaro, has made some very provocative statements which suggest that he might not accept the election results if he loses. In other words, Bolsonaro might attempt to destroy Brazilian democracy and remain in power no matter what the people of Brazil determine in a free and democratic election.

Here are just a few examples of what Mr. Bolsonaro has said over the years.

Back in September 2018, before he won his election, Bolsonaro stated:

I will not accept an election result that is not my own victory.

On September 7, 2021, as reported by the Financial Times, Bolsonaro stated:

There are those who think they can take me from the presidency with the mark of a pen. Well, I say to everyone I have only three possible fates: Arrest, death or victory. And tell the bastards I'll never be arrested. Only God can take me from the presidency.

According to Human Rights Watch, previously, President Bolsonaro had claimed, without providing any evidence, that the last two Presidential elections were fraudulent, including his own election, in which he claimed he got more votes than the final tally showed.

But it is not just Bolsonaro's words that should be of concern to those of us who still believe in democracy. According to a recent survey by the Federal University of the State of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil is experiencing a 335-percent increase in violence directed against political leaders in 2022 relative to 2019.

Mr. President, it is obviously not the business of the United States to determine who the next President of Brazil is or to get involved in Brazil's Presidential elections in any way. That is a decision to be made solely by the people of Brazil through a fair and free election. But it is the business of the United States to make clear to the people of Brazil that our government will not recognize or support a government that comes to power through a military coup or the undermining of a democratic election. That is our business.

In that regard, Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to support a resolution

that I have introduced with Senator KAINE, S. Res. 753. And Senator KAINE, of course, is the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere, and that is also cosponsored by Senators LEAHY, MERKLEY, BLUMENTHAL, and WARREN.

This resolution is very simple and straightforward. It does not take sides in Brazil's election, obviously, and that would be unacceptable. But what it does do is express the sense of the U.S. Senate that the U.S. Government will make it unequivocally clear that the continuing relationship of the United States and Brazil depends upon the commitment of the government of Brazil to democracy and human rights.

This resolution urges the Biden administration to make clear that the United States will not support any government that comes to power in Brazil through undemocratic means and to ensure U.S. security assistance to Brazil remains compliant with our laws related to the peaceful and democratic transition of power—in other words, no military aid to a military coup in Brazil.

This does not seem to be a complicated or, in my view, controversial piece of legislation. Yet—and I say this with a great deal of sadness, and maybe it tells us the state of democracy in the United States—we have not been able to get one single Republican to cosponsor this very simple, straightforward resolution.

Why is that? And the answer is, I would love for my Republican colleagues to explain to me why they cannot support and add their names to a resolution that simply supports Brazil's democracy and the peaceful transfer of power. Obviously, it would be most effective if this resolution had bipartisan support, and I hope that it will.

Mr. President, in my view, it is imperative that the U.S. Senate make it clear through this resolution that we support democracy in Brazil. It would be unacceptable to the United States to recognize a government that came to power undemocratically; and, if we did that, it would send a horrific message to the entire world. So it is important for the people of Brazil to know that we are on their side.

We are on the side of democracy, and that is what this resolution is about. I ask my colleagues, in a bipartisan way, to support it.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 1056 and 1060; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Roselyn Tso, of Oregon, to be Director of the Indian Health Service, Department of Health and Human Services, for the term of four years; and Robert A. Wood, of New York, to be an Alternate Representative of the United States of America to the Sessions of the General Assembly of the United Nations, during his tenure of service as Alternate Representative of the United States of America for Special Political Affairs in the United Nations, en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in 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.

DISCLOSE ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the DISCLOSE Act and the need to take action to get secret money out of our elections.

I want to thank Senator WHITEHOUSE for his leadership on this legislation—and testimony at the Rules Committee hearing I held on it this summer—as well as Leader SCHUMER for holding this vote. Senator WHITEHOUSE has championed this bill since 2012, and I have been proud to support it alongside him in every Congress.

This vote could not come at a more important time, as we are seeing an unprecedented flood of money into our elections. Over $14 billion was spent during the 2020 elections, the most expensive in our country's history.

As we approach the general election in November, with 48 days left, this is already the most expensive midterm election ever. One estimate expects that nearly $10 billion will be spent just on political advertising this election cycle, more than double the $4 billion in the 2018 midterm elections.

As spending on elections increases, the sources of the spending are less accountable than ever before. One investigation found that more than $1 billion was spent on the 2020 elections by groups that do not disclose their donors at all.

Americans know there is way too much money in our elections, and—for our democracy to work—we need to know where this money is coming from. But since the Supreme Court's decision in Citizens United opened up the flood of outside money, no significant improvements have been made to our disclosure laws or regulations.

Unlimited, anonymous spending in our elections doesn't encourage free speech; it drowns out the voices of the American people who are seeking to participate. And this unrelenting secret spending will continue unless we take action to address it, which is why we need to pass the DISCLOSE Act.

The DISCLOSE Act would address this tidal wave of secret money by requiring outside groups that spend in our elections to disclose their large donors—those that contribute more than $10,000—to the public.

Importantly, the bill also makes it harder for wealthy special interests to hide their contributions or cloak the identity of donors; and it cracks down on the use of shell companies to conceal donations from foreign nationals.

I held a hearing on the bill in the Rules Committee this summer, where we heard about the effects that secret money is having on our democracy—and why we need to pass this legislation.

Senator WHITEHOUSE testified at that hearing, and he spoke powerfully about the impact that secret money is having on our government—affecting all aspects of our lives, from the makeup of our courts to people's healthcare decisions to addressing climate change.

We also heard from Montana's Commissioner of Political Practices Jeff Mangan, who told us how his State's version of the DISCLOSE Act passed in 2015 with bipartisan support. I couldn't agree more that transparency in our democracy should not be a partisan issue, and regardless of political party, we should know who is spending in our elections.

The American people know what is at stake, so it is no surprise that campaign finance disclosure laws have overwhelming support. One recent poll found that in swing States, 91 percent of likely voters—Republicans and Democrats—support full transparency of campaign contributions and spending in our elections. Another poll from 2019 found that, across America, 83 percent of likely voters support public disclosure of contributions to groups involved in elections.

There is also a long history of bipartisan support for reducing the influence of money in our democracy. In fact, the very first limits on corporate campaign contributions in 1907, the landmark Federal Election Campaign Act in 1972, and the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act in 2002—which my friends and former colleagues Senators John McCain and Russ Feingold joined together to champion—were all passed on a bipartisan basis and signed into law by Republican Presidents.

Former Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia—never one to hide his opinions—was also a staunch supporter of campaign finance disclosure. In a 2010 case, Doe v. Reed, he wrote: ''For my part, I do not look forward to a society which, thanks to the Supreme Court, campaigns anonymously . . . hidden from public scrutiny and protected from the accountability of criticism. This does not resemble the Home of the Brave.''

Ensuring the transparency of our elections has been—and should continue to be—a bipartisan value. These issues are at the very heart of our democracy, and this commonsense bill would protect the right of voters to make informed choices and know who has been trying to influence our elections.

While we are here today to vote on legislation to counter the flood of secret money in our elections, there is so much more we must do to safeguard our democracy, and I continue to support this and the other reforms in the Freedom to Vote Act.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting these measures that are so fundamental to our system of government and voting to advance this legislation.

REMEMBERING SCOTT KEITH

Ms. LUMMIS. Mr. President, today I have the distinct honor of welcoming Scott Keith to the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame in the class of 2022. While Scott sadly passed away in 2020, I know he would be pleased that so many people he worked with over the years have honored him with this remarkable posthumous recognition.

Being inducted into the hall of fame is truly one of the highest achievements anyone can meet. It means your peers and colleagues believe you are among the best of the best, you have made the industry better, and during your lifetime, you have set an example for those who wish to follow in your footsteps.

Scott was introduced to the world of agriculture at an early age, having been born in Buffalo and raised on a ranch near Kaycee. It did not take long for him to learn to love and appreciate agriculture in Wyoming and realize that, when he grew up, that is what he wanted to do with his life. In order to help facilitate that dream, Scott enrolled at Casper College and eventually the University of Wyoming, where he earned a bachelor's degree in agriculture business.

Eventually, Scott and his new bride, Brenda, decided to move to Casper to settle down and raise a family. While in Casper, not only did Scott spend time fostering further relationships in the agriculture industry through his work as a loan officer with the Production Credit Association and First Interstate Bank in Casper, he also made sure to leave his mark on the community through numerous volunteer projects in Casper. Scott had served on the Casper Chamber of Commerce Ag Committee, as well as on the Natrona County Conservation District. He was also a very passionate supporter of the Kelly Walsh High School football team and the Casper Swim Club, where he could be found behind the grill at football games and on the pool deck during swim meets. Needless to say, he loved his family and enjoyed supporting his local community any way he could.

In 2002, Scott joined the Wyoming Business Council Agribusiness Division as the forage and co-op development program specialist, which eventually led to a promotion to be the livestock and forage program manager. In that role, Scott was instrumental in promoting the Wyoming hay and forage industry across the United States and abroad. Scott also played a significant role in creating numerous associations related to the promotion of Wyoming Agriculture through the Wyoming Hay and Forage Association and the Future Cattle Producers of Wyoming. His work with the Wyoming Hay and Forage Association led Wyoming hay producers to victory at the World Forage Analysis Superbowl in Madison, WI—twice. I know there are many members of the Pro Football Hall of Fame who have no Super Bowl wins, but Scott was able to claim being a two-time winner of the World Forage Analysis Superbowl.

Scott also took an interest in teaching and promoting agriculture to youth in Wyoming. Being an expert in judging cattle, among other talents, through the Future Cattle Producers of Wyoming program, Scott would encourage high school students to learn how to raise cattle by working with local producers and a donated heifer. This not only gave high school students firsthand experience in learning how to raise cattle, but it also played a vital role in making sure that Wyoming continues to be a worldwide leader in quality beef.

After the passing of his wife Brenda, Scott met Tracy Smith in Casper, and in 2016, he began working as a contractor for Big Iron Auctions. He was quickly promoted to district manager and was able to help those involved in Wyoming agriculture buy and sell their equipment.

In addition to all of his work throughout his career, he still found time to be a part of the Wyoming Wool Growers Association, the Wyoming Stock Growers Association, and even was able to serve as the chairman of Wyoming AgXpo. He truly was an amazing person and a role model to all of us in Wyoming.

I wish that Scott had been able to receive this recognition in person. He dedicated his life to the promotion of Wyoming agriculture, and many are benefiting from his hard work. But, I am glad that his legacy will continue to live on through his membership in the Wyoming Agriculture Hall of Fame.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO DANA CONNORS

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the career one of Maine's most dedicated, respected leaders: Dana Connors. Dana is part of the fabric of Maine, and it is almost impossible to concisely recognize the impact he has had on our State.

Dana, a proud native of Aroostook County, started his career as a municipal manager in Presque Isle after graduating from the University of Maine. Here, he served as city manager for 16 years, where he built a reputation as an advocate for common sense, a consensus builder, and a good listener. His exceptional ability to put a fine point on issues and present a case for the greater good brought him to State government, where he served as Maine's Commissioner of the Department of Transportation under both a Democratic and Republican Governor—a true testament to his bipartisan values.

In the time I have known him, it has always been clear that Dana served the people, not any party. It is due to this unimpeachable dedication, that people have always trusted him implicitly. I am one of those people, and when I was lucky enough to serve as Governor of the great State of Maine, Dana was my first and only choice to be my transition director. Shortly after in 1994, he became president of the Maine State Chamber of Commerce, where he has served our business community admirably for nearly 30 years.

It is here at the chamber where perhaps he has left his largest legacy. There has never been a greater advocate for Maine's businesses, and his legacy will continue to echo throughout our State for generations. Because of Dana, thousands of Maine businesses have been able to thrive, employ hardworking Maine people, and make our State the greatest in the Nation.

While his retirement will undoubtably leave a large void in the business community, Dana has instilled the same work ethic and understanding of the needs of Maine businesses in his team. They will continue Dana's legacy and ensure the growing success of the State that Dana devoted his career to.

Dana has made the Maine State chamber a shining example of professionalism. His instincts—and his fashion sense—may be a hard act to follow, but his ability to lead always includes a path for others to succeed. Thank you, Dana, for your friendship, your leadership, and your dedication to public service. Maine is better for it.●

RECOGNIZING THE KENTUCKY CHAPTER OF THE NATIONAL WASTE AND RECYCLING ASSOCIATION

● Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the Kentucky Chapter of the National Waste and Recycling Association, NWRA.

For 60 years, NWRA has been the Nation's leading voice for the private sector waste and recycling industries, which are essential to maintaining the quality of American life. The daily delivery of waste and recycling services impacts all residential, commercial, and industrial properties.

The NWRA's mission has been to promote the waste and recycling industry

through the strategic application of a results-driven advocacy and vision. The NWRA has created a favorable business climate where members prosper and provide safe, economically sustainable services and jobs that benefit communities throughout America.

With nearly 700 members, no chapter has showcased this shining standard more than Kentucky's NWRA chapter. For example, solid waste in Louisville has a diversion rate that is twice as efficient as comparable sized cities.

Solid waste and recycling collection in Louisville is no easy task. Metro Louisville consists of 83 incorporated cities, numerous homeowners' associations, and the Urban Services District collected by Metro Public Works. Despite these challenges, Kentucky's NWRA chapter continues to meet and exceed all expectations.

I am proud to salute the Kentucky NWRA chapter for their continued service and accomplishments, and I have no doubt they will continue to play an integral role in bettering the Commonwealth.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DOVER ADULT LEARNING CENTER

● Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to recognize the Dover Adult Learning Center—DALC—on its 50th anniversary. For five decades, the hard-working team at the DALC has supported thousands of adult learners in their quest to reinforce their learning skills and improve their lives through high-quality adult education. I join a grateful community in saluting them for the indispensable service they provide not only to each participant, but also to local partners and businesses who benefit from an educated and engaged workforce.

We all know that an education is the key to unlocking so many doors of opportunity. These doors could lead to a fulfilling new job, a hard-earned promotion at a current place of work, or additional education and training at a community college. No matter the destination, the Dover Adult Learning Center works closely with community members throughout their educational journey to identify personal goals and provide tailored instruction that guides them toward their full potential. The center offers an inviting atmosphere where students of all types—including people with disabilities, people who are homeless or unemployed, teens who might otherwise drop out of high school or immigrants learning English—feel comfortable honing their reading, writing, math, and digital literacy skills. At the Dover Adult Learning Center, a high-quality adult education is always within reach.

Each June, the Dover Adult Learning Center holds a graduation ceremony where participants are able to celebrate the successful completion of their program alongside family, friends, center staff, and volunteer tutors. It is a time to reflect on a period of personal growth and achievement. It is also a chance to look forward with hope. For many graduates, an exciting future with new possibilities is only just beginning. Through their experience at the Dover Adult Learning Center, they are given the tools to venture into this new world with an open mind and a lifelong appreciation for learning.

As a former teacher at the Dover Adult Learning Center, I know from personal experience how hard the center works to provide these programs and accommodate each participant through a variety of learning options, flexible schedules, and access to supportive services like childcare. Its staff and educators are creative in connecting and engaging with each student, and they are always there to offer support and guidance. We should take a moment to thank all of the teachers, staff, and volunteers for the skill, dedication, and passion that they bring to their roles at the center each and every day.

On behalf of the people of New Hampshire, I ask my colleagues and all Americans to join me in congratulating the Dover Adult Learning Center on five decades of service and wishing its team all the best as they continue their important work in the coming years.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:32 a.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 bill, without amendment:

S. 2490. An act to establish the Blackwell School National Historic Site in Marfa, Texas, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1433. An act to reauthorize the Helen Keller National Center for Youths and Adults Who Are Deaf-Blind.

H.R. 4009. An act to authorize the Georgetown African American Historic Landmark Project and Tour to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4358. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Little Manatee River as a component of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes.

H.R. 6265. An act to require a strategy by the United States Government to disrupt and dismantle the Captagon trade and narcotics networks of Bashar al-Assad in Syria.

H.R. 6846. An act to require a review of sanctions with respect to Russian kleptocrats and human rights abusers.

H.R. 7240. An act to reauthorize the READ Act.

H.R. 7338. An act to require congressional notification prior to payments of Department of State rewards using cryptocurrencies, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8453. An act to provide for the imposition of sanctions with respect to foreign persons undermining the Dayton Peace Agreement or threatening the security of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8503. An act to require the development of a strategy to promote the use of secure telecommunications infrastructure worldwide, and for other purposes.

H.R. 8520. An act to establish certain reporting and other requirements relating to telecommunications equipment and services produced or provided by certain entities, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore {Mr. LEAHY) announced that on today, September 21, 2022, he had signed the following enrolled bill, which was previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 8656. An act to designate the clinic of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Mishawaka, Indiana, as the ''Jackie Walorski VA Clinic''.

MEASURES REFERRED

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

H.R. 1433. An act to reauthorize the Helen Keller National Center for Youths and Adults Who Are Deaf-Blind; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 4009. An act to authorize the Georgetown African American Historic Landmark Project and Tour to establish a commemorative work in the District of Columbia and its environs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 4358. An act to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Little Manatee River as a component of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 6265. An act to require a strategy by the United States Government to disrupt and dismantle the Captagon trade and narcotics networks of Bashar al-Assad in Syria; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 6846. An act to require a review of sanctions with respect to Russian kleptocrats and human rights abusers; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 7338. An act to require congressional notification prior to payments of Department of State rewards using cryptocurrencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 8453. An act to provide for the imposition of sanctions with respect to foreign persons undermining the Dayton Peace Agreement or threatening the security of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 8503. An act to require the development of a strategy to promote the use of secure telecommunications infrastructure worldwide, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 8520. An act to establish certain reporting and other requirements relating to telecommunications equipment and services produced or provided by certain entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC–5141. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of

Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reproductive Health Services'' (RIN2900–AR57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5142. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Principle-based Ethics Framework for Access to and Use of Veteran Data'' (RIN2900–AR52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5143. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Informed Consent and Advance Directives'' (RIN2900–AQ97) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5144. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Individuals Using the Department of Veterans Affairs' Information Technology Systems to Access Records Relevant to a Benefit Claim'' (RIN2900–AQ81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5145. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs'' (RIN2900–AP02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5146. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, a draft bill entitled ''Veterans Benefit Programs Improvement Act of 2023''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5147. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, a draft bill entitled ''Veterans Health Care Act of 2023''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5148. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, a draft bill entitled ''Department of Veterans Affairs Miscellaneous Programs Improvement Act of 2023''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5149. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act of 2017 Implementation'' (RIN2900–AR19) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2022; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5150. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, a draft bill entitled, ''Veterans Memorial Affairs Improvement Act of 2023''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC–5151. A communication from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC–5152. A communication from the General Counsel, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Annual Fee Calculation'' (RIN3141–AA77) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2022; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–5153. A communication from the General Counsel, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Facility License Notification'' (RIN3141–AA76) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2022; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–5154. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Repayment of Candidate Loans'' (Notice 2022–17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 19, 2022; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC–5155. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Federal Election Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Repayment of Candidate Loans'' (Notice 2022–17) received in the Office of the President pro tempore of the Senate; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 177. A bill to amend the John D. Dingell, Jr. Conservation, Management, and Recreation Act to establish the Cerro de la Olla Wilderness in the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument and to modify the boundary of the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument (Rept. No. 117–151).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1128. A bill to provide for the continuation of higher education through the conveyance to the University of Alaska of certain public land in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–152).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1222. A bill to designate and adjust certain lands in the State of Utah as components of the National Wilderness Preservation System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–153).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 1321. A bill to modify the boundary of the Casa Grande Ruins National Monument, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–154).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 1631. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest System land in the State of Arizona to the Arizona Board of Regents, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–155).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1942. A bill to standardize the designation of National Heritage Areas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–156).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 2438. A bill to modify the boundary of the Cane River Creole National Historical Park in the State of Louisiana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–157).

By Mr. MANCHIN, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 3266. A bill to improve recreation opportunities on, and facilitate greater access to, Federal public land, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 117–158).

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. PORTMAN (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 4902. A bill to address the preference for United States industry with respect to patent rights in inventions made with Department of Homeland Security research assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 4903. A bill to reauthorize the Northwest Straits Marine Conservation Initiative Act to promote the protection of the resources of the Northwest Straits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 4904. A bill to address the forest health crisis on the National Forest System and public lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KING:

S. 4905. A bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance coverage to provide for 3 primary care visits and 3 behavioral health care visits without application of any cost-sharing requirement; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4906. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the National Neurological Conditions Surveillance System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. 4907. A bill to condition civil and military assistance to the Government of Colombia on certain recurring certifications from the Secretary of State; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. 4908. A bill to improve the visibility, accountability, and oversight of agency software asset management practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 4909. A bill to increase authorizations for the passenger ferry competitive grant program and the ferry boats and terminal facilities formula grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 4910. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the Office of Personnel Management to annually collect data relating to the Federal workforce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 4911. A bill to provide for noncompetitive appointments in the competitive service for high-performing Federal employees; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY:

S. 4912. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to repay a portion of student law default, to make student loan debts dischargeable in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 4913. A bill to establish the duties of the Director of the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency regarding open source software security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MARSHALL (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4914. A bill to direct the Secretary of State to designate certain Mexican drug cartels as foreign terrorist organizations, and to submit a report to Congress justifying such designations in accordance with section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. DAINES, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S. 4915. A bill to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to improve the recruitment and retention of employees in the Indian Health Service, restore accountability in the Indian Health Service, improve health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 4916. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

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

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

S. Res. 787. A resolution recognizing the vital importance of the Mekong River to Southeast Asia and the role of the Mekong-United States Partnership in supporting the prosperity of the region; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL):

S. Res. 788. A resolution designating the week of September 19 through September 23, 2022, as ''Malnutrition Awareness Week''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DURBIN (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KING, and Mr. DAINES)):

S. Res. 789. A resolution designating October 12, 2022 as ''National Loggers Day''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OSSOFF:

S. Res. 790. A resolution condemning the atrocities that occurred in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1906, in which White supremacist mobs brutalized, terrorized, and killed dozens of Black Americans, and reaffirming the commitment of the Senate to combating hatred, injustice, and White supremacy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 844

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 844, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat certain amounts paid for physical activity, fitness, and exercise as amounts paid for medical care.

S. 1116

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1116, a bill to amend chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, to create a presumption that a disability or death of a Federal employee in fire protection activities caused by any of certain diseases is the result of the performance of such employees duty, and for other purposes.

S. 1125

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1125, a bill to recommend that the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation test the effect of a dementia care management model, and for other purposes.

S. 1168

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1168, a bill to provide clarification regarding the common or usual name for bison and compliance with section 403 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1507

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1507, a bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to promulgate certain limitations with respect to pre-production plastic pellet pollution, and for other purposes.

S. 1574

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1574, a bill to codify a statutory definition for long-term care pharmacies.

S. 1848

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) were added as cosponsors of S. 1848, a bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of religion, sex (including sexual orientation and gender identity), and marital status in the administration and provision of child welfare services, to improve safety, well-being, and permanency for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer or questioning foster youth, and for other purposes.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 1863, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve access to health care for veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2014

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2014, a bill to permit legally married same-sex couples to amend their filing status for tax returns outside the statute of limitations.

S. 2513

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2513, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the application and review process of the Department of Veterans Affairs for clothing allowance claims submitted by veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 2609

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2609, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equitable payment for, and preserve Medicare beneficiary access to, diagnostic radiopharmaceuticals under the Medicare hospital outpatient prospective payment system.

S. 3295

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3295, a bill to increase access to pre-exposure prophylaxis to reduce the transmission of HIV.

S. 3347

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 3347, a bill to identify and impose sanctions with respect to persons who are responsible for or complicit in abuses toward dissidents on behalf of the Government of Iran.

S. 3389

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3389, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a demonstration project to improve outpatient clinical care for individuals with sickle cell disease.

S. 3508

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3508, a bill to posthumously award a congressional gold medal to Constance Baker Motley.

S. 3686

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3686, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide education and training on eating disorders for health care providers and communities, and for other purposes.

S. 3909

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3909, a bill to amend the Internal

Revenue Code of 1986 to make employers of spouses of military personnel eligible for the work opportunity credit.

S. 4105

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) 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. 4111

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4111, a bill to support research and State management efforts relating to chronic wasting disease, and for other purposes.

S. 4325

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4325, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 4381

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4381, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act with respect to nursing facility requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 4416

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4416, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for charitable donations to nonprofit organizations providing education scholarships to qualified elementary and secondary students.

S. 4449

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 4449, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve the accuracy of market-based Medicare payment for clinical diagnostic laboratory services, to reduce administrative burdens in the collection of data, and for other purposes.

S. 4500

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4500, a bill to expand youth access to voting, and for other purposes.

S. 4573

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 4573, a bill to amend title 3, United States Code, to reform the Electoral Count Act, and to amend the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 to provide clear guidelines for when and to whom resources are provided by the Administrator of General Services for use in connection with the preparations for the assumption of official duties as President or Vice President.

S. 4602

At the request of Ms. SMITH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4602, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to prohibit the stigmatization of children who are unable to pay for school meals, and for other purposes.

S. 4702

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4702, a bill to impose limits on excepting competitive service positions from the competitive service, and for other purposes.

S. 4816

At the request of Mr. OSSOFF, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4816, a bill to require the Archivist of the United States to submit to Congress a comprehensive plan for reducing the backlog of requests for records from the National Personnel Records Center, and for other purposes.

S. 4892

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4892, a bill to require elementary and middle schools that receive Federal funds to obtain parental consent before changing a minor child's gender markers, pronouns, or preferred name on any school form, allowing a child to change the child's sex-based accommodations, including locker rooms or bathrooms.

S.J. RES. 56

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 56, a joint resolution directing the removal of United States Armed Forces from hostilities in the Republic of Yemen that have not been authorized by Congress.

AMENDMENT NO. 5500

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 5500 intended to be proposed to the resolution of ratification to Treaty Doc. 117–1, amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the ''Montreal Protocol''), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (the ''Kigali Amendment'').

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LEAHY:

S. 4916. A bill to reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont, in introducing the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act of 2022. This bill would update and reauthorize the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs, which have provided life-saving services and housing for America's homeless youth for nearly half a century.

Homelessness is affecting youth in truly staggering numbers. According to the National Network for Youth, an estimated 4.2 million young people experience homelessness at some point each year. Some of these youth may be away from home for a few nights, while others have been living on the streets for years. No area of this country is immune from the scourge of homelessness, as it impacts rural and urban communities alike.

Tragically, runaway and homeless youth are at high risk of victimization, abuse, criminal activity, and even death. This population is at greater risk of suicide, unintended pregnancy, and substance abuse. Many are unable to continue with school and are more likely to enter our juvenile criminal justice system. The reality is that available data likely underestimate the scale and consequences of this problem.

I have met with teachers, social workers, and others from Maine who work directly with young people experiencing homelessness. We talked about the pressure that student homelessness places on teachers, school administrators, and their already strapped resources, and—most important—the homeless students themselves. I have also visited New Beginnings in Lewiston, where I saw firsthand how Runaway and Homeless Youth Act resources are providing essential safety nets for young people in need. The staff at New Beginnings helps young people with case management, provides referrals to State and local agencies, assists with housing needs and access to shelter, and connects individuals to local educational and employment programs.

Several years ago, as the chair of the Senate Transportation and Housing Appropriations Subcommittee, I held a hearing that featured testimony from Brittany Dixon, a former homeless youth from Auburn, ME, who gave powerful testimony on her personal experience with homelessness. After becoming homeless, Brittany was connected with New Beginnings. In her testimony, she said, ''New Beginnings provided many resources I could use to succeed, including assistance with college applications and financial aid. . . . New Beginnings has helped me to develop critical life skills and to become self-sufficient.'' ''Programs that support homeless youth are important to

so many young people like me,'' she added. ''It gives young people the chance to have a safe place to stay while they get their footing and figure out what they want to do in their lives.''

Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs helped make Brittany's success story possible. Sadly, however, there are still many homeless youth who do not have the support they need. We must build on our past efforts because homeless youth should have the same opportunities to succeed as their peers.

The three existing Runaway and Homeless Youth Act programs—the Basic Center Program, the Street Outreach Program, and the Transitional Living Program—help community-based organizations reach young people when they need support the most. These programs help runaway and homeless youth avoid the juvenile justice system, and early intervention can help them escape victimization and trafficking.

The Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act would reauthorize and strengthen these programs that help homeless youth meet their immediate needs, and it would help secure long-term residential services for those who cannot be safely reunited with their families. Our legislation would also create a new program—the Prevention Services Program—designed to help prevent youth from running away and becoming homeless in the first place. Moreover, our bill supports wraparound services for victims of trafficking and sexual exploitation.

Mr. President, the Runaway and Homeless Youth and Trafficking Prevention Act will support those young people who run away, are forced out of their homes, or are disconnected from their families. A caring and safe place to sleep, eat, grow, study, and develop is critical for all young people. The programs reauthorized and modernized through this legislation help extend those basic services to the most vulnerable youth in our communities.

I thank Senator LEAHY for his leadership on this bill and urge my colleagues to support it.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 787—RECOGNIZING THE VITAL IMPORTANCE OF THE MEKONG RIVER TO SOUTHEAST ASIA AND THE ROLE OF THE MEKONG-UNITED STATES PARTNERSHIP IN SUPPORTING THE PROSPERITY OF THE REGION

Mr. MERKLEY (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 787

Whereas the Mekong River supports the livelihoods of approximately 60,000,000 people, making it the most important river in Southeast Asia and one of the most important rivers in the world;

Whereas the Mekong-United States Partnership, comprising the United States, Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam, and the predecessor of that partnership, the Lower Mekong Initiative, have contributed greatly to the economic, social, and human resources development of the countries in the Mekong River Basin and the protection of the Mekong River;

Whereas the United States has long-standing diplomatic relations with the countries in the Mekong River Basin, including a nearly 200-year-old relationship with treaty ally Thailand;

Whereas the development of the countries in the Mekong River Basin is critical for the unity, economic strength, and institutional development of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, a strategic partner of the United States;

Whereas the Mekong River is increasingly imperiled by the threats of climate change and the construction of upstream dams that have altered the natural flow of the river and vital ecological processes supported by natural flow;

Whereas, since 2019, the flow of water in the Mekong River during the wet season has been abnormally low;

Whereas the Nuozhadu and Xiaowan Dams in China account for more than 50 percent of the water storage of all dams in the Mekong River Basin and can restrict up to 10 percent of the total wet season flow of the Mekong River, exacerbating drought conditions downstream;

Whereas the Mekong River Commission is an integral partner in ensuring the long-term health of the Mekong River;

Whereas the Ayeyawady-Chao Phraya-Mekong Economic Cooperation Strategy can be a leader in supporting river development and protection;

Whereas the Mekong Dam Monitor, funded partly by the Mekong-United States Partnership, has provided essential data and information about the impacts of hydropower dams along the Mekong River to the people and governments of the Mekong River Basin to allow them to prepare for irregular water flows and mitigate the economic and environmental impacts of those flows;

Whereas the Mekong River has become a hub for criminal elements to traffic in drugs, people, and wildlife, undermining the rule of law in the countries in the Mekong River Basin and impacting the world through the proliferation of illegal drugs and fauna that can cause spillover of zoonotic diseases;

Whereas the international community has committed to support the development of countries along the Mekong River through internationally recognized development goals;

Whereas the Friends of the Mekong, which includes the countries in the Mekong River Basin, the United States, Australia, the European Union, Japan, New Zealand, the Republic of Korea, the Asian Development Bank, the Mekong River Commission Secretariat, and the World Bank, is committed to supporting the shared principles that have underpinned peace and prosperity across the Indo-Pacific for decades;

Whereas close coordination and collaboration with civil society groups throughout the Mekong River Basin is essential to the protection of the Mekong River;

Whereas, among the countries in the Mekong River Basin, there has been a negative trend toward the detention and detainment of civil society actors and journalists and an increase in violations of human rights;

Whereas the February 1, 2021, military coup in Burma was illegal and unjustified and has resulted in more than 2,000 deaths, more than 1,000,000 people displaced, and tens of thousands of people in detention, and continued violence threatens the stability of the entire region, especially those countries along the borders of Burma; and

Whereas diaspora communities from countries in the Mekong River Basin are a vital part of the United States and help build thriving people-to-people ties between those countries and the United States that lead to strong commercial, civil society, and cultural ties: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) expresses sincere concern over the environmental, economic, and humanitarian threats to the Mekong River and the communities of the Mekong River and continued support to counter those threats; and

(2) declares it is the policy of the United States Government to—

(A) through the Mekong-United States Partnership and the Friends of the Mekong, promote the economic and environmental well-being of the people of Mainland Southeast Asia in the 5 countries through which the Mekong River flows, namely, Burma, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam;

(B) support a whole-of-government approach in providing and coordinating Federal aid and assistance throughout the Mekong River Basin under the Mekong-United States Partnership, including programmatic support provided by the Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, and other Federal agencies;

(C) contribute to the development of quality infrastructure, the development of national electricity markets, cross-border energy trade, the facilitation of cross-border transport, renewable and clean energy acceleration and deployment, the development of micro, small, and medium enterprises, agriculture, transportation, the facilitation of trade and investment, strengthened subregional production linkages and supply chains, digital infrastructure, and the digital economy in the Mekong River Basin;

(D) promote engagement and buy-in of the United States private sector to support the long-term inclusive economic growth, resilience, global health, education, and sustainable development of the region;

(E) leverage the expertise of the United States, Japan, the Republic of Korea, Australia, and other partners in high-quality infrastructure to support the economic development needs of the countries in the Mekong River Basin;

(F) support the development of quality infrastructure, including through projects financed by the United States International Development Finance Corporation, in the countries in the Mekong River Basin;

(G) encourage all members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations to view the environmental, humanitarian, and economic threats to the Mekong River as a danger to the entire region;

(H) promote sustainable water use, natural resources management, and environmental conservation and protection, including—

(i) through support for a technically sound, well-coordinated, and consensus-based approach to managing the shared resources of the Mekong River Basin;

(ii) through support for environmental conservation, protection, and resilience in the Mekong subregion; and

(iii) by enhancing the capacity of countries in the Mekong River Basin in the sustainable conservation and management of natural resources, including fishery resources, for sustainable food security;

(I) continue the important work that provides vital data and monitoring to the people and governments of the Mekong River;

(J) support the development of the capacity of the region to respond to a variety of threats, including countering transnational crime such as trafficking of drugs, wildlife, timber, and persons, and criminal activity associated with illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing, and to improve health security, including emergency preparedness and response for pandemics and epidemics, cybersecurity, and disaster response and preparedness and humanitarian assistance and disaster relief;

(K) promote the development of human capital through education, medical and laboratory research and development, vocational training, youth empowerment, women's economic empowerment, gender equality, university cooperation, and educational and professional exchanges;

(L) work together with countries in the Mekong River Basin to combat the impacts of climate change and support the resiliency of those countries;

(M) encourage all countries in the Mekong River Basin to provide timely early warning for natural and unnatural operations of the river;

(N) support freedom of expression in the countries in the Mekong River Basin through promoting independent journalism and the freedom to access information;

(O) continue to call for the cessation of violence in Burma and support the return of Burma to a path of inclusive democracy, so that it can fully contribute to regional development;

(P) prioritize the strengthening of people-to-people ties through United States exchange programs such as the Fulbright Program, the Peace Corps, the International Visitors Leadership Program, and the Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative Program, including the Young Southeast Asian Leaders Initiative Academy at Fulbright University Vietnam; and

(Q) recognize that strong democratic institutions, the protection of human rights, independent civil society, and free and fair elections are central to implementing the shared vision of a Mekong River region, and an Indo-Pacific region, that is free, open, secure, prosperous, and sustainable.

SENATE RESOLUTION 788—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 19 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 23, 2022, AS ''MALNUTRITION AWARENESS WEEK''

Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. HASSAN, and Mr. BLUMENTHAL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 788

Whereas malnutrition is the condition that occurs when an individual does not get enough protein, calories, or nutrients;

Whereas malnutrition is a significant problem in the United States and around the world, crossing all age, racial, class, gender, and geographic lines;

Whereas malnutrition can be driven by social determinants of health, including poverty or economic instability, access to affordable healthcare, and low health literacy;

Whereas there are inextricable and cyclical links between poverty and malnutrition;

Whereas communities of color, across all age groups, are disproportionately likely to experience both food insecurity and malnutrition;

Whereas the Department of Agriculture defines food insecurity as when an individual or household does not have regular, reliable access to the foods needed for good health;

Whereas Black children are almost 3 times more likely to live in a food-insecure household than White children;

Whereas infants, older adults, individuals with chronic diseases, and other vulnerable populations are particularly at risk for malnutrition;

Whereas the American Academy of Pediatrics has found that failure to provide key nutrients during early childhood may result in lifelong deficits in brain function;

Whereas disease-associated malnutrition affects between 30 and 50 percent of patients admitted to hospitals, and the medical costs of hospitalized patients with malnutrition can be 300 percent more than the medical costs of properly nourished patients;

Whereas, according to the ''National Blueprint: Achieving Quality Malnutrition Care for Older Adults, 2020 Update'', as many as ½ of older adults living in the United States are malnourished or at risk for malnutrition;

Whereas, according to recent Aging Network surveys, 76 percent of older adults receiving meals at senior centers and other congregate facilities report improved health outcomes, and 84 percent of older adults receiving home-delivered meals indicate the same;

Whereas disease-associated malnutrition in older adults alone costs the United States more than $51,300,000,000 each year; and

Whereas the American Society for Parenteral and Enteral Nutrition established Malnutrition Awareness Week to raise awareness about, and promote the prevention of, malnutrition across the lifespan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 19 through September 23, 2022, as ''Malnutrition Awareness Week'';

(2) recognizes registered dietitian nutritionists and other nutrition professionals, health care providers, school foodservice workers, social workers, advocates, caregivers, and other professionals and agencies for their efforts to advance awareness about, treatments for, and the prevention of malnutrition;

(3) recognizes the importance of existing Federal nutrition programs, such as the nutrition programs under title III of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3021 et seq.) and Federal child nutrition programs, for their role in combating malnutrition;

(4) supports increased funding for the critical programs described in paragraph (3);

(5) recognizes—

(A) the importance of medical nutrition therapy under the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.); and

(B) the need for vulnerable populations to have access to nutrition counseling;

(6) recognizes the importance of the innovative research conducted by the National Institutes of Health on—

(A) nutrition, dietary patterns, and the human gastrointestinal microbiome; and

(B) how those factors influence the prevention or development of chronic disease throughout the lifespan;

(7) supports access to malnutrition screening and assessment for all patients;

(8) encourages the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services to evaluate the implementation of newly-approved malnutrition electronic clinical quality measures; and

(9) acknowledges—

(A) the importance of access to healthy food for children, especially in child care settings and schools; and

(B) the benefits of evidence-based nutrition standards.

SENATE RESOLUTION 789—DESIGNATING OCTOBER 12, 2022 AS ''NATIONAL LOGGERS DAY''

Mr. DURBIN (for Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. KING, and Mr. DAINES)) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 789

Whereas the logging industry has served as an economic driver and cultural tradition in the United States for centuries;

Whereas the logging industry creates rural jobs and provides revenue for local and State governments and National Forests;

Whereas loggers provide renewable material for products used by people in the United States every day;

Whereas loggers are the first link in the $300,000,000,000 domestic forest products supply chain;

Whereas loggers are the means by which healthy forest management plans are accomplished;

Whereas logging provides for healthy forests that maintain vital animal habitats;

Whereas logging provides for healthy forests which—

(1) protect watersheds;

(2) sequester carbon;

(3) provide public recreational opportunities; and

(4) reduce loss of life and property from wildfires; and

Whereas logging provides for healthy forests through regeneration, including planting 2,500,000,000 trees annually: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates October 12, 2022, as ''National Loggers Day''; and

(2) encourages the President to officially designate October 12th as ''National Loggers Day''.

SENATE RESOLUTION 790—CONDEMNING THE ATROCITIES THAT OCCURRED IN ATLANTA, GEORGIA, IN 1906, IN WHICH WHITE SUPREMACIST MOBS BRUTALIZED, TERRORIZED, AND KILLED DOZENS OF BLACK AMERICANS, AND REAFFIRMING THE COMMITMENT OF THE SENATE TO COMBATING HATRED, INJUSTICE, AND WHITE SUPREMACY

Mr. OSSOFF submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 790

Whereas the horrific act of lynching impacted race relations in the United States and shaped the geographic, political, social, and economic conditions of Black people in ways that are still relevant today;

Whereas more than 4,400 Black people were lynched across 20 States between 1877 and 1950, 594 of whom were Black victims in Georgia and 36 of those documented victims were killed in Fulton County;

Whereas, until 1906, Atlanta, Georgia, was home to more than 50,000 Black residents, many of whom owned homes and businesses in the city;

Whereas, on September 22, 1906, at 9 p.m., 10,000 White men and boys gathered at the corner of Pryor and Decatur Streets, an area known as Five Points in downtown Atlanta;

Whereas the mob was motivated by the media's false coverage of Black men brutalizing White women;

Whereas city officials, which included Mayor James G. Woodward, attempted to calm the crowds but failed to do so;

Whereas, going through Decatur Street, Pryor Street, Central Avenue, and throughout the central business district, assaulting hundreds of Black people, the mob of White men and boys continued to hunt and kill Atlanta's Black residents into the night;

Whereas, in an attempt to control the mob, Mayor Woodward called the fire department out to disperse the mob using large streams of water, but the mob quickly regathered and continued to shoot and stone Atlanta's Black residents;

Whereas, by Monday, September 24, 1906, what is now known as Downtown Atlanta, was under military rule;

Whereas the massacre continued, with plans to move outside of the city and into Brownsville, a Black community south of downtown with about 1,500 residents;

Whereas the community gathered to prepare and fight back, and with great fear of a counterattack they were disarmed by State Troops, and more than 250 African American men were arrested;

Whereas, through the duration of the massacre, armed Black residents defended their neighborhoods, both in Brownsville and in Dark Town;

Whereas at least 25 Black residents were murdered, 2 White men were killed, hundreds of Black residents were wounded, and thousands of Black businesses and homes were burned or destroyed;

Whereas the story of the Atlanta race massacre is only 1 of many such atrocities and horrific incidents, and shows the lasting impact of White supremacy in the United States; and

Whereas the theft of property from Black landowners as well as the displacement caused by the terrorizing of the Black community in Atlanta, Georgia, shows how historic racism and injustice have significantly contributed to persistent wealth inequality between Black and White Americans in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns the actions of the White supremacist mobs that drove out Black residents of Atlanta, Georgia;

(2) honors the memory of the victims and acknowledges the lasting impact that this incident has had on the Black community of Atlanta, Georgia;

(3) expresses support for the designation of a national day of remembrance for the victims of forced migrations of Black Americans throughout United States history; and

(4) reaffirms the commitment of the Federal Government to combat White supremacy and seek reconciliation for racial injustice.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 5518. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the resolution of ratification to Treaty Doc. 117–1, Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the ''Montreal Protocol''), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (the ''Kigali Amendment'').

SA 5519. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 5520. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5521. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H .R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5522. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H .R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5523. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5524. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5525. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5526. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5527. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5528. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5529. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5530. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5531. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5532. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5533. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5534. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5535. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5536. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5537. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5538. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5539. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5540. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5541. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5542. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5543. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5544. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5545. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5546. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5547. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED

(for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5548. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5549. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5550. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5551. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5552. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5553. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5554. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5555. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5556. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5557. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5558. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5559. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5560. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5561. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5562. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5563. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5564. Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COTTON, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. OSSOFF) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5565. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5566. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5567. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5568. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5569. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 5570. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 5518. Mr. SULLIVAN (for himself and Mr. LEE) proposed an amendment to the resolution of ratification to Treaty Doc. 117–1, Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (the ''Montreal Protocol''), adopted at Kigali on October 15, 2016, by the Twenty-Eighth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol (the ''Kigali Amendment''); as follows:

In section 1, in the section heading, strike ''**DECLARATION**'' and insert ''**DECLARATIONS AND A CONDITION**''.

In section 1, strike ''declaration of section 2'' and insert ''declarations of section 2 and the condition of section 3''.

In section 2, in the section heading, strike ''**DECLARATION**'' and insert ''**DECLARATIONS**''.

In section 2, strike ''following declaration'' and all that follows through the period at the end and insert the following: ''following declarations:

(1) The Kigali amendment is not self-executing.

(2) The People's Republic of China is not a developing country, and the United Nations and other intergovernmental organizations should not treat the People's Republic of China as such.

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 3. CONDITION.

The advice and consent of the Senate under section 1 is subject to the following condition: Prior to the Thirty-Fifth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol, the Secretary of State shall transmit to the Secretariat of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer a proposal to amend Decision I/12E, ''Clarification of terms and definitions: developing countries,'' made at the First Meeting of the Parties, to remove the People's Republic of China.

SA 5519. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 10____. ZERO-EMISSION VEHICLE CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE AT GSA FACILITIES OR CAMPUSES.

(a) ANNUAL GOALS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator of General Services (referred to in this section as the ''Administrator'') shall develop—

(1) annual goals for the deployment of zero-emission vehicle infrastructure, including electric vehicle supply equipment, at facilities or campuses of the General Services Administration (referred to in this section as ''GSA facilities or campuses'') such that by December 31, 2030, not less than 90 percent of GSA facilities or campuses with 200 or more daily employees and visitors offer zero-emission vehicle charging or fueling infrastructure; and

(2) guidance to ensure progress towards the annual goals developed under paragraph (1).

(b) PLAN.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall prepare a detailed plan—

(1) to achieve the goals developed under subsection (a)(1); and

(2) that—

(A) identifies particular GSA facilities or campuses as priority facilities or campuses, as applicable, at which to achieve those goals, including by considering—

(i) demand for zero-emission vehicle charging and fueling;

(ii) locations of zero-emission vehicle fleets of the General Services Administration and tenant Federal agencies;

(iii) locations relevant to State zero-emission vehicle charging and fueling needs;

(iv) geographical gaps in zero-emission vehicle charging infrastructure;

(v) availability of incentives; and

(vi) other factors, as determined by the Administrator; and

(B) includes a requirement that all applicable electric vehicle supply equipment at GSA facilities or campuses is certified under the Energy Star program established by section 324A of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (42 U.S.C. 6294a).

(c) INCLUSION IN PROJECTS.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Administrator shall ensure that appropriate zero-emission

vehicle infrastructure, including electric vehicle supply equipment and zero-emission vehicle fueling infrastructure, is included in, with respect to a GSA facility or campus—

(1) any prospectus for a construction, alteration, or lease project;

(2) any prospectus for an alteration of a leased building;

(3) any contract for parking lot paving or repaving; and

(4) any other appropriate project, as determined by the Administrator.

(d) FUNDING.—The Administrator may use amounts made available under section 60504 of Public Law 117–169 (commonly known as the ''Inflation Reduction Act'')—

(1) to achieve the zero-emission vehicle infrastructure goals developed under subsection (a)(1), including through carrying out projects in support of those goals; and

(2) for the cost of any additional employees, contractors, and training needed to support those goals.

SA 5520. Mr. BRAUN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

SEC. 10___. TREATMENT OF PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM LOAN FORGIVENESS OF PAYROLL COSTS UNDER HIGHWAY AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROJECT COST-REIMBURSEMENT CONTRACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 31.201–5 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), for the purposes of any cost-reimbursement contract awarded in accordance with section 112 of title 23, United States Code, or section 5325 of title 49, United States Code, or any subcontract under such a contract, no cost reduction or cash refund (including through a reduced indirect cost rate) shall be due to the Department of Transportation or to a State transportation department, transit agency, or other recipient of assistance under chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, or chapter 53 of title 49, United States Code, on the basis of forgiveness of the payroll costs of a covered loan (as those terms are defined in section 7A(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636m(a))) issued under the paycheck protection program under section 7(a)(36) of that Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(36)).

(b) SAVING PROVISION.—Nothing in this section amends or exempts the prohibitions and liabilities under section 3729 of title 31, United States Code.

(c) TERMINATION.—This section ceases to be effective on June 30, 2025.

SA 5521. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. PROHIBITION ON SMOKING IN FACILITIES OF THE VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1715 of title 38, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''§ 1715. Prohibition on smoking in facilities of the Veterans Health Administration

''(a) PROHIBITION.—No person (including any veteran, patient, resident, employee of the Department, contractor, or visitor) may smoke on the premises of any facility of the Veterans Health Administration.

''(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) The term 'facility of the Veterans Health Administration' means any land or building (including any medical center, nursing home, domiciliary facility, outpatient clinic, or center that provides readjustment counseling) that is—

''(A) under the jurisdiction of the Department of Veterans Affairs;

''(B) under the control of the Veterans Health Administration; and

''(C) not under the control of the General Services Administration.

''(2) The term 'smoke' includes—

''(A) the use of cigarettes, cigars, pipes, and any other combustion or heating of tobacco; and

''(B) the use of any electronic nicotine delivery system, including electronic or e-cigarettes, vape pens, and e-cigars.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of chapter 17 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 1715 and inserting the following new item:

''1715. Prohibition on smoking in facilities of the Veterans Health Administration.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 526 of the Veterans Health Care Act of 1992 (Public Law 102–585; 38 U.S.C. 1715 note) is repealed.

SA 5522. Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. COONS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. INVESTMENT, TRADE, AND DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish a comprehensive United States strategy for public and private investment, trade, and development in Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean.

(2) FOCUS OF STRATEGY.—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall focus on increasing exports of United States goods and services to Africa and Latin America and the Caribbean by 200 percent in real dollar value by the date that is 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) CONSULTATIONS.—In developing the strategy required by paragraph (1), the President shall consult with—

(A) Congress;

(B) each agency that is a member of the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee;

(C) the relevant multilateral development banks, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury and the respective United States Executive Directors of such banks;

(D) each agency that participates in the Trade Policy Staff Committee;

(E) the President's Export Council;

(F) each of the development agencies;

(G) any other Federal agencies with responsibility for export promotion or financing and development; and

(H) the private sector, including businesses, nongovernmental organizations, and African and Latin American and Caribbean diaspora groups.

(4) SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—

(A) STRATEGY.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress the strategy required by paragraph (1).

(B) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the strategy required by paragraph (1).

(b) SPECIAL AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN EXPORT STRATEGY COORDINATORS.—The President shall designate an individual to serve as Special Africa Export Strategy Coordinator and an individual to serve as Special Latin America and the Caribbean Export Strategy Coordinator—

(1) to oversee the development and implementation of the strategy required by subsection (a); and

(2) to coordinate developing and implementing the strategy with—

(A) the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee;

(B) the Assistant United States Trade Representative for African Affairs or the Assistant United States Trade Representative for the Western Hemisphere, as appropriate;

(C) the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs or the Assistant Secretary of State for Western Hemisphere Affairs, as appropriate;

(D) the Export-Import Bank of the United States;

(E) the United States International Development Finance Corporation; and

(F) the development agencies.

(c) TRADE MISSIONS TO AFRICA AND LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN.—It is the sense of Congress that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce and other high-level officials of the United States Government with responsibility for export promotion, financing, and development should conduct a joint trade missions to Africa and to Latin America and the Caribbean.

(d) TRAINING.—The President shall develop a plan—

(1) to standardize the training received by United States and Foreign Commercial Service officers, economic officers of the Department of State, and economic officers of the United States Agency for International Development with respect to the programs and procedures of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, the United States International Development Finance Corporation, the Small Business Administration, and the United States Trade and Development Agency; and

(2) to ensure that, not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) all United States and Foreign Commercial Service officers that are stationed overseas receive the training described in paragraph (1); and

(B) in the case of a country to which no United States and Foreign Commercial Service officer is assigned, any economic officer of the Department of State stationed in that country receives that training.

(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DEVELOPMENT AGENCIES.—The term ''development agencies'' means the United States Department of State, the United States Agency for International Development, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the United States International Development Finance Corporation, the United States Trade and Development Agency, the United States Department of Agriculture, and relevant multilateral development banks.

(2) MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS.—The term ''multilateral development banks'' has the meaning given that term in section 1701(c)(4) of the International Financial Institutions Act (22 U.S.C. 262r(c)(4)) and includes the African Development Foundation.

(3) TRADE POLICY STAFF COMMITTEE.—The term ''Trade Policy Staff Committee'' means the Trade Policy Staff Committee established pursuant to section 2002.2 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations.

(4) TRADE PROMOTION COORDINATING COMMITTEE.—The term ''Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee'' means the Trade Promotion Coordinating Committee established under section 2312 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4727).

(5) UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE.—The term ''United States and Foreign Commercial Service'' means the United States and Foreign Commercial Service established by section 2301 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4721).

SA 5523. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1052. TERMINATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND DECLARATIONS OF WAR.

(a) FUTURE AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND DECLARATIONS OF WAR.—Any authorization for the use of military force or declaration of war enacted into law after the date of enactment of this Act shall terminate on the date that is 10 years after the date of enactment of such authorization or declaration.

(b) EXISTING AUTHORIZATIONS FOR THE USE OF MILITARY FORCE AND DECLARATIONS OF WAR.—Any authorization for the use of military force or declaration of war enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act shall terminate on the date that is 6 months after the date of such enactment.

SA 5524. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. GRASSLEY) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 XII, add the following:

Subtitle G—Baltic Defense and Deterrence

SEC. 1281. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Baltic Defense and Deterrence Act''.

SEC. 1282. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) supporting and strengthening the security of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania (referred to in this Act as the ''Baltic countries'') is in the national security interests of the United States;

(2) continuing to strengthen and update the United States-Baltics security cooperation roadmap is critical to achieving strategic security priorities as the Baltic countries face ongoing belligerence and threats from the Russian Federation, including amid the Russian Federation's illegal and unprovoked war in Ukraine that began on February 24, 2022;

(3) the United States should encourage advancement of the Three Seas Initiative to strengthen transport, energy, and digital infrastructures among Eastern European countries, including the Baltic countries; and

(4) improved economic ties between the United States and the Baltic countries, including to counter economic pressure by the People's Republic of China, offer an opportunity to strengthen the United States-Baltic strategic partnership.

SEC. 1283. BALTIC SECURITY AND ECONOMIC ENHANCEMENT INITIATIVE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of State shall establish and implement an initiative, to be known as the ''Baltic Security and Economic Enhancement Initiative'', for the purpose of increasing security and economic ties with the Baltic countries.

(b) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the Baltic Security and Economic Enhancement Initiative shall be—

(1) to ensure timely delivery of security assistance to the Baltic countries, prioritizing assistance to bolster defenses against hybrid warfare and improve interoperability with the military forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization;

(2) to mitigate the impact on the Baltic countries of economic coercion by the Russian Federation and the People's Republic of China;

(3) to identify new opportunities for foreign direct investment and United States business ties; and

(4) to bolster United States support for the economic and energy security needs of the Baltic countries, including by convening an annual trade forum with the Baltic countries and the United States International Development Finance Corporation.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State, $60,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027 to carry out the initiative authorized under subsection (a).

SEC. 1284. BALTIC SECURITY INITIATIVE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of Defense shall establish and implement an initiative, to be known as the ''Baltic Security Initiative'', for the purpose of deepening security cooperation with the Baltic countries.

(b) OBJECTIVES.—The objectives of the Baltic Security Initiative shall be—

(1) to achieve United States national security objectives, including deterring aggression by the Russian Federation and bolstering the long-term security of North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies;

(2) to enhance regional planning and cooperation among the Baltic countries, particularly with respect to long-term regional capability projects, including—

(A) long-range precision fire systems and capabilities;

(B) integrated air and missile defense;

(C) maritime domain awareness;

(D) land forces development, including stockpiling large caliber ammunition;

(E) command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance;

(F) special operations forces development; and

(G) coordination with and security enhancements for Poland, which is a neighboring North Atlantic Treaty Organization ally; and

(3) to improve the Baltic countries' cyber defenses and resilience to hybrid threats.

(c) STRATEGY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to Congress a report setting forth the strategy of the Department of Defense to achieve the objectives described in subsection (b).

(2) CONSIDERATIONS.—The strategy required by paragraph (1) shall include a consideration of—

(A) security assistance programs for the Baltic countries managed by the Department of State;

(B) the ongoing security threats to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's eastern flank posed by Russian aggression, including as a result of the Russian Federation's 2022 invasion of Ukraine with support from Belarus; and

(C) rising tensions with, and presence in the Baltic countries of, the People's Republic of China, including economic bullying of the Baltic countries by the People's Republic of China.

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Department of Defense, $250,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2023 through 2027 to carry out the initiative authorized under subsection (a).

SA 5525. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 I, add the following:

SEC. 144. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR RETIREMENT OF C–40 AIRCRAFT.

(a) PROHIBITION.—None of the funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act for fiscal year 2023 for the Air Force may be obligated to retire, prepare to retire, or place in storage or on backup aircraft inventory status any C–40 aircraft.

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The prohibition under subsection (a) shall not apply to an individual C–40 aircraft that the Secretary of the Air Force determines, on a case-by-case basis, to be no longer mission capable because of a Class A mishap.

(2) CERTIFICATION REQUIRED.—If the Secretary determines under paragraph (1) that an aircraft is no longer mission capable, the Secretary shall submit to the congressional defense committees a certification that the status of such aircraft is due to a Class A mishap and not due to lack of maintenance or repairs or other reasons.

SA 5526. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 X, add the following:

SEC. 1035. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO OPERATE THE DETENTION FACILITY AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, AFTER SEPTEMBER 30, 2024.

None of the funds authorized to be appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act or any other Act may be used to operate the detention facility at United States Naval Station, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, after September 30, 2024.

SEC. 1036. REPEAL OF PROHIBITIONS RELATING TO DETAINEES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.

(a) USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO CERTAIN COUNTRIES.—Section 1035 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232; 132 Stat. 1954), as most recently amended by section 1032 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117–81; 135 Stat. 1901), is repealed.

(b) USE OF FUNDS FOR TRANSFER OR RELEASE OF INDIVIDUALS DETAINED AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO THE UNITED STATES.—Section 1033 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232; 132 Stat. 1953), as most recently amended by section 1033 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117–81; 135 Stat. 1901), is repealed.

(c) USE OF FUNDS TO CONSTRUCT OR MODIFY FACILITIES IN THE UNITED STATES TO HOUSE DETAINEES TRANSFERRED FROM UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.—Section 1034 of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019 (Public Law 115–232; 132 Stat. 1954), as most recently amended by section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2022 (Public Law 117–81; 135 Stat. 1901), is repealed.

SEC. 1037. REPEAL OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTIFICATIONS AND NOTIFICATIONS RELATING TO TRANSFER OF DETAINEES AT UNITED STATES NAVAL STATION, GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA, TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES AND OTHER FOREIGN ENTITIES.

(a) CERTIFICATION.—Section 1034 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2016 (Public Law 114–92; 129 Stat. 969; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is repealed.

(b) NOTIFICATION.—Section 308 of the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112–87; 125 Stat. 1883; 10 U.S.C. 801 note) is repealed.

SEC. 1038. REPEAL OF CHAPTER 47A OF TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapters I through VI and subchapter VIII of chapter 47A of title 10, United States Code, are repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO SUBCHAPTER VII.—Subchapter VII of chapter 47A of such title is amended—

(1) in section 950d(a)(3), by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023)'' after ''of this title'';

(2) in section 950f—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (2), by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023)'' after ''of this title''; and

(ii) in paragraph (6)(B), by striking ''section 949b(b)(4) of this title'' and inserting ''paragraph (7)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(7) No appellate military judge on the United States Court of Military Commission Review may be reassigned to other duties, except under circumstances as follows:

''(A) The appellate military judge voluntarily requests to be reassigned to other duties and the Secretary of Defense, or the designee of the Secretary, in consultation with the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which the appellate military judge is a member, approves such reassignment.

''(B) The appellate military judge retires or otherwise separates from the armed forces.

''(C) The appellate military judge is reassigned to other duties by the Secretary of Defense, or the designee of the Secretary, in consultation with the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which the appellate military judge is a member, based on military necessity and such reassignment is consistent with service rotation regulations (to the extent such regulations are applicable).

''(D) The appellate military judge is withdrawn by the Secretary of Defense, or the designee of the Secretary, in consultation with the Judge Advocate General of the armed force of which the appellate military judge is a member, for good cause consistent with applicable procedures under chapter 47 of this title (the Uniform Code of Military Justice).'';

(3) in section 950h(c), by inserting ''(as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023)'' after ''of this title''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 950k. Definition

''In this subchapter, the term 'military commission under this chapter' means a military commission under this chapter as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023.''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of subchapters at the beginning of chapter 47A of such title is amended by striking the items relating to subchapters I through VI and subchapter VIII.

SA 5527. Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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:

In the funding table in section 4101, in the item relating to F/A–18E/F (FIGHTER) HORNET, strike the amount in the Senate Authorized column and insert ''756,865''.

In the funding table in section 4101, in the item relating to Total Aircraft Procurement, Navy, strike the amount in the Senate Authorized column and insert ''19,125,814''.

In the funding table in section 4101, in the item relating to Total Procurement, strike the amount in the Senate Authorized column and insert ''158,585,016''.

SA 5528. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 V, insert the following:

SEC. ____. EXTREMIST ACTIVITY BY A MEMBER OF THE ARMED FORCES: TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COUNSELING; NOTATION IN SERVICE RECORD.

(a) TRANSITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM COUNSELING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 1142 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(20) In the case of a member who has violated Department of Defense Instruction 1325.06 (or successor instruction) by participating in extremist activity, in-person counseling, developed by the Secretary of Defense in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, that includes—

''(A) efforts to deradicalize the member;

''(B) information regarding why extremist activity is inconsistent with service in the armed forces and with national security;

''(C) information regarding the dangers associated with involvement with an extremist group; and

''(D) methods for the member to recognize and avoid disinformation.''.

(2) IMPLEMENTATION.—The Secretary of Defense shall complete development of counseling provided under paragraph (20) of such subsection, as added by paragraph (1), not later than the day that is one year after the date of the enactment of this Act. The Secretary concerned shall ensure that such counseling is carried out on and after that day.

(b) SERVICE RECORD.—In the case of a member of the Armed Forces who has violated Department of Defense Instruction 1325.06 (or successor instruction) by participating in extremist activity, the Secretary concerned shall ensure that the commanding officer of the member notes the violation in the service record of the member.

(c) SECRETARY CONCERNED DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''Secretary concerned'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SA 5529. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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, add the following:

DIVISION E—DREAM ACT

TITLE LI—DREAM ACT

SEC. 5101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Dream Act''.

SEC. 5102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, any term used in this title that is used in the immigration laws shall have the meaning given such term in the immigration laws.

(2) DACA.—The term ''DACA'' means deferred action granted to an alien pursuant to the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program announced by President Obama on June 15, 2012.

(3) DISABILITY.—The term ''disability'' has the meaning given such term in section 3(1) of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12102(1)).

(4) EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION PROGRAM.—The term ''early childhood education program'' has the meaning given such term in section 103 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1003).

(5) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL; HIGH SCHOOL; SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The terms ''elementary school'', ''high school'', and ''secondary school'' have the meanings given such terms in section 8101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7801).

(6) IMMIGRATION LAWS.—The term ''immigration laws'' has the meaning given such term in section 101(a)(17) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(17)).

(7) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education''—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), has the meaning given such term in section 102 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002); and

(B) does not include an institution of higher education outside of the United States.

(8) PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS ON A CONDITIONAL BASIS.—The term ''permanent resident status on a conditional basis'' means status as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis under this title.

(9) POVERTY LINE.—The term ''poverty line'' has the meaning given such term in section 673 of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902).

(10) SECRETARY.—Except as otherwise specifically provided, the term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(11) UNIFORMED SERVICES.—The term ''Uniformed Services'' has the meaning given the term ''uniformed services'' in section 101(a) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 5103. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS ON A CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR CERTAIN LONG-TERM RESIDENTS WHO ENTERED THE UNITED STATES AS CHILDREN.

(a) CONDITIONAL BASIS FOR STATUS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an alien shall be considered, at the time of obtaining the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence under this section, to have obtained such status on a conditional basis subject to the provisions under this title.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall cancel the removal of, and adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis, an alien who is inadmissible or deportable from the United States or is in temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a), if—

(A) the alien has been continuously physically present in the United States since the date that is 4 years before the date of the enactment of this Act;

(B) the alien was younger than 18 years of age on the date on which the alien initially entered the United States;

(C) subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), the alien—

(i) is not inadmissible under paragraph (2), (3), (6)(E), (6)(G), (8), (10)(A), (10)(C), or (10)(D) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a));

(ii) has not ordered, incited, assisted, or otherwise participated in the persecution of any person on account of race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion; and

(iii) has not been convicted of—

(I) any offense under Federal or State law, other than a State offense for which an essential element is the alien's immigration status, that is punishable by a maximum term of imprisonment of more than 1 year; or

(II) 3 or more offenses under Federal or State law, other than State offenses for which an essential element is the alien's immigration status, for which the alien was convicted on different dates for each of the 3 offenses and imprisoned for an aggregate of 90 days or more; and

(D) the alien—

(i) has been admitted to an institution of higher education;

(ii) has earned a high school diploma or a commensurate alternative award from a public or private high school, or has obtained a general education development certificate recognized under State law or a high school equivalency diploma in the United States; or

(iii) is enrolled in secondary school or in an education program assisting students in—

(I) obtaining a regular high school diploma or its recognized equivalent under State law; or

(II) in passing a general educational development exam, a high school equivalence diploma examination, or other similar State-authorized exam.

(2) WAIVER.—With respect to any benefit under this title, the Secretary may waive the grounds of inadmissibility under paragraph (2), (6)(E), (6)(G), or (10)(D) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)) for humanitarian purposes or family unity or if the waiver is otherwise in the public interest.

(3) TREATMENT OF EXPUNGED CONVICTIONS.—An expunged conviction shall not automatically be treated as an offense under paragraph (1). The Secretary shall evaluate expunged convictions on a case-by-case basis according to the nature and severity of the offense to determine whether, under the particular circumstances, the Secretary determines that the alien should be eligible for cancellation of removal, adjustment to permanent resident status on a conditional basis, or other adjustment of status.

(4) DACA RECIPIENTS.—Secretary shall cancel the removal of, and adjust to the status of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence on a conditional basis, an alien who was granted DACA unless the alien has engaged in conduct since the alien was granted DACA that would make the alien ineligible for DACA.

(5) APPLICATION FEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may require an alien applying for permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section to pay a reasonable fee that is commensurate with the cost of processing the application.

(B) EXEMPTION.—An applicant may be exempted from paying the fee required under subparagraph (A) if the alien—

(i)(I) is younger than 18 years of age;

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line; and

(III) is in foster care or otherwise lacking any parental or other familial support;

(ii) is younger than 18 years of age and is homeless;

(iii)(I) cannot care for himself or herself because of a serious, chronic disability; and

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line; or

(iv)(I) during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, accumulated $10,000 or more in debt as a result of unreimbursed medical expenses incurred by the alien or an immediate family member of the alien; and

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line.

(6) SUBMISSION OF BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC DATA.—The Secretary may not grant an alien permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section unless the alien submits biometric and biographic data, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide an alternative procedure for aliens who are unable to provide such biometric or biographic data because of a physical impairment.

(7) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(A) REQUIREMENT FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary shall utilize biometric, biographic, and other data that the Secretary determines appropriate—

(i) to conduct security and law enforcement background checks of an alien seeking permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section; and

(ii) to determine whether there is any criminal, national security, or other factor that would render the alien ineligible for such status.

(B) COMPLETION OF BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The security and law enforcement background checks of an alien required under subparagraph (A) shall be completed, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, before the date on which the Secretary grants such alien permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section.

(8) MEDICAL EXAMINATION.—

(A) REQUIREMENT.—An alien applying for permanent resident status on a conditional

basis under this section shall undergo a medical examination.

(B) POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—The Secretary, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall prescribe policies and procedures for the nature and timing of the examination required under subparagraph (A).

(9) MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE.—An alien applying for permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section shall establish that the alien has registered under the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. 3801 et seq.), if the alien is subject to registration under such Act.

(c) DETERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PRESENCE.—

(1) TERMINATION OF CONTINUOUS PERIOD.—Any period of continuous physical presence in the United States of an alien who applies for permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this section shall not terminate when the alien is served a notice to appear under section 239(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1229(a)).

(2) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN BREAKS IN PRESENCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraphs (B) and (C), an alien shall be considered to have failed to maintain continuous physical presence in the United States under subsection (b)(1)(A) if the alien has departed from the United States for any period exceeding 90 days or for any periods, in the aggregate, exceeding 180 days.

(B) EXTENSIONS FOR EXTENUATING CIRCUMSTANCES.—The Secretary may extend the time periods described in subparagraph (A) for an alien who demonstrates that the failure to timely return to the United States was due to extenuating circumstances beyond the alien's control, including the serious illness of the alien, or death or serious illness of a parent, grandparent, sibling, or child of the alien.

(C) TRAVEL AUTHORIZED BY THE SECRETARY.—Any period of travel outside of the United States by an alien that was authorized by the Secretary may not be counted toward any period of departure from the United States under subparagraph (A).

(d) LIMITATION ON REMOVAL OF CERTAIN ALIENS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary or the Attorney General may not remove an alien who appears prima facie eligible for relief under this section.

(2) ALIENS SUBJECT TO REMOVAL.—The Secretary shall provide a reasonable opportunity to apply for relief under this section to any alien who requests such an opportunity or who appears prima facie eligible for relief under this section if the alien is in removal proceedings, is the subject of a final removal order, or is the subject of a voluntary departure order.

(3) CERTAIN ALIENS ENROLLED IN ELEMENTARY OR SECONDARY SCHOOL.—

(A) STAY OF REMOVAL.—The Attorney General shall stay the removal proceedings of an alien who—

(i) meets all the requirements under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of subsection (b)(1), subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) of such subsection;

(ii) is at least 5 years of age; and

(iii) is enrolled in an elementary school, a secondary school, or an early childhood education program.

(B) COMMENCEMENT OF REMOVAL PROCEEDINGS.—The Secretary may not commence removal proceedings for an alien described in subparagraph (A).

(C) EMPLOYMENT.—An alien whose removal is stayed pursuant to subparagraph (A) or who may not be placed in removal proceedings pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall, upon application to the Secretary, be granted an employment authorization document.

(D) LIFT OF STAY.—The Secretary or Attorney General may not lift the stay granted to an alien under subparagraph (A) unless the alien ceases to meet the requirements under such subparagraph.

(e) EXEMPTION FROM NUMERICAL LIMITATIONS.—Nothing in this section or in any other law may be construed to apply a numerical limitation on the number of aliens who may be granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis under this title.

SEC. 5104. TERMS OF PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS ON A CONDITIONAL BASIS.

(a) PERIOD OF STATUS.—Permanent resident status on a conditional basis is—

(1) valid for a period of 8 years, unless such period is extended by the Secretary; and

(2) subject to termination under subsection (c).

(b) NOTICE OF REQUIREMENTS.—At the time an alien obtains permanent resident status on a conditional basis, the Secretary shall provide notice to the alien regarding the provisions of this title and the requirements to have the conditional basis of such status removed.

(c) TERMINATION OF STATUS.—The Secretary may terminate the permanent resident status on a conditional basis of an alien only if the Secretary—

(1) determines that the alien ceases to meet the requirements under paragraph (1)(C) of section 5103(b), subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) of that section; and

(2) prior to the termination, provides the alien—

(A) notice of the proposed termination; and

(B) the opportunity for a hearing to provide evidence that the alien meets such requirements or otherwise contest the termination.

(d) RETURN TO PREVIOUS IMMIGRATION STATUS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an alien whose permanent resident status on a conditional basis expires under subsection (a)(1) or is terminated under subsection (c) or whose application for such status is denied shall return to the immigration status that the alien had immediately before receiving permanent resident status on a conditional basis or applying for such status, as appropriate.

(2) SPECIAL RULE FOR TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.—An alien whose permanent resident status on a conditional basis expires under subsection (a)(1) or is terminated under subsection (c) or whose application for such status is denied and who had temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a) immediately before receiving or applying for such permanent resident status on a conditional basis, as appropriate, may not return to such temporary protected status if—

(A) the relevant designation under section 244(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(b)) has been terminated; or

(B) the Secretary determines that the reason for terminating the permanent resident status on a conditional basis renders the alien ineligible for such temporary protected status.

SEC. 5105. REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS OF PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS.

(a) ELIGIBILITY FOR REMOVAL OF CONDITIONAL BASIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Secretary shall remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status granted under this title and grant the alien status as all alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien—

(A) is described in paragraph (1)(C) of section 5103(b), subject to paragraphs (2) and (3) of that section;

(B) has not abandoned the alien's residence in the United States; and

(C)(i) has acquired a degree from an institution of higher education or has completed at least 2 years, in good standing, in a program for a bachelor's degree or higher degree in the United States;

(ii) has served in the Uniformed Services for at least 2 years and, if discharged, received an honorable discharge; or

(iii) has been employed for periods totaling at least 3 years and at least 75 percent of the time that the alien has had a valid employment authorization, except that any period during which the alien is not employed while having a valid employment authorization and is enrolled in an institution of higher education, a secondary school, or an education program described in section 5103(b)(1)(D)(iii), shall not count toward the time requirements under this clause.

(2) HARDSHIP EXCEPTION.—The Secretary shall remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status and grant the alien status as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence if the alien—

(A) satisfies the requirements under subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1);

(B) demonstrates compelling circumstances for the inability to satisfy the requirements under subparagraph (C) of such paragraph; and

(C) demonstrates that—

(i) the alien has a disability;

(ii) the alien is a full-time caregiver of a minor child; or

(iii) the removal of the alien from the United States would result in extreme hardship to the alien or the alien's spouse, parent, or child who is a national of the United States or is lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(3) CITIZENSHIP REQUIREMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status granted under this title may not be removed unless the alien demonstrates that the alien satisfies the requirements under section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)).

(B) EXCEPTION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to an alien who is unable to meet the requirements under such section 312(a) due to disability.

(4) APPLICATION FEE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may require aliens applying for lawful permanent resident status under this section to pay a reasonable fee that is commensurate with the cost of processing the application.

(B) EXEMPTION.—An applicant may be exempted from paying the fee required under subparagraph (A) if the alien—

(i)(I) is younger than 18 years of age;

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line; and

(III) is in foster care or otherwise lacking any parental or other familial support;

(ii) is younger than 18 years of age and is homeless;

(iii)(I) cannot care for himself or herself because of a serious, chronic disability; and

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line; or

(iv)(I) during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, the alien accumulated $10,000 or more in debt as a result of unreimbursed medical expenses incurred by the alien or an immediate family member of the alien; and

(II) received total income, during the 12-month period immediately preceding the date on which the alien files an application under this section, that is less than 150 percent of the poverty line.

(5) SUBMISSION OF BIOMETRIC AND BIOGRAPHIC DATA.—The Secretary may not remove the conditional basis of an alien's permanent resident status unless the alien submits biometric and biographic data, in accordance with procedures established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall provide an alternative procedure for applicants who are unable to provide such biometric data because of a physical impairment.

(6) BACKGROUND CHECKS.—

(A) REQUIREMENT FOR BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The Secretary shall utilize biometric, biographic, and other data that the Secretary determines appropriate—

(i) to conduct security and law enforcement background checks of an alien applying for removal of the conditional basis of the alien's permanent resident status; and

(ii) to determine whether there is any criminal, national security, or other factor that would render the alien ineligible for removal of such conditional basis

(B) COMPLETION OF BACKGROUND CHECKS.—The security and law enforcement background checks of an alien required under subparagraph (A) shall be completed, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, before the date on which the Secretary removes the conditional basis of the alien's permanent resident status.

(b) TREATMENT FOR PURPOSES OF NATURALIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of title III of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), an alien granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis shall be considered to have been admitted to the United States, and be present in the United States, as an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(2) LIMITATION ON APPLICATION FOR NATURALIZATION.—An alien may not apply for naturalization while the alien is in permanent resident status on a conditional basis.

SEC. 5106. DOCUMENTATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING IDENTITY.—An alien's application for permanent resident status on a conditional basis may include, as proof of identity—

(1) a passport or national identity document from the alien's country of origin that includes the alien's name and the alien's photograph or fingerprint;

(2) the alien's birth certificate and an identity card that includes the alien's name and photograph;

(3) a school identification card that includes the alien's name and photograph, and school records showing the alien's name and that the alien is or was enrolled at the school;

(4) a Uniformed Services identification card issued by the Department of Defense;

(5) any immigration or other document issued by the United States Government bearing the alien's name and photograph; or

(6) a State-issued identification card bearing the alien's name and photograph.

(b) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING CONTINUOUS PHYSICAL PRESENCE IN THE UNITED STATES.—To establish that an alien has been continuously physically present in the United States, as required under section 5103(b)(1)(A), or to establish that an alien has not abandoned residence in the United States, as required under section 5105(a)(1)(B), the alien may submit documents to the Secretary, including—

(1) employment records that include the employer's name and contact information;

(2) records from any educational institution the alien has attended in the United States;

(3) records of service from the Uniformed Services;

(4) official records from a religious entity confirming the alien's participation in a religious ceremony;

(5) passport entries;

(6) a birth certificate for a child who was born in the United States;

(7) automobile license receipts or registration;

(8) deeds, mortgages, or rental agreement contracts;

(9) tax receipts;

(10) insurance policies;

(11) remittance records;

(12) rent receipts or utility bills bearing the alien's name or the name of an immediate family member of the alien, and the alien's address;

(13) copies of money order receipts for money sent in or out of the United States;

(14) dated bank transactions; or

(15) 2 or more sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien who have direct knowledge of the alien's continuous physical presence in the United States, that contain—

(A) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(B) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(c) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING INITIAL ENTRY INTO THE UNITED STATES.—To establish under section 5103(b)(1)(B) that an alien was younger than 18 years of age on the date on which the alien initially entered the United States, an alien may submit documents to the Secretary, including—

(1) an admission stamp on the alien's passport;

(2) records from any educational institution the alien has attended in the United States;

(3) any document from the Department of Justice or the Department of Homeland Security stating the alien's date of entry into the United States;

(4) hospital or medical records showing medical treatment or hospitalization, the name of the medical facility or physician, and the date of the treatment or hospitalization;

(5) rent receipts or utility bills bearing the alien's name or the name of an immediate family member of the alien, and the alien's address;

(6) employment records that include the employer's name and contact information;

(7) official records from a religious entity confirming the alien's participation in a religious ceremony;

(8) a birth certificate for a child who was born in the United States;

(9) automobile license receipts or registration;

(10) deeds, mortgages, or rental agreement contracts;

(11) tax receipts;

(12) travel records;

(13) copies of money order receipts sent in or out of the country;

(14) dated bank transactions;

(15) remittance records; or

(16) insurance policies.

(d) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING ADMISSION TO AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—To establish that an alien has been admitted to an institution of higher education, the alien shall submit to the Secretary a document from the institution of higher education certifying that the alien—

(1) has been admitted to the institution; or

(2) is currently enrolled in the institution as a student.

(e) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING RECEIPT OF A DEGREE FROM AN INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—To establish that an alien has acquired a degree from an institution of higher education in the United States, the alien shall submit to the Secretary a diploma or other document from the institution stating that the alien has received such a degree.

(f) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING RECEIPT OF HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA, GENERAL EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE, OR A RECOGNIZED EQUIVALENT.—To establish that an alien has earned a high school diploma or a commensurate alternative award from a public or private high school, or has obtained a general educational development certificate recognized under State law or a high school equivalency diploma in the United States, the alien shall submit to the Secretary—

(1) a high school diploma, certificate of completion, or other alternate award;

(2) a high school equivalency diploma or certificate recognized under State law; or

(3) evidence that the alien passed a State-authorized exam, including the general educational development exam, in the United States.

(g) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING ENROLLMENT IN AN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM.—To establish that an alien is enrolled in any school or education program described in section 5103(b)(1)(D)(iii), 5103(d)(3)(A)(iii), or 5105(a)(1)(C), the alien shall submit school records from the United States school that the alien is currently attending that include—

(1) the name of the school; and

(2) the alien's name, periods of attendance, and current grade or educational level.

(h) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING EXEMPTION FROM APPLICATION FEES.—To establish that an alien is exempt from an application fee under section 5103(b)(5)(B) or 5105(a)(4)(B), the alien shall submit to the Secretary the following relevant documents:

(1) DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH AGE.—To establish that an alien meets an age requirement, the alien shall provide proof of identity, as described in subsection (a), that establishes that the alien is younger than 18 years of age.

(2) DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH INCOME.—To establish the alien's income, the alien shall provide—

(A) employment records that have been maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency;

(B) bank records; or

(C) at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien's work and income that contain—

(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(3) DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH FOSTER CARE, LACK OF FAMILIAL SUPPORT, HOMELESSNESS, OR SERIOUS, CHRONIC DISABILITY.—To establish that the alien was in foster care, lacks parental or familial support, is homeless, or has a serious, chronic disability, the alien shall provide at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the circumstances that contain—

(A) a statement that the alien is in foster care, otherwise lacks any parental or other familiar support, is homeless, or has a serious, chronic disability, as appropriate;

(B) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(C) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(4) DOCUMENTS TO ESTABLISH UNPAID MEDICAL EXPENSE.—To establish that the alien has debt as a result of unreimbursed medical expenses, the alien shall provide receipts or

other documentation from a medical provider that—

(A) bear the provider's name and address;

(B) bear the name of the individual receiving treatment; and

(C) document that the alien has accumulated $10,000 or more in debt in the past 12 months as a result of unreimbursed medical expenses incurred by the alien or an immediate family member of the alien.

(i) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING QUALIFICATION FOR HARDSHIP EXEMPTION.—To establish that an alien satisfies one of the criteria for the hardship exemption set forth in section 5105(a)(2)(C), the alien shall submit to the Secretary at least 2 sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the circumstances that warrant the exemption, that contain—

(1) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(2) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien.

(j) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING SERVICES IN THE UNIFORMED SERVICES.—To establish that an alien has served in the Uniformed Services for at least 2 years and, if discharged, received an honorable discharge, the alien shall submit to the Secretary—

(1) a Department of Defense form DD–214;

(2) a National Guard Report of Separation and Record of Service form 22;

(3) personnel records for such service from the appropriate Uniformed Service; or

(4) health records from the appropriate Uniformed Service.

(k) DOCUMENTS ESTABLISHING EMPLOYMENT.—

IN GENERAL.—An alien may satisfy the employment requirement under section 5105(a)(1)(C)(iii) by submitting records that—

(A) establish compliance with such employment requirement; and

(B) have been maintained by the Social Security Administration, the Internal Revenue Service, or any other Federal, State, or local government agency.

(2) OTHER DOCUMENTS.—An alien who is unable to submit the records described in paragraph (1) may satisfy the employment requirement by submitting at least 2 types of reliable documents that provide evidence of employment, including—

(A) bank records;

(B) business records;

(C) employer records;

(D) records of a labor union, day labor center, or organization that assists workers in employment;

(E) sworn affidavits from individuals who are not related to the alien and who have direct knowledge of the alien's work, that contain—

(i) the name, address, and telephone number of the affiant; and

(ii) the nature and duration of the relationship between the affiant and the alien; and

(F) remittance records.

(l) AUTHORITY TO PROHIBIT USE OF CERTAIN DOCUMENTS.—If the Secretary determines, after publication in the Federal Register and an opportunity for public comment, that any document or class of documents does not reliably establish identity or that permanent resident status on a conditional basis is being obtained fraudulently to an unacceptable degree, the Secretary may prohibit or restrict the use of such document or class of documents.

SEC. 5107. RULEMAKING.

(a) INITIAL PUBLICATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish regulations implementing this title in the Federal Register. Such regulations shall allow eligible individuals to immediately apply affirmatively for the relief available under section 5103 without being placed in removal proceedings.

(b) INTERIM REGULATIONS.—Notwithstanding section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the regulations published pursuant to subsection (a) shall be effective, on an interim basis, immediately upon publication in the Federal Register, but may be subject to change and revision after public notice and opportunity for a period of public comment.

(c) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which interim regulations are published under this section, the Secretary shall publish final regulations implementing this title.

(d) PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT.—The requirements under chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Paperwork Reduction Act''), shall not apply to any action to implement this title.

SEC. 5108. CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not disclose or use information provided in applications filed under this title or in requests for DACA for the purpose of immigration enforcement.

(b) REFERRALS PROHIBITED.—The Secretary may not refer any individual who has been granted permanent resident status on a conditional basis or who was granted DACA to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, or any designee of either such entity.

(c) LIMITED EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b), information provided in an application for permanent resident status on a conditional basis or a request for DACA may be shared with Federal security and law enforcement agencies—

(1) for assistance in the consideration of an application for permanent resident status on a conditional basis;

(2) to identify or prevent fraudulent claims;

(3) for national security purposes; or

(4) for the investigation or prosecution of any felony not related to immigration status.

(d) PENALTY.—Any person who knowingly uses, publishes, or permits information to be examined in violation of this section shall be fined not more than $10,000.

SEC. 5109. RESTORATION OF STATE OPTION TO DETERMINE RESIDENCY FOR PURPOSES OF HIGHER EDUCATION BENEFITS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 505 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1623) is repealed.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The repeal under subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the original enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (division C of Public Law 104–208; 110 Stat. 3009–546).

SA 5530. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 VI, add the following:

SEC. 606. ACCESS TO PAY AND BENEFITS FOR MEMBERS OF NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE COMPONENTS WHILE REQUESTS FOR RELIGIOUS AND HEALTH ACCOMMODATIONS ARE PENDING.

A member of the National Guard or another reserve component of the Armed Forces shall maintain access to pay and benefits while a request of the member for a religious or health accommodation is pending.

SA 5531. Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RISCH, and Mr. BRAUN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 589. LIMITATION ON INVOLUNTARY SEPARATION OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES BASED ON COVID–19 VACCINATION STATUS.

A member of an active or reserve component of the Armed Forces may not be involuntarily separated from the Armed Forces based solely on the vaccination status of the member with respect to COVID–19 until the Armed Forces have achieved the end strengths authorized under section 401.

SA 5532. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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, insert the following:

SEC. 1254. SENSE OF CONGRESS ON INCREASING PORT AND AIRFIELD CAPACITY OF COUNTRIES IN INDO-PACIFIC REGION.

It is the sense of Congress that, as the People's Republic of China continues to grow in influence through infrastructure (specifically infrastructure that can easily be shifted from economic to military uses), the United States International Development Finance Corporation should prioritize providing alternative financing opportunities that increase port and air field capacity of countries throughout the Indo-Pacific region that—

(1) are targets of the predatory infrastructure development scheme of the People's Republic of China; and

(2) are eligible for support provided by the Corporation under title II of the Better Utilization of Investments Leading to Development Act of 2018 (22 U.S.C. 9621 et seq.).

SA 5533. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by

Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. RECOGNITION OF SERVICE OF THE USS OKLAHOMA CITY AND CREW.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The USS Oklahoma City is a nuclear-powered fast attack submarine named after Oklahoma City, the capital and most populous city in Oklahoma, and is the second ship in the history of the Navy to bear that name.

(2) The motto of the USS Oklahoma City is ''The Sooner, The Better'', which is a testament to both the spirit of the people of Oklahoma City and the readiness of the 140-person crew of the USS Oklahoma City.

(3) The USS Oklahoma City was christened and launched on November 2, 1985, sponsored by Linda M. Nickles, and was commissioned for service on July 9, 1988, with Commander Kevin John Reardon as the first commanding officer of the submarine.

(4) Since the commissioning of the USS Oklahoma City, the USS Oklahoma City has traveled around the globe multiple times and has served in the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, the Pacific, and, most recently, Apra Harbor, Guam.

(5) In the aftermath of the April 19, 1995, bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City, the crew of the USS Oklahoma City donated blood in support of the victims of the deadliest act of homegrown terrorism in the history of the United States, which resulted in the deaths of 168 individuals.

(6) The USS Oklahoma City was the first Navy submarine to transition from navigation using paper charts to an all-electronic navigation suite.

(7) On Friday, May 20, 2022, the inactivation ceremony for the USS Oklahoma City was held in Puget Sound Naval Shipyard to honor nearly 34 years of service.

(8) Throughout the career of the USS Oklahoma City, the USS Oklahoma City supported a range of missions, including anti-surface warfare, anti-submarine warfare, targeted strike missions, and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions.

(b) RECOGNITION OF SERVICE.—Congress recognizes the service of the Los Angeles-class attack submarine the USS Oklahoma City and the crew of the USS Oklahoma City, who served the United States with valor and bravery.

SA 5534. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 G of title V, add the following:

SEC. 589. PROHIBITED EXTREMIST ACTIVITIES.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall amend Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 1325.06 to provide that military personnel may not actively engage in, threaten, or advocate—

(1) conduct that promotes illegal discrimination based on race, creed, color, sex, religion, ethnicity, or national origin; or

(2) conduct that threatens or advocate the use of force, violence, or criminal activity to achieve political or ideological objectives.

SA 5535. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 F of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1064. ENSURING RELIABLE SUPPLY OF RARE EARTH MINERALS.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The People's Republic of China is the global leader in mining, refining, and component manufacturing of rare earth elements, producing approximately 85 percent of the world's supply between 2011 and 2017.

(2) In 2019, the United States imported an estimated 80 percent of its rare earth compounds from the People's Republic of China.

(3) On March 26, 2014, the World Trade Organization ruled that the People's Republic of China's export restraints on rare earth minerals violated its obligations under its protocol of accession to the World Trade Organization, thereby harming United States manufacturers and workers.

(4) The Chinese Communist Party has threatened to leverage the People's Republic of China's dominant position in the rare earth market to ''strike back'' at the United States.

(5) The Quadrilateral Security Dialogue is an effective partnership for reliable multilateral financing, development, and distribution of goods for global consumption, as evidenced by the Quad Vaccine Partnership announced on March 12, 2021.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the People's Republic of China's dominant share of the global rare earth mining market is a threat to the economic stability, well being, and competitiveness of key industries in the United States;

(2) the United States should reduce reliance on the People's Republic of China for rare earth minerals through—

(A) strategic investments in development projects, production technologies, and refining facilities in the United States; or

(B) in partnership with strategic allies of the United States that are reliable trading partners, including members of the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue; and

(3) the United States Trade Representative should initiate multilateral talks among the countries of the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue to promote shared investment and development of rare earth minerals.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the United States Trade Representative, in consultation with the officials specified in paragraph (3), shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the work of the Trade Representative to address the national security threat posed by the People's Republic of China's control of nearly ⅔ of the global supply of rare earth minerals.

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a description of the extent of the engagement of the United States with the other countries of the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue to promote shared investment and development of rare earth minerals during the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on the date of the report; and

(B) a description of the plans of the President to leverage the partnership of the countries of the Quadrilateral Security Dialogue to produce a more reliable and secure global supply chain of rare earth minerals.

(3) OFFICIALS SPECIFIED.—The official specified in this paragraph are the following:

(A) The Secretary of State.

(B) the Secretary of Commerce.

(C) The Chief Executive Officer of the United States International Development Finance Corporation.

(4) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives.

SA 5536. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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:

Section 220 is amended to read as follows:

SEC. 220. STUDY ON FACILITATING THE DEVELOPMENT OF ELECTRIC VEHICLE BATTERY TECHNOLOGIES FOR WARFIGHTERS.

(a) STUDY REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Defense shall carry conduct study to assess the feasibility and advisability of providing support to domestic battery producers, particularly those producing lithium-ion cells and battery packs—

(1) to facilitate the research and development of safe and secure battery technologies for existing as well as new or novel battery chemistry configurations;

(2) to assess existing commercial battery offerings within the marketplace for viability and utility for warfighter applications; and

(3) to transition such technologies, including technologies developed from pilot programs, prototype projects, or other research and development programs, from the prototyping phase to production.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—In conducting the study required by subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) collect, analyze, and retain data;

(2) develop and share best practices relating to matters described in subsection (a);

(3) identify any policy or regulatory impediments inhibiting the facilitation described in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) or the transition described in paragraph (3) of such subsection; and

(4) share results from the study across the Department, and with elements of the Federal Government, including the legislative branch of the Federal Government.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering shall administer the study.

SA 5537. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 V, insert the following:

SEC. 5___. LIMITATION ON DISCHARGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO CHOOSE NOT TO RECEIVE A VACCINE FOR COVID–19.

The Secretary of Defense may not discharge any member of the Armed Forces under conditions other than honorable solely because such member chooses not to receive a vaccine for COVID–19.

SA 5538. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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. _____. GUIDANCE CLARITY.

(a) REQUIREMENT.—Each agency, as defined in section 551 of title 5, United States Code, shall include a guidance clarity statement as described in subsection (b) on any guidance issued by that agency under section 553(b)(3)(A) of title 5, United States Code, on and after the date that is 30 days after the date on which the Director of the Office of Management and Budget issues the guidance required under subsection (c).

(b) GUIDANCE CLARITY STATEMENT.—A guidance clarity statement required under subsection (a) shall—

(1) be displayed prominently on the first page of the document; and

(2) include the following: ''The contents of this document do not have the force and effect of law and do not, of themselves, bind the public or the agency. This document is intended only to provide clarity to the public regarding existing requirements under the law or agency policies.''.

(c) OMB GUIDANCE.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall issue guidance to implement this section.

SA 5539. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. GOLDEN VISA TRANSPARENCY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(D) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) COVERED CONTRIBUTION.—The term ''covered contribution'' means—

(A) a monetary donation to, investment in, or any other form of direct or indirect capital transfer, including through the purchase or rental of real estate, to—

(i) the government of a foreign country; or

(ii) any person, business, or entity in such a foreign country; and

(B) a donation to, or endowment of, any activity contributing to the public good in such a foreign country.

(3) GOLDEN VISA PROGRAM.—The term ''golden visa program'' means an immigration, investment, or other program of a foreign country that, in exchange for a covered contribution authorizes the individual making the covered contribution to acquire citizenship in such country or receive any other immigration benefit in the foreign country, including temporary or permanent residence that may serve as the basis for subsequent naturalization.

(4) VISA WAIVER PROGRAM.—The term ''visa waiver program'' means the program authorized under section 217 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187).

(b) NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENT FOR VISA WAIVER PROGRAM PARTICIPANT COUNTRIES THAT OPERATE GOLDEN VISA PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As a condition of continued participation in the visa waiver program, each foreign country participating in the visa waiver program that operates a golden visa program shall—

(A) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, provide to the Secretary of Homeland Security a description of the laws, regulations, and policies governing the golden visa program of the country, including, as applicable, such laws, regulations, and policies relating to—

(i) the physical presence of the golden visa program applicant in the country;

(ii) residence requirements;

(iii) covered contribution requirements;

(iv) security and background check procedures for applicants and intermediaries;

(v) risk management practices or measures, control systems, and oversight mechanisms;

(vi) information sharing with other foreign countries regarding application rejections;

(vii) anti-money laundering measures; and

(viii) information sharing with the tax residence of the applicant; and

(B) not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, provide notice to the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State of the name of each individual to whom the foreign country has ever provided citizenship, residence, or any other immigration benefit through such golden visa program before the date of the first such notice;

(C) promptly provide notice to the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State of the name of each individual to whom the foreign country provides citizenship, residence, or any other immigration benefit through such golden visa program after the date of the first such notice; and

(D) with respect to each such individual, details regarding—

(i) any identity assumed by the individual before the individual applied for such golden visa program; and

(ii) any identity the individual has assumed since receiving such immigration benefit.

(2) EFFECT OF NONCOMPLIANCE.—The Secretary of Homeland shall suspend from participation in the visa waiver program any foreign country described in paragraph (1) that does not comply with such paragraph.

(3) PROCEDURES TO ENSURE SANCTIONED INDIVIDUALS ARE NOT ADMITTED OR PAROLED INTO THE UNITED STATES.—The Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Director of National Intelligence, shall develop procedures to ensure that an individual whose entry into the United States has been prohibited pursuant to sanctions imposed by the United States Government and who has received an immigration benefit through a foreign country's golden visa program is not admitted or paroled into the United States as a national of such foreign country.

(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and at the beginning of each fiscal year thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Director of National Intelligence shall jointly submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report that—

(i) with respect to each visa waiver program participant country that operates a golden visa program, describes the laws, regulations, and policies governing the golden visa program including, as applicable, such laws, regulations, and policies with respect to—

(I) the physical presence of the golden visa program applicant in the country;

(II) residence requirements;

(III) covered contribution requirements;

(IV) security and background check procedures for applicants and intermediaries;

(V) risk management practices or measures, control systems, and oversight mechanisms;

(VI) information sharing with other foreign countries regarding application rejections;

(VII) anti-money laundering measures; and

(VIII) information sharing with the tax residence of an applicant;

(ii) includes the number of individuals whose entry into the United States has been prohibited pursuant to sanctions imposed by the United States Government and who have received an immigration benefit pursuant to

a golden visa program of a visa waiver program country, disaggregated by country that granted such benefit;

(iii) with respect to each such individual, a description of the specific type of sanction to which the individual is subject;

(iv) describes the procedures developed and implemented pursuant to paragraph (3); and

(v) includes an intelligence assessment of national security and criminal threats posed by the use of golden visa programs by foreign nationals and by United States citizens.

(B) FORM.—Each report required under subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO VISA WAIVER PROGRAM.—Section 217(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1187(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by adding at the end the following:

''(H) OPERATION OF GOLDEN VISA PROGRAM.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023, no country that operates a golden visa program may be designated as a program country unless the country submits, as a condition of its participation, the information described in section 1077(b)(1) of such Act.'';

(2) in paragraph (5)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(i) in subclause (IV), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(ii) by redesignating subclause (V) as subclause (VI); and

(iii) by inserting after subclause (IV) the following:

''(V) shall evaluate whether the program country operates a golden visa program and, as applicable, whether the program country has complied with the requirements of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023; and'';

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D);

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following:

''(C) TERMINATIONS RELATING TO GOLDEN VISA PROGRAMS.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall immediately terminate the designation of a program country if the country—

''(I) establishes a golden visa program (or in the case of a program country with an existing golden visa program, modifies the golden visa program or the terms and conditions of the golden visa program) without providing to the Secretary the information described in section 1077(b)(1) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023;

''(II) refuses to provide such information; or

''(III) provides such information but the information is of insufficient quality, as determined by the Secretary.

''(ii) REDESIGNATION.—With respect to a country the designation of which has been terminated under this subparagraph, the Secretary of Homeland Security may redesignate the country as a program country, without regard to subsection (f) or paragraph (2) or (3), if the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Secretary of State, determines that—

''(I) the country—

''(aa) has resumed sharing the information described in section 1077(b)(1) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023; and

''(bb) has shared such information that was withheld before the date of termination and such information that has accumulated since that date; and

''(II) the quality of such information is sufficient, as determined by the Secretary of Homeland Security.''; and

(D) in subparagraph (D)(i), as redesignated, by striking ''subparagraph (A) or (B)'' and inserting ''subparagraph (A), (B), or (C)''; and

(3) in paragraph (11)(C)—

(A) in clause (iv), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(B) in clause (v), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(vi) with respect to a subject country that operates a golden visa program—

''(I) an assessment of any threat posed by the golden visa program;

''(II) recommendations to mitigate any such threat; and

''(III) an assessment of the quality of the subject country's information sharing relating to the golden visa program.''; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(13) DEFINITION OF GOLDEN VISA PROGRAM.—In this subsection, the term 'golden visa program' has the meaning given such term in section 1077(a) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023.''.

SA 5540. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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. _____. REQUIREMENT TO POST A 100 WORD SUMMARY TO REGULATIONS.GOV.

Section 553(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (3), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) the Internet address of a summary of not more than 100 words in length of the proposed rule, in plain language, that shall be posted on the Internet website under section 206(d) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (44 U.S.C. 3501 note) (commonly known as regulations.gov).''.

SA 5541. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 B of title III, add the following:

SEC. 322. PRODUCTION AND USE OF NATURAL GAS AT MCALESTER ARMY AMMUNITION PLANT.

(a) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3 of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 352), the Secretary of the Army may—

(A) produce any natural gas located within land under the geographic footprint of the McAlester Army Ammunition Plant (referred to in this Act as ''MCAAP''); and

(B) treat, manage, and use the natural gas produced pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(2) CONTRACT AUTHORITY.—To carry out any authority described in paragraph (1), the Secretary of the Army may enter into a contract with an entity determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) ROYALTIES TO THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA.—

(1) VALUE OF ROYALTIES.—Beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, the Secretary of the Interior shall provide to the Secretary of the Army, for natural gas produced at MCAAP pursuant to subsection (a) during that calendar year, information on the amount of royalty payments that the State of Oklahoma would have received under the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) if the natural gas had been produced pursuant to a lease issued under that Act.

(2) ACCESS TO INFORMATION.—On request of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of the Army shall promptly provide all information, documents, and other materials the Secretary of the Interior considers necessary to calculate the amount of royalty payments under paragraph (1).

(3) PAYMENTS; DISBURSEMENTS.—

(A) PAYMENTS TO TREASURY.—On receipt of the information from the Secretary of the Interior under paragraph (1) each calendar year, the Secretary of the Army shall deposit in the Treasury of the United States an amount equal to the amount of the royalty payments calculated under that paragraph.

(B) DISBURSEMENTS TO OKLAHOMA.—The Secretary of the Interior shall disburse to the State of Oklahoma an amount equal to the amount deposited in the Treasury of the United States by the Secretary of the Army pursuant to subparagraph (A) as though the amounts were being disbursed to the State under section 6 of the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 355).

(4) WAIVER AUTHORITY.—On receipt of written notice from the Governor of Oklahoma consenting to the waiver of any of the requirements of paragraphs (1) through (3), the Secretary of the Interior may waive that requirement.

(c) OWNERSHIP OF FACILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army may take ownership of any gas production and treatment equipment and facilities and associated infrastructure from an entity with which the Secretary has entered into a contract under subsection (a)(2) in accordance with the terms of such contract.

(2) RESPONSIBILITY.—With respect to a natural gas well installed on MCAAP and subject to this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall have no responsibility for—

(A) the plugging, abandonment, or reclamation of such well; or

(B) any environmental damage caused by or associated with the production of such well.

(d) LIMITATION ON USES.—Natural gas produced pursuant to subsection (a) may be used only to support activities and operations at MCAAP.

(e) SAFETY STANDARDS FOR GAS WELLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A natural gas well installed on MCAAP and subject to this Act shall meet the same technical installation and operating standards required for a natural gas well installed under a lease issued pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), including—

(A) the gas measurement requirements under the Federal Oil and Gas Royalty Management Act of 1982 (30 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.); and

(B) the operational standards required by the Bureau of Land Management pursuant to part 3160 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or a successor regulation).

(2) COMPLIANCE.—With respect to a natural gas well installed on MCAAP and subject to this Act—

(A) the Bureau of Land Management shall—

(i) ensure compliance by the Secretary of the Army with the standards described in paragraph (1); and

(ii) report any violations of the standards to the Secretary of the Army; and

(B) the Secretary of the Army shall take such actions as are necessary to bring the well into compliance with such standards.

SA 5542. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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. _____. CRITERIA FOR GRANTING DIRECT-HIRE AUTHORITY TO AGENCIES.

Section 3304(a)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''shortage of candidates'' and all that follows through ''highly qualified candidates)'' and inserting ''shortage of highly qualified candidates''.

SA 5543. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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. _____. APPOINTMENT OF MILITARY SPOUSES.

Section 3330d of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) The term 'remote work' refers to a work flexibility arrangement under which an employee—

''(A) is not expected to physically report to the location from which the employee would otherwise work, considering the position of the employee; and

''(B) performs the duties and responsibilities of such employee's position, and other authorized activities, from an approved worksite—

''(i) other than the location from which the employee would otherwise work;

''(ii) that may be inside or outside the local commuting area of the location from which the employee would otherwise work; and

''(iii) that is typically the residence of the employee.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking ''or'' at the end;

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(3) a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces who is on active duty, or a spouse of a disabled or deceased member of the Armed Forces, to a position in which that spouse will engage in remote work.''; and

(3) in subsection (c)(1), by striking ''subsection (a)(3)'' and inserting ''subsection (a)(4)''.

SA 5544. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 VI, add the following:

SEC. 606. TRAVEL AND TRANSPORTATION ALLOWANCES FOR TRAVEL FOR MEDICAL CARE.

Section 453 of title 37, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(h) TRAVEL AWAY FROM DUTY STATION FOR MEDICAL CARE.—A member of the uniformed services, or a family member of such a member, who travels to obtain medical care not provided at the duty station of the member may be provided travel and transportation allowances to the extent provided in regulations prescribed under section 464 of this title.''.

SA 5545. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. SECURITY COOPERATION ACTIVITIES AT COUNTER-UAS TRAINING ACADEMY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—Congress—

(1) supports the Department of Defense's decision to establish the Counter-UAS Training Academy at Fort Sill, Oklahoma (in this section referred to as the ''C-UAS Academy'');

(2) believes the C-UAS Academy will play an important role in synchronizing training on counter-drone tactics across the military services;

(3) recognizes the important role of the C-UAS Academy in the military education and training of foreign partners on counter-unmanned aircraft systems operations; and

(4) encourages the Department of Defense to utilize the C-UAS Academy to expand such efforts.

(b) BRIEFING ON SECURITY COOPERATION EFFORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall brief the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives on how the Department of Defense intends to bolster security cooperation activities with allies and partners at the C-UAS Academy, including an identification of any shortfalls in resourcing or gaps in authorities that could inhibit these security cooperation efforts.

SA 5546. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. ROMNEY, Mr. CORNYN, and Mr. LEE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 XI, add the following:

SEC. 1115. LIMITATION ON APPOINTMENT OF RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES TO CERTAIN POSITIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3326 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the section heading, by inserting ''**CERTAIN**'' before ''**POSITIONS**''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''appointed'' and all that follows through ''Defense'' and inserting ''appointed to a position in the excepted or competitive service classified at or above GS–14 of the General Schedule (or equivalent) in or under the Department of Defense''; and

(B) in paragraph (1), by striking ''for the purpose'' and all that follows through ''Management''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter I of chapter 33 of such title is amended in the item relating to section 3326 by inserting ''certain'' before ''positions''.

SA 5547. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. SOCIOECONOMIC LABOR THRESHOLD FOR THE SERVICE CONTRACT ACT.

(a) SOCIOECONOMIC LABOR THRESHOLD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the socioeconomic labor threshold is—

(A) for the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on October

1 following such date of enactment, the amount determined by the Secretary of Labor under paragraph (2)(A); and

(B) for each 1-year period beginning on October 1 following such date of enactment, the amount determined by the Secretary of Labor under paragraph (2)(B).

(2) INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS.—

(A) INITIAL PERIOD.—The amount determined under this paragraph for the period described in paragraph (1)(A) shall be $2,500 as—

(i) increased by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items; United States city average), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, comparing—

(I) such Consumer Price Index for October of 1965; and

(II) such Consumer Price Index for the most recent month as of the date of enactment of this Act for which such Consumer Price Index is available; and

(ii) (if applicable), rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.

(B) SUBSEQUENT PERIODS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The amount determined under this subparagraph for the applicable period described in paragraph (1)(B) shall be the amount in effect on the date of such determination as—

(I) increased (if applicable) from such amount by the annual percentage increase, if any, in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items; United States city average), as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, from the preceding year as calculated in accordance with clause (ii); and

(II) (if applicable) rounded to the nearest multiple of $100.

(ii) CONSUMER PRICE INDEX.—In making the determination under clause (i) and calculating the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers under clause (i)(I), the Secretary of Labor shall compare the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items; United States city average), as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for June of the calendar year in which such determination is made with the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items; United States city average), as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, for June of the preceding calendar year.

(iii) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—With respect to a determination under clause (i) of the amount in effect under this paragraph for an applicable period under paragraph (1)(B), if there is not an annual percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers (all items; United States city average) from the preceding year as described in clause (i)(I), the amount in effect under this paragraph for such applicable period shall be the amount in effect under paragraph (1) on the date of such determination.

(b) AMENDMENTS TO THE MCNAMARA-O'HARA SERVICE CONTRACT ACT.—

(1) DEFINITION.—Section 6701 of title 41, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) SOCIOECONOMIC LABOR THRESHOLD.—The term 'socioeconomic labor threshold' means the socioeconomic labor threshold established under section 1077(a) of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023.''.

(2) APPLICABILITY THRESHOLD.—Section 6702(a)(2) of title 41, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(2) involves an amount exceeding—

''(A) for contracts and bid specifications made prior to the date of enactment of the James M. Inhofe National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2023, $2,500; and

''(B) for contracts and bid specifications made on or after such date of enactment, the socioeconomic labor threshold.''.

SA 5548. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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. ____. FLEXIBILITY FOR TEMPORARY AND TERM APPOINTMENTS.

(a) TEMPORARY AND TERM APPOINTMENTS.—Subchapter I of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 3117. Temporary and term appointments

''(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

''(1) DIRECTOR.—The term 'Director' means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

''(2) TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT.—The term 'temporary appointment' means an appointment in the competitive service for a period of not more than 1 year.

''(3) TERM APPOINTMENT.—The term 'term appointment' means an appointment in the competitive service for a period of more than 1 year and not more than 5 years.

''(b) APPOINTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The head of an Executive agency may make a temporary appointment or term appointment to a position in the competitive service when the need for the services of an employee in the position is not permanent.

''(2) EXTENSION.—Under conditions prescribed by the Director, the head of an Executive agency may—

''(A) extend a temporary appointment made under paragraph (1) in increments of not more than 1 year each, up to a maximum of 3 total years of service; and

''(B) extend a term appointment made under paragraph (1) in increments determined appropriate by the head of the Executive agency, up to a maximum of 6 total years of service.

''(c) APPOINTMENTS FOR CRITICAL HIRING NEEDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions prescribed by the Director, the head of an Executive agency may make a noncompetitive temporary appointment, or a noncompetitive term appointment for a period of not more than 18 months, to a position in the competitive service for which a critical hiring need exists, as determined under section 3304, without regard to the requirements of sections 3327 and 3330.

''(2) NO EXTENSIONS.—An appointment made under paragraph (1) may not be extended.

''(d) REGULATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Director may prescribe regulations to carry out this section.

''(2) APPLICATION.—Any regulations prescribed by the Director for the administration of this section shall not apply to the Secretary of Defense in the exercise of the authorities granted under section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2447).

''(e) SPECIAL PROVISION REGARDING THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Nothing in this section shall preclude the Secretary of Defense from making temporary and term appointments in the competitive service pursuant to section 1105 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328; 130 Stat. 2447).

''(f) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect the authorities granted under section 3109.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter I of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 3116 the following:

''3117. Temporary and term appointments.''.

SA 5549. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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:

Strike section 2867.

SA 5550. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY.

(a) EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY FOR COLLEGE GRADUATES.—Section 3115(e)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''15 percent'' and inserting ''25 percent''.

(b) EXPEDITED HIRING AUTHORITY FOR POSTSECONDARY STUDENTS.—Section 3116(d)(1) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking ''15 percent'' and inserting ''25 percent''.

SA 5551. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 E of title V, add the following:

SEC. 564. REPORT ON STATUS OF RELIGIOUS FREEDOM EDUCATION AND TRAINING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act,

the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the implementation of the training for all components of the Armed Forces required by Department of Defense Instruction (DoDI) 1300.17, entitled ''Religious Liberty in the Military Services'' and issued on September 1, 2020.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required under subsection (a) shall include the following elements:

(1) A copy of the educational materials for each military service.

(2) A description, disaggregated by military service, of—

(A) the number of trainings that have been conducted pursuant to DoDI 1300.17;

(B) the number of members of the Armed Forces who have received the training; and

(C) the number of members of the Armed Forces who have yet to complete the training.

SA 5552. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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. _____. NONCOMPETITIVE ELIGIBILITY FOR HIGH-PERFORMING CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''competitive service'' has the meaning given the term in section 2102 of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) the term ''Executive agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Under such regulations as the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue, an Executive agency may noncompetitively appoint, for other than temporary employment, to a position in the competitive service any individual who—

(1) is certified by the Director as having been a high-performing employee in a former position in the competitive service;

(2) has been separated from the former position described in paragraph (1) for less than 6 years; and

(3) is qualified for the new position in the competitive service, as determined by the head of the Executive agency making the noncompetitive appointment.

(c) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY.—An individual may not be appointed to a position under subsection (b) more than once.

(d) DESIGNATION OF HIGH-PERFORMING EMPLOYEES.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall, in the regulations issued under subsection (b), set forth the criteria for certifying an individual as a ''high-performing employee'' in a former position, which shall be based on—

(1) the final performance appraisal of the individual in that former position; and

(2) a recommendation by the immediate or other supervisor of the individual in that former position.

SA 5553. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 F of title III, add the following:

SEC. 389. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO MAINTAIN OR ESTABLISH COMPUTER NETWORKS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), none of the funds made available under this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) EXCEPTION FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT AND VICTIM ASSISTANCE.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, adjudication, or other activity relating to law enforcement or victim assistance.

SA 5554. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 end of subtitle E of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1052. PORT MAINTENANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 411(o) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 211(o)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

''(3) PORT MAINTENANCE.—

''(A) PROCEDURES.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraphs (B) and (C), the Commissioner, in consultation with the Administrator of the General Services Administration—

''(I) shall establish procedures by which U.S. Customs and Border Protection may conduct maintenance and repair projects costing not more than $300,000 at any Federal Government-owned port of entry where the Office of Field Operations performs any of the activities described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of subsection (g)(3); and

''(II) is authorized to perform such maintenance and repair projects, subject to the procedures described in clause (ii).

''(ii) PROCEDURES DESCRIBED.—The procedures established pursuant to clause (i) shall include—

''(I) a description of the types of projects that may be carried out pursuant to clause (i); and

''(II) the procedures for identifying and addressing any impacts on other tenants of facilities where such projects will be carried out.

''(iii) PUBLICATION OF PROCEDURES.—All of the procedures established pursuant to clause (i) shall be published in the *Federal Register*.

''(iv) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The publication of procedures under clause (iii) shall not impact the authority of the Commissioner to update such procedures, in consultation with the Administrator, as appropriate.

''(B) LIMITATION.—The authority under subparagraph (A) shall only be available for maintenance and repair projects involving existing infrastructure, property, and capital at any port of entry described in subparagraph (A).

''(C) ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS.—The Commissioner shall annually adjust the amount described in subparagraph (A) by the percentage (if any) by which the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the month of June preceding the date on which such adjustment takes effect exceeds the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers for the same month of the preceding calendar year.

''(D) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph may be construed to affect the availability of funding from—

''(i) the Federal Buildings Fund established under section 592 of title 40, United States Code;

''(ii) the Donation Acceptance Program established under section 482; or

''(iii) any other statutory authority or appropriation for projects described in subparagraph (A).''.

(b) REPORTING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Commissioner of U.S. Customs and Border Protection shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives that includes the elements described in paragraph (2).

(2) ELEMENTS.—The report required under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) a summary of all maintenance projects conducted pursuant to section 411(o)(3) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a) during the prior fiscal year;

(B) the cost of each project referred to in subparagraph (A);

(C) the account that funded each such project, if applicable; and

(D) any budgetary transfers, if applicable, that funded each such project.

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 422(a) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 232(a)) is amended by inserting ''section 411(o)(3) of this Act and'' after ''Administrator under''.

SA 5555. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 XI, insert the following:

SEC. _____. MAKING PERMANENT THE DIRECT HIRE AUTHORITY FOR DOMESTIC DEFENSE INDUSTRIAL BASE FACILITIES, THE MAJOR RANGE AND TEST FACILITIES BASE, AND THE OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF OPERATIONAL TEST AND EVALUATION.

(a) CODIFICATION OF SECTION 1125 OF FY 2017 NDAA.—Chapter 81 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end a new section consisting of—

(1) a heading as follows:

"§ 1599j. Direct hire authority for domestic defense industrial base facilities, the Major Range and Test Facilities Base, and the Office of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation"; and

(2) a text consisting of the text of section 1125 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (10 U.S.C. 1580 note prec.).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH CODIFICATION.—Section 1599j of title 10, United States Code, as added by subsection (a), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''During each of fiscal years 2017 through 2025, the Secretary'' and inserting ''The Secretary''; and

(B) by striking ''United States Code,''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''During fiscal years 2017 through 2021, the Secretary'' and inserting ''The Secretary''; and

(B) by striking ''United States Code,''.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 81 of such title is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1599j. Direct hire authority for domestic defense industrial base facilities, the Major Range and Test Facilities Base, and the Office of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation.''.

(d) CONFORMING REPEAL.—Section 1125 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (10 U.S.C. 1580 note prec.) is repealed.

SA 5556. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 end of subtitle B of title VIII, add the following:

SEC. 829. IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAFFICKING IN CONTRACTING PROVISIONS.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO REFER VIOLATIONS TO AGENCY SUSPENSION AND DEBARMENT OFFICIAL.—Section 1704(c)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 22 U.S.C. 7104b(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''refer the matter to the agency suspension and debarment official and'' before ''consider taking one of the following actions''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (G).

(b) REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION OF TRAFFICKING IN CONTRACTING PROVISIONS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress a report on implementation of title XVII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112–239; 126 Stat. 2092).

SA 5557. Mr. DAINES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. PROTECTION OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN VESSEL MANIFESTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 431(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1431(c)) is amended to read as follows:

''(2)(A) The information listed in paragraph (1) shall not be available for public disclosure if—

''(i) the Secretary of the Treasury makes an affirmative finding on a shipment-by-shipment basis that disclosure is likely to pose a threat of personal injury or property damage; or

''(ii) the information is exempt under the provisions of section 552(b)(1) of title 5, United States Code.

''(B) The Secretary shall ensure that any personally identifiable information, including Social Security numbers and passport numbers, is removed from any manifest signed, produced, delivered, or electronically transmitted under this section before access to the manifest is provided to the public.''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date that is 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 5558. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 V, insert the following:

SEC. 5____. OPPORTUNITY TO COMPLETE 20 YEARS OF SERVICE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES WHO HAVE NOT RECEIVED A VACCINE FOR COVID–19.

The Secretary of Defense shall permit any member of the Armed Forces who has reached or exceeded 18 years of satisfactory service in the Armed Forces the opportunity to complete 20 years of satisfactory service if—

(1) the member has not received a vaccine for COVID–19; and

(2) the Secretary is unable to provide clear and convincing evidence that there is a reason not to permit the member to complete such service other than the fact that member has not received such vaccine.

SA 5559. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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:

SEC. _____. USE OF SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION IN RULEMAKING.

Section 553 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) To the extent that an agency makes a decision based on science when issuing a rule under this section, the agency shall use scientific information, technical procedures, measures, methods, protocols, methodologies, or models, employed in a manner consistent with the best available science, and shall consider as applicable—

''(1) the extent to which the scientific information, technical procedures, measures, methods, protocols, methodologies, or models employed to generate the information are reasonable for and consistent with the intended use of the information;

''(2) the extent to which the information is relevant for use by the head of the agency in making a decision related to issuing the rule;

''(3) the degree of clarity and completeness with which the data, assumptions, methods, quality assurance, and analyses employed to generate the information are documented;

''(4) the extent to which the variability and uncertainty in the information, or in the procedures, measures, methods, protocols, methodologies, or models, are evaluated and characterized; and

''(5) the extent of independent verification or peer review of the information or of the procedures, measures, methods, protocols, methodologies, or models.

''(g) An agency shall make a decision described in subsection (f) based on the weight of the scientific evidence.

''(h) Each agency shall make available to the public—

''(1) all notices, determinations, findings, rules, consent agreements, and orders of the head of the agency in connection with a rule;

''(2) a nontechnical summary of each risk evaluation conducted in connection with a rule; and

''(3) a list of the studies considered by the agency in carrying out each risk evaluation described in paragraph (2), along with a description of the results of those studies.''.

SA 5560. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 end of title XII, add the following:

Subtitle G—Belt and Road Initiative Oversight

SEC. 1281. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Belt and Road Oversight Act''.

SEC. 1282. COUNTRY CHINA OFFICER.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall direct all Chiefs of Mission to designate not fewer than 1 Foreign Service Officer in a United States embassy or other diplomatic post in each country with whom the United States has diplomatic relations as the Country China Officer.

(b) DUTIES.—Each Country China Officer shall monitor and report on the activity of the People's Republic of China in his or her country of responsibility, including capital investment in critical infrastructure and other projects associated with the Belt and Road Initiative.

SEC. 1283. COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW OF BELT AND ROAD INITIATIVE PROJECTS.

(a) REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall direct all United States embassies to prepare a report that details equity and assets within their country of operation that are controlled by the Government of the People's Republic of China. Each such report shall be prepared by a Country China Officer designated pursuant to section 1282(a) and shall include the information described in subsection (b).

(b) CONTENTS.—Each report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) an assessment of the respective country's overall debt obligations to the People's Republic of China;

(2) a list of known infrastructure projects in the respective country that are financed from capital provided by—

(A) the banking system of the People's Republic of China, including—

(i) policy banks, including—

(I) the China Development Bank;

(II) the Export-Import Bank of China; and

(III) the Agricultural Development Bank of China;

(ii) state-owned commercial banks, including—

(I) the Industrial and Commercial Bank of China;

(II) the Agricultural Bank of China;

(III) the China Construction Bank;

(IV) the Bank of Communications Limited; and

(V) the Bank of China;

(iii) sovereign wealth funds, including—

(I) the China Investment Corporation;

(II) China Life Insurance Company;

(III) the China National Social Security Fund; and

(IV) the Silk Road Fund;

(iv) urban commercial banks; and

(v) rural financial institutions; and

(B) international financing institutions, including—

(i) the World Bank Group;

(ii) the Asian Development Bank;

(iii) the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank; and

(iv) the New Development Bank; and

(C) any other financial institution or entity the China Country Officer deems appropriate;

(3) the identification of the infrastructure projects referred to in paragraph (2) that are projects under the Belt and Road Initiative;

(4) any domestic vulnerabilities that the debts referred to in paragraph (1) could exacerbate in the respective country;

(5) a list of the known or speculated collateral listed by the respective country for the debts incurred by Belt and Road Initiative projects referred to in paragraph (2); and

(6) a list of the known or speculated assets owned by People's Republic of China entities, including telecommunications and critical infrastructure.

(c) SUBMISSION AND DISTRIBUTION OF REPORT.—

(1) INITIAL SUBMISSION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the Secretary of State issues the directive described in subsection (a), the Chief of Mission in each country shall submit the report required under subsection (a) to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

(2) DISTRIBUTION.—The Under Secretary shall prepare and distribute a report that includes all of the information from the individual country reports received pursuant to paragraph (1) to—

(A) the heads of other Bureaus and agencies of the Department of State, as appropriate;

(B) the United States International Development Finance Corporation;

(C) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(E) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(F) the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(G) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(H) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives;

(I) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; and

(J) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1284. NOTIFICATION OF FUTURE BELT AND ROAD INITIATIVE PROJECTS.

After the reports required under section 1283 have been prepared and submitted, the Secretary of State shall require that each Country China Officer notify the Chief of Mission of the respective Embassy and the China Desk at the Department of State of any project described in section 1283(b)(2) not later than 30 days after the date on which the Country China Officer is made aware of such project.

SEC. 1285. ANNUAL COMPREHENSIVE REPORT OF BELT AND ROAD INITIATIVE PROJECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the reports required under section 1283 and the notifications required under section 1284, each Country China Officer shall submit an annual report to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, through the Chief of Mission that contains all of findings relating to Belt and Road Initiative projects described in section 1283(b)(2) in the respective country during the 12-month reporting period.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—The Under Secretary shall prepare and distribute an annual report containing all of the information from the reports received pursuant to subsection (a) to the recipients described in section 1283(c)(2).

SEC. 1286. ANNUAL STRATEGY TO COUNTER THE INFLUENCE OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Country China Officer at each respective embassy, in consultation with the Chief of Mission for the respective country, shall develop a comprehensive, country-specific strategy to counter the influence of the People's Republic of China within their country of responsibility.

(b) USE OF STRATEGY.—The strategy developed pursuant to subsection (a) shall be used to equip all personnel across all embassies, consulates, and other diplomatic posts in the respective country of responsibility to effectively counter the influence of the People's Republic of China in their respective context and country of responsibility.

(c) SUBMISSION.—The Chief of Mission shall submit an annual report to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs that—

(1) describes the implementation of the strategy developed pursuant to subsection (a) during the reporting period; and

(2) assesses specific challenges and opportunities relating to the People's Republic of China in the respective country of responsibility.

(d) DISTRIBUTION.—The Under Secretary shall submit an annual report that summarizes the information contained in the reports received pursuant to subsection (c) to the heads of the Bureaus of the Department of State, as appropriate.

SEC. 1287. PROCUREMENT PROJECTIONS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Country China Officer at each respective embassy, in consultation with other embassy personnel, shall submit an annual report to the Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs that—

(1) describes the procurement and infrastructure needs of their respective country of responsibility; and

(2) assesses specific challenges and opportunities relating to potential financing by the People's Republic of China for procurement and infrastructure projects to meet such needs.

(b) DISTRIBUTION.—The Under Secretary shall submit an annual report that summarizes the information contained in the reports received pursuant to subsection (a) to—

(1) the heads of the Bureaus of the Department of State, as appropriate; and

(2) the United States International Development Finance Corporation.

SEC. 1288. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING DEVELOPMENT FINANCE.

It is the sense of Congress that, as the People's Republic of China's influence grows through infrastructure (particularly infrastructure that can easily be shifted from economic to military uses), the United States International Development Finance Corporation should prioritize providing alternative financing opportunities that increase port and air field capacity of countries that—

(1) meet the investment criteria set forth in the BUILD Act of 2018 (division F of Public Law 115–254); and

(2) are targets of the predatory infrastructure development scheme of the People's Republic of China commonly known as the Belt and Road Initiative.

SA 5561. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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. ____. BLENDED FEDERAL WORKFORCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1103(c) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking ''(c)(1)'' and inserting ''(c)(1)(A)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B)(i) The Office of Personnel Management shall collect from Executive agencies, other than elements of the intelligence community (as defined in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C.

3003(4))), on at least an annual basis the following:

''(I) The total number of persons employed directly by the Executive agency.

''(II) The total number of prime contractor employees and subcontractor employees, as those terms are defined in section 8701 of title 41, issued credentials allowing access to Executive agency property or computer systems.

''(III) The total number of employees of Federal grant and cooperative agreement recipients, as those legal instruments are described in sections 6304 and 6305 of title 31, respectively, who are issued credentials allowing access to Executive agency property or computer systems.

''(IV) A total count of the workforce of the Executive agency, including employees, prime contractor employees, subcontractor employees, grantee employees, and cooperative agreement employees.

''(ii) The Office of Personnel Management shall compile the data collected under clause (i) and issue, and post on its website, an annual report containing the data.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking ''paragraph (1)'' and inserting ''paragraph (1)(A)''.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS ON EFFECTIVE AND EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT OF THE BLENDED FEDERAL WORKFORCE.—

(1) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term ''Executive agency'' has the meaning given the term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(A) The implementation of Federal laws and the competent administration of Federal programs require skilled and capable personnel.

(B) Executive agencies depend on a blended workforce that includes Federal employees, employees of prime contractors and subcontractors performing services to Executive agencies, and employees of State or local governments, nonprofit organizations, or institutions of higher education performing services to Executive agencies under the terms of grants and cooperative agreements (in this subsection referred to as ''grantees''), all of whom make essential contributions to achieving the missions of the Government in service to the people of the United States.

(C) Approximately 2,000,000 Federal employees help to execute the laws of the United States, supplemented by an unknown number, estimated to exceed 5,000,000, of employees of prime contractors, subcontractors, and grantees providing services to Executive agencies.

(D) Policymakers, Executive agencies, and observers have often focused on individual components of the blended workforce, such as employees, without considering all components or considering the entire blended workforce and how all 3 components can work most effectively together.

(E) Executive agencies inhibit their own workforce planning and risk making decisions that may reduce the overall efficiency and cost effectiveness of the blended workforce by focusing on only 1 component in isolation.

(F) Establishing artificial limits on headcounts or full-time equivalent positions for Federal employees, administrators, and managerial employees of Executive agencies may discourage the employment of interns or entry-level employees to build a balanced employment pipeline and may inadvertently encourage managers to shift work to contractors and grantees for the purpose of complying with such numerical limits, even if those decisions are not justified by an approach to improve the efficiency or cost effectiveness of the Executive agency's work.

(G) The Government Accountability Office has identified strategic human capital management as a high-risk area for the Federal Government, adding that critical skills gaps ''impede the government from cost-effectively serving the public and achieving results''.

(3) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that Executive agencies should—

(A) manage the entire Federal blended workforce, including employees, contractors, and grantees, using a comprehensive and holistic approach to advance their missions as effectively and cost efficiently as possible, within appropriated budgets and without using artificial numerical limits on headcounts or full-time-equivalent positions; and

(B) conduct a holistic review of their blended workforce and develop a comprehensive plan to ensure an efficient and cost-effective blended workforce.

SA 5562. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 C of title VII, add the following:

SEC. 753. CONSCIENCE PROTECTIONS FOR MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES WHO PROVIDE OR ASSIST WITH PROVISION OF HEALTH CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense shall not take any adverse action against a member of the Armed Forces who provides or assists in the provision of health care for the Department of Defense (including as a behavioral, mental, or physical health professional) on the basis that such member declines to perform, assist, refer for, or otherwise participate in a particular medical procedure, counseling activity, or course of treatment because of a sincere religious belief or moral conviction of such member or because the particular medical procedure, counseling activity, or course of treatment would, in the professional medical judgment of such member, be harmful to the patient.

(b) NO IMPACT ON CARE.—The Secretary shall ensure that no patient is unduly delayed in receiving any medically indicated care they are otherwise eligible to receive, including preventative, emergency, and routine care, because of compliance by the Secretary with subsection (a).

(c) ADVERSE ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''adverse action'' includes any adverse personnel action, discrimination, or denial of promotion, schooling, training, or assignment.

SA 5563. Mr. LANKFORD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 E of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1262. REPORT ON UNITED STATES-COLOMBIA COUNTERNARCOTICS PARTNERSHIP.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on the counternarcotics partnership between the United States and Colombia.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A strategy for the Department to enhance coordination with and support for the Comandos Jungla Antinarcoticos, including through training with United States Special Forces, also known as the Green Berets.

(2) An evaluation of the success, as of the date on which the report is submitted, of the support provided by the Department for the efforts of the Policia National de Colombia to conduct counternarcotics operations, eradicate and seize cocaine and coca base, and train police in rural security positions.

SA 5564. Mr. BLUNT (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COTTON, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. OSSOFF) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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. 1214. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT TRAINING PIPELINE BETWEEN UNITED STATES NAVY AND ROYAL AUSTRALIAN NAVY.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the AUKUS partnership between Australia, the United Kingdom, and the United States presents a significant opportunity to enhance security cooperation in the Indo-Pacific region;

(2) parties to the AUKUS partnership should work expeditiously to implement a strategic roadmap to successfully deliver capabilities outlined in the agreement;

(3) the United States should engage with industry partners to develop a comprehensive understanding of the requirements needed to increase capacity and capability;

(4) Australia should continue to expand its industrial base to support production and delivery of future capabilities;

(5) the delivery of a nuclear-powered submarine to the Government of Australia would require the appropriate training and development of future commanding officers to operate such submarines for the Royal Australian Navy; and

(6) in order to uphold the stewardship of the Naval Nuclear Propulsion Program, the Secretary of Defense should work to coordinate an exchange program to integrate and train Australian sailors for the operation and maintenance of nuclear-powered submarines.

(b) EXCHANGE PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Defense, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall carry out an exchange program for Australian submarine officers during 2023 and each subsequent year. Under the

program, each year, two Australian submarine officers shall be selected to participate in the program. Each such participant shall—

(1) receive training in the Navy Nuclear Propulsion School;

(2) following such training and by not later than July 1 of the year of participation, enroll in the Submarine Office Basic Course; and

(3) following completion of such course, be assigned to duty on an operational United States submarine at sea.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the congressional defense committees a report on a notional exchange program for Australian submarine officers that includes initial, follow-on, and recurring training that could be provided to Australian submarine officers in order to prepare such officers for command of nuclear-powered Australian submarines.

SA 5565. Mr. BLUNT (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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. _____. LOW POWER TV STATIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term ''Commission'' means the Federal Communications Commission;

(2) the term ''Designated Market Area'' means—

(A) a Designated Market Area determined by Nielsen Media Research or any successor entity; or

(B) a Designated Market Area under a system of dividing television broadcast station licensees into local markets using a system that the Commission determines is equivalent to the system established by Nielsen Media Research; and

(3) the term ''low power TV station'' has the meaning given the term ''digital low power TV station'' in section 74.701 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide low power TV stations with a limited window of opportunity to apply for the opportunity to be accorded primary status as Class A television licensees.

(c) RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall issue a notice of proposed rulemaking to issue a rule that contains the requirements described in this subsection.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The rule with respect to which the Commission is required to issue notice under paragraph (1) shall provide that, during the 1-year period beginning on the date on which that rule takes effect, a low power TV station may apply to the Commission to be accorded primary status as a Class A television licensee under section 73.6001 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation.

(B) CONSIDERATIONS.—The Commission may approve an application submitted under subparagraph (A) if the low power TV station submitting the application—

(i) satisfies—

(I) section 336(f)(2) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 336(f)(2)) and the rules issued under that section, including the requirements under such section 336(f)(2) with respect to locally produced programming, except that, for the purposes of this subclause, the period described in the matter preceding subclause (I) of subparagraph (A)(i) of such section 336(f)(2) shall be construed to be the 90-day period preceding the date of enactment of this Act; and

(II) paragraphs (b), (c), and (d) of 73.6001 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation;

(ii) demonstrates to the Commission that the Class A station for which the license is sought will not cause any interference described in section 336(f)(7) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 336(f)(7)); and

(iii) as of the date of enactment of this Act, operates in a Designated Market Area with not more than 95,000 television households.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF LICENSE.—A license that accords primary status as a Class A television licensee to a low power TV station as a result of the rule with respect to which the Commission is required to issue notice under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be subject to the same license terms and renewal standards as a license for a full power television broadcast station, except as otherwise expressly provided in this subsection; and

(B) require the low power TV station to remain in compliance with paragraph (2)(B) during the term of the license.

(d) REPORTING.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report regarding the implementation of this section, which shall include—

(1) a list of the current, as of the date on which the report is submitted, licensees that have been accorded primary status as Class A television licensees; and

(2) of the licensees described in paragraph (1), an identification of each such licensee that has been accorded the status described in that paragraph because of the implementation of this section.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section may be construed to affect a decision of the Commission relating to completion of the transition, relocation, or reimbursement of entities as a result of the systems of competitive bidding conducted pursuant to title VI of the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012 (47 U.S.C. 1401 et seq.), and the amendments made by that title, that are collectively commonly referred to as the ''Television Broadcast Incentive Auction''.

SA 5566. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 F of title XII, add the following:

SEC. 1276. MODIFICATIONS TO SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 10101 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 1262 the following:

''SEC. 1262A. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

''It is the sense of Congress that the President should establish and regularize information sharing and sanctions-related decision making with like-minded governments possessing human rights and anti-corruption sanctions programs similar in nature to those authorized under this subtitle.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 2(b) and in title XII of division A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017 (Public Law 114–328) are each amended by inserting after the items relating to section 1262 the following:

''Sec. 1262A. Sense of Congress.''.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1263(a) of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 10102) is amended by striking paragraphs (2) through (4) and inserting the following:

''(2) is a current or former government official, or a person acting for or on behalf of such an official, who is responsible for or complicit in, or has directly or indirectly engaged in—

''(A) corruption, including—

''(i) the misappropriation of state assets;

''(ii) the expropriation of private assets for personal gain;

''(iii) corruption related to government contracts or the extraction of natural resources; or

''(iv) bribery; or

''(B) the transfer or facilitation of the transfer of the proceeds of corruption;

''(3) is or has been a leader or official of—

''(A) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, any of the activities described in paragraph (1) or (2) related to the tenure of the leader or official; or

''(B) an entity whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section as a result of activities related to the tenure of the leader or official;

''(4) has materially assisted, sponsored, or provided financial, material, or technological support for, or goods or services to or in support of—

''(A) an activity described in paragraph (1) or (2) that is conducted by a foreign person;

''(B) a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section; or

''(C) an entity, including a government entity, that has engaged in, or whose members have engaged in, an activity described in paragraph (1) or (2) conducted by a foreign person; or

''(5) is owned or controlled by, or has acted or been purported to act for or on behalf of, directly or indirectly, a person whose property and interests in property are blocked pursuant to this section.''.

(2) CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION.—Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended by inserting ''corruption and'' after ''monitor''.

(3) REQUESTS BY CONGRESS.—Subsection (d)(2) of such section is amended to read as follows:

''(2) REQUIREMENTS.—A request under paragraph (1) with respect to whether a foreign person has engaged in an activity described in subsection (a) shall be submitted to the President in writing jointly by the chairperson and ranking member of one of the appropriate congressional committees.''.

(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—Section 1264(a) of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 10103(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''; and'' and inserting a semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) a description of additional steps taken by the President through diplomacy, international engagement, and assistance to foreign or security sectors to address persistent underlying causes of conduct giving rise to the imposition of sanctions under this section, as amended on or after the date of the enactment of this paragraph, in each country in which foreign persons with respect to which such sanctions have been imposed are located; and

''(8) a description of additional steps taken by the President to ensure the pursuit of judicial accountability in appropriate jurisdictions with respect to foreign persons subject to sanctions under this section.''.

SA 5567. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 XII, add the following:

Subtitle G—Combating Global Corruption

SEC. 1281. SHORT TITLE.

This subtitle may be cited as the ''Combating Global Corruption Act of 2022''.

SEC. 1282. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) CORRUPT ACTOR.—The term ''corrupt actor'' means—

(A) any foreign person or entity that is a government official or government entity responsible for, or complicit in, an act of corruption; and

(B) any company, in which a person or entity described in subparagraph (A) has a significant stake, which is responsible for, or complicit in, an act of corruption.

(2) CORRUPTION.—The term ''corruption'' means the unlawful exercise of entrusted public power for private gain, including by bribery, nepotism, fraud, or embezzlement.

(3) SIGNIFICANT CORRUPTION.—The term ''significant corruption'' means corruption committed at a high level of government that has some or all of the following characteristics:

(A) Illegitimately distorts major decision-making, such as policy or resource determinations, or other fundamental functions of governance.

(B) Involves economically or socially large-scale government activities.

SEC. 1283. PUBLICATION OF TIERED RANKING LIST.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall annually publish, on a publicly accessible website, a tiered ranking of all foreign countries.

(b) TIER 1 COUNTRIES.—A country shall be ranked as a tier 1 country in the ranking published under subsection (a) if the government of such country is complying with the minimum standards set forth in section 1284.

(c) TIER 2 COUNTRIES.—A country shall be ranked as a tier 2 country in the ranking published under subsection (a) if the government of such country is making efforts to comply with the minimum standards set forth in section 1284, but is not achieving the requisite level of compliance to be ranked as a tier 1 country.

(d) TIER 3 COUNTRIES.—A country shall be ranked as a tier 3 country in the ranking published under subsection (a) if the government of such country is making de minimis or no efforts to comply with the minimum standards set forth in section 1284.

SEC. 1284. MINIMUM STANDARDS FOR THE ELIMINATION OF CORRUPTION AND ASSESSMENT OF EFFORTS TO COMBAT CORRUPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The government of a country is complying with the minimum standards for the elimination of corruption if the government—

(1) has enacted and implemented laws and established government structures, policies, and practices that prohibit corruption, including significant corruption;

(2) enforces the laws described in paragraph (1) by punishing any person who is found, through a fair judicial process, to have violated such laws;

(3) prescribes punishment for significant corruption that is commensurate with the punishment prescribed for serious crimes; and

(4) is making serious and sustained efforts to address corruption, including through prevention.

(b) FACTORS FOR ASSESSING GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO COMBAT CORRUPTION.—In determining whether a government is making serious and sustained efforts to address corruption, the Secretary of State shall consider, to the extent relevant or appropriate, factors such as—

(1) whether the government of the country has criminalized corruption, investigates and prosecutes acts of corruption, and convicts and sentences persons responsible for such acts over which it has jurisdiction, including, as appropriate, incarcerating individuals convicted of such acts;

(2) whether the government of the country vigorously investigates, prosecutes, convicts, and sentences public officials who participate in or facilitate corruption, including nationals of the country who are deployed in foreign military assignments, trade delegations abroad, or other similar missions, who engage in or facilitate significant corruption;

(3) whether the government of the country has adopted measures to prevent corruption, such as measures to inform and educate the public, including potential victims, about the causes and consequences of corruption;

(4) what steps the government of the country has taken to prohibit government officials from participating in, facilitating, or condoning corruption, including the investigation, prosecution, and conviction of such officials;

(5) the extent to which the country provides access, or, as appropriate, makes adequate resources available, to civil society organizations and other institutions to combat corruption, including reporting, investigating, and monitoring;

(6) whether an independent judiciary or judicial body in the country is responsible for, and effectively capable of, deciding corruption cases impartially, on the basis of facts and in accordance with the law, without any improper restrictions, influences, inducements, pressures, threats, or interferences (direct or indirect);

(7) whether the government of the country is assisting in international investigations of transnational corruption networks and in other cooperative efforts to combat significant corruption, including, as appropriate, cooperating with the governments of other countries to extradite corrupt actors;

(8) whether the government of the country recognizes the rights of victims of corruption, ensures their access to justice, and takes steps to prevent victims from being further victimized or persecuted by corrupt actors, government officials, or others;

(9) whether the government of the country protects victims of corruption or whistleblowers from reprisal due to such persons having assisted in exposing corruption, and refrains from other discriminatory treatment of such persons;

(10) whether the government of the country is willing and able to recover and, as appropriate, return the proceeds of corruption;

(11) whether the government of the country is taking steps to implement financial transparency measures in line with the Financial Action Task Force recommendations, including due diligence and beneficial ownership transparency requirements;

(12) whether the government of the country is facilitating corruption in other countries in connection with state-directed investment, loans or grants for major infrastructure, or other initiatives; and

(13) such other information relating to corruption as the Secretary of State considers appropriate.

(c) ASSESSING GOVERNMENT EFFORTS TO COMBAT CORRUPTION IN RELATION TO RELEVANT INTERNATIONAL COMMITMENTS.—In determining whether a government is making serious and sustained efforts to address corruption, the Secretary of State shall consider the government of a country's compliance with the following, as relevant:

(1) The Inter-American Convention against Corruption of the Organization of American States, done at Caracas March 29, 1996.

(2) The Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials in International Business Transactions of the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development, done at Paris December 21, 1997 (commonly referred to as the ''Anti-Bribery Convention'').

(3) The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, done at New York November 15, 2000.

(4) The United Nations Convention against Corruption, done at New York October 31, 2003.

(5) Such other treaties, agreements, and international standards as the Secretary of State considers appropriate.

SEC. 1285. IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS UNDER GLOBAL MAGNITSKY HUMAN RIGHTS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, should evaluate whether there are foreign persons engaged in significant corruption for the purposes of potential imposition of sanctions under the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (subtitle F of title XII of Public Law 114–328; 22 U.S.C. 2656 note)—

(1) in all countries identified as tier 3 countries under section 1283; or

(2) in relation to the planning or construction or any operation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline.

(b) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after publishing the list required by section 1283(a) and annually thereafter, the Secretary of State shall submit to the committees specified in subsection (f) a report that includes—

(1) a list of foreign persons with respect to which the President imposed sanctions pursuant to the evaluation under subsection (a);

(2) the dates on which such sanctions were imposed;

(3) the reasons for imposing such sanctions; and

(4) a list of all foreign persons found to have been engaged in significant corruption in relation to the planning, construction, or operation of the Nord Stream 2 pipeline.

(c) FORM OF REPORT.—Each report required by subsection (b) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(d) BRIEFING IN LIEU OF REPORT.—The Secretary of State, in coordination with the Secretary of the Treasury, may (except with respect to the list required by subsection (b)(4)) provide a briefing to the committees specified in subsection (f) instead of submitting a written report required under subsection (b), if doing so would better serve existing United States anti-corruption efforts or the national interests of the United States.

(e) TERMINATION OF REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO NORD STREAM 2.—The requirements under subsections (a)(2) and (b)(4) shall terminate on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(f) COMMITTEES SPECIFIED.—The committees specified in this subsection are—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 1286. DESIGNATION OF EMBASSY ANTI-CORRUPTION POINTS OF CONTACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of State shall annually designate an anti-corruption point of contact at the United States diplomatic post to each country identified as tier 2 or tier 3 under section 1283, or which the Secretary otherwise determines is in need of such a point of contact. The point of contact shall be the chief of mission or the chief of mission's designee.

(b) RESPONSIBILITIES.—Each anti-corruption point of contact designated under subsection (a) shall be responsible for enhancing coordination and promoting the implementation of a whole-of-government approach among the relevant Federal departments and agencies undertaking efforts to—

(1) promote good governance in foreign countries; and

(2) enhance the ability of such countries—

(A) to combat public corruption; and

(B) to develop and implement corruption risk assessment tools and mitigation strategies.

(c) TRAINING.—The Secretary of State shall implement appropriate training for anti-corruption points of contact designated under subsection (a).

SA 5568. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS ON SENATE-CONFIRMED OFFICIALS AT THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress and the executive branch have recognized the importance of preventing and mitigating the potential for conflicts of interest following government service, including with respect to senior United States officials working on behalf of foreign governments; and

(2) Congress and the executive branch should jointly evaluate the status and scope of post-employment restrictions.

(b) RESTRICTIONS.—Section 1 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2651a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(m) EXTENDED POST-EMPLOYMENT RESTRICTIONS FOR CERTAIN SENATE-CONFIRMED OFFICIALS.—

''(1) SECRETARY OF STATE AND DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE.—With respect to a person serving as the Secretary of State or Deputy Secretary of State, the restrictions described in section 207(f)(1) of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to representing, aiding, or advising a foreign governmental entity before an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States at any time after the termination of that person's service as Secretary or Deputy Secretary.

''(2) UNDER SECRETARIES, ASSISTANT SECRETARIES, AND AMBASSADORS.—With respect to a person serving as an Under Secretary, Assistant Secretary, or Ambassador at the Department of State or the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations, the restrictions described in section 207(f)(1) of title 18, United States Code, shall apply to representing, aiding, or advising a foreign governmental entity before an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States for 3 years after the termination of that person's service in a position described in this paragraph, or the duration of the term or terms of the President who appointed that person to their position, whichever is longer.

''(3) ENHANCED RESTRICTIONS FOR POST-EMPLOYMENT WORK ON BEHALF OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES OF CONCERN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to all former officials listed in this subsection, the restrictions described in paragraphs (1) and (2) shall apply to representing, aiding, or advising a country of concern described in subparagraph (B) before an officer or employee of the executive branch of the United States at any time after the termination of that person's service in a position described in paragraph (1) or (2).

''(B) COUNTRIES SPECIFIED.—In this paragraph, the term 'country of concern' means—

''(i) the People's Republic of China;

''(ii) the Russian Federation;

''(iii) the Islamic Republic of Iran;

''(iv) the Democratic People's Republic of Korea;

''(v) the Republic of Cuba; and

''(vi) the Syrian Arab Republic.

''(4) PENALTIES AND INJUNCTIONS.—Any violations of the restrictions in paragraphs (1) or (2) shall be subject to the penalties and injunctions provided for under section 216 of title 18, United States Code.

''(5) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

''(A) FOREIGN GOVERNMENT ENTITY.—The term 'foreign governmental entity' includes—

''(i) any person employed by—

''(I) any department, agency, or other entity of a foreign government at the national, regional, or local level;

''(II) any governing party or coalition of a foreign government at the national, regional, or local level; or

''(III) any entity majority-owned or majority-controlled by a foreign government at the national, regional, or local level; and

''(ii) in the case of a country described in paragraph (3)(B), any company, economic project, cultural organization, exchange program, or nongovernmental organization that is more than 33 percent owned or controlled by the government of such country.

''(B) REPRESENTATION.—The term 'representation' does not include representation by an attorney, who is duly licensed and authorized to provide legal advice in a United States jurisdiction, of a person or entity in a legal capacity or for the purposes of rendering legal advice.

''(6) NOTICE OF RESTRICTIONS.—Any person subject to the restrictions of this subsection shall be provided notice of these restrictions by the Department of State upon appointment by the President, and subsequently upon termination of service with the Department of State.

''(7) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The restrictions under this subsection shall apply only to persons who are appointed by the President to the positions referenced in this subsection on or after 120 days after the date of the enactment of this subsection.

''(8) SUNSET.—The enhanced restrictions under paragraph (3) shall expire on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this subsection.''.

SA 5569. Mr. TOOMEY (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 XII, add the following:

Subtitle G—Masih Alinejad HUNT Act of 2022

SEC. 1281. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Masih Alinejad Harassment and Unlawful Targeting Act of 2022'' or the ''Masih Alinejad HUNT Act of 2022''.

SEC. 1282. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran surveils, harasses, terrorizes, tortures, abducts, and murders individuals who peacefully defend human rights and freedoms in Iran, and innocent entities and individuals considered by the Government of Iran to be enemies of that regime, including United States citizens on United States soil, and takes foreign nationals hostage, including in the following instances:

(1) In 2021, Iranian intelligence agents were indicted for plotting to kidnap United States citizen, women's rights activist, and journalist Masih Alinejad, from her home in New York City, in retaliation for exercising her rights under the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Iranian agents allegedly spent at least approximately half a million dollars to capture the outspoken critic of the authoritarianism of the Government of Iran, and studied evacuating her by military-style speedboats to Venezuela before rendition to Iran.

(2) Prior to the New York kidnapping plot, Ms. Alinejad's family in Iran was instructed by authorities to lure Ms. Alinejad to Turkey. In an attempt to intimidate her into silence, the Government of Iran arrested 3 of Ms. Alinejad's family members in 2019, and sentenced her brother to 8 years in prison for refusing to denounce her.

(3) According to Federal prosecutors, the same Iranian intelligence network that allegedly plotted to kidnap Ms. Alinejad is also targeting critics of the Government of Iran who live in Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United Arab Emirates.

(4) In 2021, an Iranian diplomat was convicted in Belgium of attempting to carry out a 2018 bombing of a dissident rally in France.

(5) In 2021, a Danish high court found a Norwegian citizen of Iranian descent guilty of illegal espionage and complicity in a failed plot to kill an Iranian Arab dissident figure in Denmark.

(6) In 2021, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) appealed to the United Nations to protect BBC Persian employees in London who suffer regular harassment and threats of kidnapping by Iranian government agents.

(7) In 2021, 15 militants allegedly working on behalf of the Government of Iran were arrested in Ethiopia for plotting to attack citizens of Israel, the United States, and the United Arab Emirates, according to United States officials.

(8) In 2020, Iranian agents allegedly kidnapped United States resident and Iranian-German journalist Jamshid Sharmahd, while he was traveling to India through Dubai. Iranian authorities announced they had seized Mr. Sharmahd in ''a complex operation'', and paraded him blindfolded on state television. Mr. Sharmahd is arbitrarily detained in Iran, allegedly facing the death penalty. In 2009, Mr. Sharmahd was the target of an alleged Iran-directed assassination plot in Glendora, California.

(9) In 2020, the Government of Turkey released counterterrorism files exposing how Iranian authorities allegedly collaborated with drug gangs to kidnap Habib Chabi, an Iranian-Swedish activist for Iran's Arab minority. In 2020, the Government of Iran allegedly lured Mr. Chabi to Istanbul through a female agent posing as a potential lover. Mr. Chabi was then allegedly kidnapped from Istanbul, and smuggled into Iran where he faces execution, following a sham trial.

(10) In 2020, a United States-Iranian citizen and an Iranian resident of California pleaded guilty to charges of acting as illegal agents of the Government of Iran by surveilling Jewish student facilities, including the Hillel Center and Rohr Chabad Center at the University of Chicago, in addition to surveilling and collecting identifying information about United States citizens and nationals who are critical of the Iranian regime.

(11) In 2019, 2 Iranian intelligence officers at the Iranian consulate in Turkey allegedly orchestrated the assassination of Iranian dissident journalist Masoud Molavi Vardanjani, who was shot while walking with a friend in Istanbul. Unbeknownst to Mr. Molavi, his ''friend'' was in fact an undercover Iranian agent and the leader of the killing squad, according to a Turkish police report.

(12) In 2019, around 1,500 people were allegedly killed amid a less than 2 week crackdown by security forces on anti-government protests across Iran, including at least an alleged 23 children and 400 women.

(13) In 2019, Iranian operatives allegedly lured Paris-based Iranian journalist Ruhollah Zam to Iraq, where he was abducted, and hanged in Iran for sedition.

(14) In 2019, a Kurdistan regional court convicted an Iranian female for trying to lure Voice of America reporter Ali Javanmardi to a hotel room in Irbil, as part of a foiled Iranian intelligence plot to kidnap and extradite Mr. Javanmardi, a critic of the Government of Iran.

(15) In 2019, Federal Bureau of Investigation agents visited the rural Connecticut home of Iran-born United States author and poet Roya Hakakian to warn her that she was the target of an assassination plot orchestrated by the Government of Iran.

(16) In 2019, the Government of Denmark accused the Government of Iran of directing the assassination of Iranian Arab activist Ahmad Mola Nissi, in The Hague, and the assassination of another opposition figure, Reza Kolahi Samadi, who was murdered near Amsterdam in 2015.

(17) In 2018, German security forces searched for 10 alleged spies who were working for Iran's al-Quds Force to collect information on targets related to the local Jewish community, including kindergartens.

(18) In 2017, Germany convicted a Pakistani man for working as an Iranian agent to spy on targets including a former German lawmaker and a French-Israeli economics professor.

(19) In 2012, an Iranian American pleaded guilty to conspiring with members of the Iranian military to bomb a popular Washington, DC, restaurant with the aim of assassinating the ambassador of Saudi Arabia to the United States.

(20) In 1996, agents of the Government of Iran allegedly assassinated 5 Iranian dissident exiles across Turkey, Pakistan, and Baghdad, over a 5-month period that year.

(21) In 1992, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom expelled 2 Iranians employed at the Iranian Embassy in London and a third Iranian on a student visa amid allegations they were plotting to kill Indian-born British American novelist Salman Rushdie, pursuant to the fatwa issued by then supreme leader of Iran, Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini.

(22) In 1992, 4 Iranian Kurdish dissidents were assassinated at a restaurant in Berlin, Germany, allegedly by Iranian agents.

(23) In 1992, singer, actor, poet, and gay Iranian dissident Fereydoun Farrokhzad was found dead with multiple stab wounds in his apartment in Germany. His death is allegedly the work of Iran-directed agents.

(24) In 1980, Ali Akbar Tabatabaei, a leading critic of Iran and then president of the Iran Freedom Foundation, was murdered in front of his Bethesda, Maryland, home by an assassin disguised as a postal courier. The Federal Bureau of Investigation had identified the ''mailman'' as Dawud Salahuddin, born David Theodore Belfield. Mr. Salahuddin was working as a security guard at an Iranian interest office in Washington, DC, when he claims he accepted the assignment and payment of $5,000 from the Government of Iran to kill Mr. Tabatabaei.

(25) Other exiled Iranian dissidents alleged to have been victims of the Government of Iran's murderous extraterritorial campaign include Shahriar Shafiq, Shapour Bakhtiar, and Gholam Ali Oveissi.

(26) Iranian Americans face an ongoing campaign of intimidation both in the virtual and physical world by agents and affiliates of the Government of Iran, which aims to stifle freedom of expression and eliminate the threat Iranian authorities believe democracy, justice, and gender equality pose to their rule.

SEC. 1283. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ADMISSION; ADMITTED; ALIEN.—The terms ''admission'', ''admitted'', and ''alien'' have the meanings given those terms in section 101 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101).

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ''appropriate congressional committees'' means—

(A) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Financial Services and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

(3) CORRESPONDENT ACCOUNT; PAYABLE-THROUGH ACCOUNT.—The terms ''correspondent account'' and ''payable-through account'' have the meanings given those terms in section 5318A of title 31, United States Code.

(4) FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTION.—The term ''foreign financial institution'' has the meaning of that term as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to section 104(i) of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (22 U.S.C. 8513(i)).

(5) FOREIGN PERSON.—The term ''foreign person'' means any individual or entity that is not a United States person.

(6) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ''United States person'' means—

(A) a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States; or

(B) an entity organized under the laws of the United States or any jurisdiction within the United States, including a foreign branch of such an entity.

SEC. 1284. REPORT AND IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO PERSONS WHO ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR OR COMPLICIT IN ABUSES TOWARD DISSIDENTS ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of National Intelligence, and the Attorney General, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that—

(A) includes a detailed description and assessment of—

(i) the state of human rights and the rule of law inside Iran, including the rights and well-being of women, religious and ethnic minorities, and the LGBTQ community in Iran;

(ii) actions taken by the Government of Iran during the year preceding submission of the report to target and silence dissidents both inside and outside of Iran who advocate for human rights inside Iran;

(iii) the methods used by the Government of Iran to target and silence dissidents both inside and outside of Iran; and

(iv) the means through which the Government of Iran finances efforts to target and silence dissidents both inside and outside of Iran;

(B) identifies foreign persons working as part of the Government of Iran or acting on behalf of that Government (including members of paramilitary organizations such as Ansar-e-Hezbollah and Basij-e Mostaz'afin), that the Secretary of State determines, based on credible evidence, are knowingly responsible for, complicit in or involved in ordering, conspiring, planning or implementing the surveillance, harassment, kidnapping, illegal extradition, imprisonment, torture, killing, or assassination of citizens of Iran (including citizens of Iran of dual nationality) or citizens of the United States inside or outside Iran who seek—

(i) to expose illegal or corrupt activity carried out by officials of the Government of Iran;

(ii) to obtain, exercise, defend, or promote internationally recognized human rights and freedoms, such as the freedoms of religion, expression, association, and assembly, and the rights to a fair trial and democratic elections, in Iran; or

(iii) to obtain, exercise, defend, or promote the rights and well-being of women, religious

and ethnic minorities, and the LGBTQ community in Iran; and

(C) includes, for each foreign person identified subparagraph (B), a clear explanation for why the foreign person was so identified.

(2) UPDATES OF REPORT.—The report required by paragraph (1) shall be updated, and the updated version submitted to the appropriate congressional committees, during the 10-year period following the date of the enactment of this Act—

(A) not less frequently than annually; and

(B) with respect to matters relating to the identification of foreign persons under paragraph (1)(B), on an ongoing basis as new information becomes available.

(3) FORM OF REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report required by paragraph (1) and each update required by paragraph (2) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of State shall post the unclassified portion of each report required by paragraph (1) and each update required by paragraph (2) on a publicly available internet website of the Department of State.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—In the case of a foreign person identified under paragraph (1)(B) of subsection (a) in the most recent report or update submitted under that subsection, the President shall—

(1) if the foreign person meets the criteria for the imposition of sanctions under subsection (a) of section 1263 of the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act (22 U.S.C. 10102), impose sanctions under subsection (b) of that section; and

(2) if the foreign person does not meet such criteria, impose the sanctions described in subsection (c).

(c) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions to be imposed under this subsection with respect to a foreign person are the following:

(1) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall exercise all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in all property and interests in property of the person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(2) INELIGIBILITY FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—

(i) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien described in subsection (a)(1)(B) is—

(I) inadmissible to the United States;

(II) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(III) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(ii) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The visa or other entry documentation of an alien described in subsection (a)(1)(B) shall be revoked, regardless of when such visa or other entry documentation is or was issued.

(II) IMMEDIATE EFFECT.—A revocation under subclause (I) shall—

(aa) take effect immediately; and

(bb) automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien's possession.

(d) TERMINATION OF SANCTIONS.—The President may terminate the application of sanctions under this section with respect to a person if the President determines and reports to the appropriate congressional committees, not later than 15 days before the termination of the sanctions that—

(1) credible information exists that the person did not engage in the activity for which sanctions were imposed;

(2) the person has been prosecuted appropriately for the activity for which sanctions were imposed; or

(3) the person has—

(A) credibly demonstrated a significant change in behavior;

(B) has paid an appropriate consequence for the activity for which sanctions were imposed; and

(C) has credibly committed to not engage in an activity described in subsection (a) in the future.

SEC. 1285. REPORT AND IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS CONDUCTING SIGNIFICANT TRANSACTIONS WITH PERSONS RESPONSIBLE FOR OR COMPLICIT IN ABUSES TOWARD DISSIDENTS ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not earlier than 30 days and not later than 60 days after the Secretary of State submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report required by section 1284(a), the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that identifies any foreign financial institution that knowingly conducts a significant transaction with a foreign person identified in the report submitted under section 1284(a).

(2) FORM OF REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form but may include a classified annex.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall post the unclassified portion of each report required by paragraph (1) on a publicly available internet website of the Department of the Treasury.

(b) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—The Secretary of the Treasury may prohibit the opening, or prohibit or impose strict conditions on the maintaining, in the United States of a correspondent account or a payable-through account by a foreign financial institution identified under subsection (a)(1).

SEC. 1286. EXCEPTIONS; WAIVERS; IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) EXCEPTION FOR INTELLIGENCE, LAW ENFORCEMENT, AND NATIONAL SECURITY ACTIVITIES.—Sanctions under sections 1284 and 1285 shall not apply to any authorized intelligence, law enforcement, or national security activities of the United States.

(2) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under section 1284(c)(2) shall not apply with respect to the admission of an alien to the United States if the admission of the alien is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967, or other applicable international obligations.

(b) NATIONAL SECURITY WAIVER.—The President may waive the application of sanctions under section 1284 with respect to a person if the President—

(1) determines that the waiver is in the national security interests of the United States; and

(2) submits to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the waiver and the reasons for the waiver.

(c) IMPLEMENTATION; PENALTIES.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION.—The President may exercise all authorities provided to the President under sections 203 and 205 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1702 and 1704) to carry out this Act.

(2) PENALTIES.—A person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of section 1284(b)(1) or 1285(b) or any regulation, license, or order issued to carry out either such section shall be subject to the penalties set forth in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) to the same extent as a person that commits an unlawful act described in subsection (a) of that section.

SEC. 1287. EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the authorities and requirements to impose sanctions under this title shall not include the authority or a requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(b) GOOD DEFINED.—In this section, the term ''good'' means any article, natural or manmade substance, material, supply or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

SA 5570. Mr. CARDIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 5499 submitted by Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. INHOFE) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 7900, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2023 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 G of title X, add the following:

SEC. 1077. PATUXENT RESEARCH REFUGE EXPANSION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term ''Federal land'' means the approximately 105 acres of Goddard Space Flight Center land under the jurisdiction of the Administrator known as ''Area 400''.

(3) RESEARCH REFUGE.—The term ''Research Refuge'' means the Patuxent Research Refuge established by Executive Order 7514 of December 16, 1936.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

(b) RESEARCH REFUGE BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.—The acquisition boundary of the Research Refuge is expanded to include the land depicted as ''Area 400'' on the map entitled ''Patuxent Research Refuge Acquisition Boundary Expansion'' and dated July 28, 2022.

(c) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN GODDARD SPACE FLIGHT CENTER LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On a joint determination by the Administrator and the Secretary that the Federal land has been remediated and restored to the satisfaction of the Administrator and the Secretary, in accordance with paragraphs (2) and (3), the Administrator shall transfer to the Secretary, at no cost, administrative jurisdiction over the Federal land for inclusion in the Research Refuge.

(2) REMEDIATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Administrator shall prepare an updated environmental evaluation of the Federal land, which shall include—

(i) a sampling and analysis of the soil;

(ii) a sampling and analysis of the groundwater; and

(iii) an assessment of the onsite septic system.

(B) CONSULTATION.—The Administrator shall consult with, and incorporate input from, the Secretary relating to the environmental evaluation prepared under subparagraph (A), including for purposes of—

(i) developing the sampling design;

(ii) conducting the data review and analysis; and

(iii) developing recommendations for the remediation of the Federal land.

(C) REMEDIATION.—Any necessary remediation identified in the environmental evaluation prepared under subparagraph (A) shall be conducted and funded by the Administrator.

(D) MONITORING.—Based on the findings of the environmental evaluation prepared under subparagraph (A), the Administrator and the Secretary shall jointly design and agree to an ongoing monitoring plan for the Federal land, which shall be conducted and funded by the Administrator.

(3) RESTORATION.—Before the transfer of the Federal land under paragraph (1), the Administrator shall restore the Federal land, which shall include—

(A) the demolition of any—

(i) aboveground structures;

(ii) concrete sidewalks;

(iii) underground storage tanks;

(iv) seismic isolation pads; and

(v) abandoned in-place monitoring wells;

(B) the decommissioning of the septic system;

(C) the demolition of the perimeter fence and gate;

(D) the decommissioning of electrical, sewer, and water connections;

(E) the removal of associated debris from the Federal land; and

(F) the stabilization of exposed soil.

(4) FUTURE LIABILITY.—The Administrator shall retain post-transfer responsibility, including for any ongoing monitoring required under paragraph (2)(D), for any hazardous substances that may be present on the Federal land as a result of activities by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(5) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator such sums as are necessary to carry out this subsection.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I have nine 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 ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, 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 Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPREUNERSHIP

The Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS

The Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 10:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, September 21, 2022, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

RUSSIA AND BELARUS SDR EXCHANGE PROHIBITION ACT OF 2022

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 452, H.R. 6899.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 6899) to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from engaging in transactions involving the exchange of Special Drawing Rights issued by the International Monetary Fund that are held by the Russian Federation or Belarus.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SANDERS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon table.

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

The bill (H.R. 6899) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2022

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, September 22; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 484, S. 4822, with the provisions of the previous order in effect; further, that if cloture is not invoked, the Senate proceed to executive session to vote on confirmation of the Bennett nomination; that upon disposition of the Bennett nomination, the Senate resume consideration of the Prabhakar nomination and at 1:45 p.m. vote on confirmation of the nomination; finally, that if any nominations are confirmed during Thursday'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.

Mr. SANDERS. For the information of the Senate, there will be two rollcall votes at 11:30 a.m. and one rollcall vote at 1:45 p.m.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:33 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 22, 2022, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 21, 2022:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ROSELYN TSO, OF OREGON, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

ROBERT A. WOOD, OF NEW YORK, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA FOR SPECIAL POLITICAL AFFAIRS IN THE UNITED NATIONS.