United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2023 *No. 147*

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

We pause at the convening of this Senate session, Eternal God, to acknowledge our total dependence upon You. We are aware of the fragile and temporary nature of our earthly pilgrimage and look to You, the changeless one, to guide our steps. From You we borrow our heartbeats and because of You we live and move and have our being.

Guide our lawmakers today with more than human wisdom. Give them the ability to solve the difficult problems of these turbulent days. Break in and through their human efforts, empowering them to let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mrs. MURRAY).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 12, 2023.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable RAPHAEL G. WARNOCK, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

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

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Tanya J. Bradsher, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE INSIGHT FORUM

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, for Congress to legislate on artificial intelligence is for to us engage in one of the most complex and important subjects Congress has ever faced. In just a few years, artificial intelligence has grown in complexity, speed, and power, doing things even experts didn't think possible so soon.

In past situations, when subjects like this that are so complex and difficult have come forward, too many Congresses have tended to behave reactively or have favored delaying action until it is too late. But on AI, we can't behave like ostriches and stick our heads in the sand. It will affect just about every aspect of society in major ways, both positive and negative, and on an issue this wide-ranging and important, we must make every good-faith effort to act.

Congress must recognize two things; that this effort must be bipartisan and that we need outside help if we want to write effective AI policies. We need help, of course, from developers and experts who build AI systems, but we also need help from critics who can make sure the liabilities of AI are minimized by guardrails. Those critics will come from two places, like from outside the industry, such as labor and civil rights and the creative community, but we also need critics from inside the industry as well who may know, in a very technical sense, how to minimize the dangers.

That is why tomorrow will be so important. Tomorrow morning, I will convene, with Senators ROUNDS and HEINRICH and YOUNG, the first of a series of AI Insight Forums to bring leaders from inside and outside the industry to debate Congress's role in regulating AI.

We will have a balanced and diverse group at the table, not just those from tech but AI experts and ethicists who have spent years researching and advancing the technology. We will also have organizations outside the industry representing labor and civil rights, the world of academia and defense, and so much more—all of these groups together in one room, talking about how and why Congress must act, what questions to ask, and how to build a consensus for SAFE innovation. That is, of course, what we have called our suggestion because AI innovation must be our North Star in all we do.

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

And I am talking about innovation in both a transformational sense—the kind of innovation that unlocks new cures, improves education, protects our national security, protects our food supply—and sustainable innovation so that we may find new and creative ways to protect against AI's risks and minimize the chances of this technology going off the rails, which would undermine innovation altogether.

The only way we will achieve this goal is by bringing a diverse group of perspectives together, from those who work every day on these systems to those openly critical of many parts of AI and who worry about its effects on workers, on racial and gender bias, and more. So I look forward to tomorrow's conversation, the first of many we will have this fall. I expect we will hear a wide range of views and opinions and lots of dissenting views. That is how it should be.

I want to thank every participant attending tomorrow's forum. Thank you also to Senators ROUNDS and HEINRICH and YOUNG, who helped to organize tomorrow's meeting. And, of course, I want to thank all of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who recognize the urgency of AI.

The Senate is fully engaged on this issue and is ready to do more. Our committees and subcommittees have already held no fewer than nine hearings on AI, with more happening this week, all on issues ranging from national security to human rights, to IP, and more. We need all hands on deck if we want to maximize AI's societal benefits while minimizing its many risks. Tomorrow, we will take the next step in this great undertaking, and I urge all of my colleagues from both sides to attend.

NOMINATION OF JEFFREY IRVINE CUMMINGS

On nominations, Mr. President, today, the Senate will continue the business of confirming more judicial nominees. We will vote this afternoon to confirm Jeffrey Cummings of Illinois to serve as district judge for the Northern District of Illinois. Judge Cummings was reported out of committee with a bipartisan vote, and he would be the 104th district court judge that we confirm under President Biden.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. President, on another matter, after a lot of hard work and compromise by appropriators on both sides—a salute goes to PATTY MURRAY and SUSAN COLLINS—today, the Senate will take up the first procedural vote on a package of three appropriations bills: MILCON-Veterans Affairs, Agriculture, and Transportation-HUD. Each of these bills passed unanimously out of committee, so I hope they will have strong bipartisan support here on the floor.

And I mentioned both Chair MURRAY and Vice Chair COLLINS. I want to also thank all of the members of the Appropriations Committee for their great work. None of it was easy. They deserve great credit.

The Senate appropriations, thus far, has been the gold standard for good governance. All 12 appropriations bills passed through regular order, with Democratic chairs and Republican ranking members working together to move bills forward.

As the Senate continues the work of funding the government, the House gavels back in today with one very important responsibility: following the Senate's example and working in a bipartisan fashion to prevent a government shutdown. The American people don't want a shutdown. It would undo so much of our progress to lower costs, create millions and millions of jobs, and help our economy recover from the pandemic.

So I, once again, implore the House Republican leadership to reject all-or-nothing tactics, to reject unrealistic expectations, and refuse to cave to the extremist demands we are hearing from 30 or so Members way out on the fringe.

There is only one way we will avoid a costly government shutdown: bipartisanship. It is as simple as that. We have seen bipartisanship work in the Senate, and now the House must follow suit.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

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

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this week, the Senate will begin consideration of the first package of full-year appropriations for the coming fiscal year. This is an important milestone and a downpayment on our goal of funding the Federal Government through regular order.

Our progress on this front has been due in large part to the leadership of Senator COLLINS and Senator MURRAY of the Appropriations Committee. For months—months—our colleagues have worked diligently to build consensus and process as many bills as possible with deadlines looming large.

The legislation before us this week is designed to address a trio of important commitments—to America's farmers, to our veterans, and to investing in transportation infrastructure.

Seven percent of American adults are veterans of the Armed Forces. Ten percent of American jobs are supported by agriculture. And our entire economy hinges on safe and efficient airports, roads, bridges, and ports. So it is difficult to overstate the importance of this legislation, but it is especially important that we get it right. To that end, I hope and expect that all Senators will receive ample opportunity to offer amendments for consideration.

Ultimately, our work will need to earn the support of a divided Congress and earn the President's signature. So I am grateful to our colleagues' commitment to regular order appropriations, and I look forward to supporting a sensible step forward in the coming days.

UKRAINE

Mr. President, now on another matter, I have spoken in recent days about the most common arguments deployed against U.S. assistance to the fight against Putin in Ukraine and how they fall short. Today, I would like to address the misconception that America's lethal aid lacks necessary accountability and protections against misuse.

The United States probably has a deeper understanding of how Ukraine is using weapons provided by the United States and our allies than we have had with any other partner nation, period. There are many reasons for this.

First, Ukraine is not Iraq or Afghanistan; it is a modern democracy, firmly committed to integration with the West.

Second, Russia's escalation last year led to a political sea change in how Ukraine treats corruption. Today, corruption and misuse of funds or weapons can mean the death of loved ones or imperil critical Western support.

I am not saying that corruption has vanished. Even in the worst conflicts or most advanced democracies, human nature remains. But the cost calculus has changed, and robust, independent anti-corruption bodies are making a difference.

Third, American diplomats, military officers, and USAID employees have finally returned to Kyiv. Their presence allows for more oversight and accountability of our assistance.

Senators who have visited the American-led headquarters in Germany and seen the professional, multinational effort supporting Ukraine firsthand have come away impressed. They have also been impressed by LTG Tony Aguto, the senior American officer who runs this effort and was confirmed by the Senate last year by a voice vote.

Through these coalition efforts, we have unprecedented insight into how nearly 30 types of Western weapons systems and vehicles are being used by Ukraine, often down to the serial number.

Take for example an American-led effort in Poland that remotely assists Ukrainian units on the frontlines to maintain and prepare various weapons and vehicles. When trouble arises, Ukrainian units have every incentive to share data, photos, and video in real time about the status of their weapons and benefit from engineering solutions we have provided to help maintain and prepare these weapons out in the field.

This is a win-win. The United States gets unprecedented insight into how our weapons are being used—often overused—in combat, which helps us improve and maintain America's own arsenal. U.S. forces also get a unique view into the situation on the battlefield and the challenges Ukrainian forces are facing.

Given his oversight role and regular contact with Ukrainian commanders, I have requested the administration make Lieutenant General Aguto available to brief Senators on these insights.

Finally, here in the Senate, Ranking Member RISCH, Ranking Member WICKER, Vice Chairman COLLINS, and Vice Chairman RUBIO have been conducting proactive oversight based on lessons learned in Iraq and Afghanistan.

We have ensured that $50 million was included in previous supplementals specifically to conduct oversight of assistance to Ukraine. We have added dozens of transparency and reporting requirements so Congress has more insight than ever.

Tomorrow, my colleagues will have an opportunity to learn even more. At my request, the inspectors general for the Pentagon, the State Department, and USAID will come to brief Republican Senators on the state of their own independent oversight of these assistance efforts. Already, as the State Department's IG put it, ''Our completed work has not substantiated any allegations of diversion.''

So it is my hope that each of our colleagues will take the opportunity to get the facts from these independent auditors.

ENERGY

Mr. President, now on one final matter, across the country, the end of summer gave working families gas prices near alltime highs, beyond just a seasonal swing.

Last week, Washington Democrats opened a new front in their war on affordable and abundant American energy. The Biden administration announced the withdrawal of more than 13 million acres in the National Petroleum Reserve from oil and gas leasing and canceled—canceled—seven oil and gas leases in Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The President calls this move a necessary step to ''meet the urgency of the climate crisis,'' but any serious observer would call it bad news for families trying to make ends meet.

Last fiscal year, under President Biden's stranglehold, the number of new Federal acres leased plummeted. Comparing the first 30 months of each administration, onshore leasing is down from 67 sales under the previous administration to a mere 9 sales under President Biden—67 sales down to 9 under this administration.

Meanwhile, the Biden administration has let a 5-year plan for offshore energy production—required by law—to expire over a year ago with no new plan in sight. In other words, there are no new offshore energy leases in the hopper.

Now, Congress has exercised its authority and forced the President to reinstate an offshore lease it had already canceled, but in response, his administration put 6 million acres of the sale off limits to oil and gas exploration.

Senate Democrats have been more than willing to tow the party line. Last year, every single one of our Democratic colleagues voted against Senator BARRASSO's effort to require dependable onshore leasing, and every single one voted against Senator KENNEDY's measure to restore certainty to offshore leasing.

Freezing the development of clean and reliable energy here at home does nothing more than kick production of more expensive and less reliable fuels into overdrive overseas. You can guarantee fuels won't be climate-conscious or environmentally sound when they come from hostile regimes overseas.

The cost of Washington Democrats' shortsighted obsession is measured in higher costs at the pump, higher home heating and cooling bills, and greater reliance on foreign energy.

By outsourcing our energy policy to the radical environmentalists, the Biden administration is literally outsourcing America's energy security. Our Nation really deserves better.

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

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

STUDENT LOANS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, 3 weeks ago, President Biden officially launched the second part of his student loan giveaway—his dramatic overhaul of the REPAYE program, an income-driven repayment plan for Federal student loans.

The President's revamp flew under the radar a bit when it was first announced, overshadowed by his plan to forgive up to $10,000 of student loan debt outright—or $20,000 for Pell grant recipients. But the truth is that the President's new income-driven repayment plan, which he has dubbed the Saving on a Valuable Education plan—or the SAVE plan—is just as problematic, if not more, as the President's scheme to forgive student debt outright because the new SAVE plan will create a system in which the majority of future Federal borrowers will never fully repay their student loans.

The nonpartisan Penn Wharton Budget Model estimates that just 24.6 percent of future borrowers will repay their loans in full—in other words, less than a quarter of borrowers.

The Department of Education estimates that borrowers with only undergraduate debt enrolled in the SAVE program can, on average, expect to pay back just $6,121 for each $10,000 they borrow. That amount the Federal Government is taking on, on average, is almost 40 percent of the cost of these undergraduates' student loans.

Let's call this what it is: It is loan forgiveness by another name. You don't have to take my word for it.

One scholar from the left-leaning Urban Institute had this to say on NPR the other day:

> I think it's going to be less obvious that it's a big loan forgiveness program to both borrowers and onlookers as well. But, yeah, it's a big loan forgiveness program. . . . So no longer a safety net like it has been in the past for undergraduates—this looks more like a broad-based subsidy for undergraduate degrees through loan forgiveness.

That, from a scholar at the left-leaning Urban Institute. Let me repeat that: ''a broad-based subsidy for undergraduate degrees through loan forgiveness.''

Or, in other words, in the words of one scholar from the American Enterprise Institute, ''a functional entitlement program'' whose costs, he adds, ''will prove difficult to control.''

I don't need to tell anyone that the problems here are myriad. Just think about it. For starters, someone is going to have to bear the cost of all these unrepaid student loans. And that someone is the American taxpayers, including taxpayers who worked hard to pay off the full balance on their own student loans, without a handout from the Federal Government, and taxpayers who worked their way through school to avoid a heavy loan burden and parents who scrimped and saved to send their children to college debt-free and individuals who covered the cost of their education by enlisting in the military and risking their lives for their country. And I could go on.

I am at a loss to understand why taxpayers, as a whole, should assume a substantial part of the educational burden for individuals, who, if they graduated from college, have greater long-term earning potential than many of the Americans who will be helping to shoulder the burdens for their debts.

And, of course, this program isn't just being offered to help undergraduate debt. No. Graduate students, including those in professional degree programs like medical school and law school, will also be eligible for the so-called SAVE program.

And I don't need to tell anyone that the lifetime earning potential of a doctor or a lawyer is usually pretty good. But leaving aside questions of fairness, let's talk about the costs of this de facto new entitlement program. Again, the Penn Wharton Budget Model estimates the SAVE program will cost roughly half a trillion dollars over the next 10 years.

We have a national debt today of $32 trillion and a Federal budget that has increased by 41 percent since 2019. Contrary to what President Biden seems to believe, we can't afford to be constantly expanding government programs. We simply don't have the money to be subsidizing the college—and graduate—education of a group of people whose earning potential will exceed the earning potential of a lot of the people subsidizing their schooling.

Perhaps the worst thing about the President's new program is that we will be spending all that money and doing nothing—nothing—to solve the real problem, and that is the high cost of a college education.

President Biden's student loan giveaway provides actually zero—exactly

zero—incentive for colleges to contain costs. In fact, there is reason to fear that it could actually encourage colleges to raise their prices or, at least, make them significantly less reluctant to do so.

And, of course, the President's proposal does nothing to discourage students from borrowing substantial amounts of money to finance their education. Indeed, there is a good chance students will increase their borrowing as a result of the President's plan.

The President's ill-conceived student loan giveaway is a tremendous disservice to taxpayers—and a terrible move for our economic health.

As I said, it does nothing to address the real problem, which is the high cost of higher education, which is why last week, I joined Senator CASSIDY to introduce a resolution of disapproval to block the President's plan. And I encourage Members of both parties to support this resolution. Anyone who cares about actually addressing the cost of higher education should oppose a program that not only fails to solve the underlying problems but is actually likely to make things worse.

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.

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. 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.

REMEMBERING JIMMY BUFFETT

Mrs. HYDE-SMITH. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to the remarkable life of a legendary native of Mississippi whose music is synonymous with the spirit of summertime and enjoying life: Jimmy Buffett.

Born in Pascagoula, MS, Jimmy Buffett's journey began in the heart of the South. His music touches the heart of those well beyond Mississippi or the South, but there is no denying Jimmy's music embodies the very essence of the South, with its warm hospitality, vibrant culture, and distinctive charm.

Jimmy's early years were filled with the sights and sounds of Mississippi. The Sun shining over the Gulf of Mexico and many other beautiful experiences of the South would later inspire some of his most beloved songs.

But it was Jimmy's great appetite for adventure that ultimately propelled him to worldwide fame. He embarked on a journey that would take him to the Florida Keys, the Caribbean, and beyond those changes in latitudes. Amid more than 40 musical tours throughout his career, he churned his talents into a diverse business empire and charitable works.

As we reflect on the legacy of this son of a son of a sailor, we cannot help but be inspired by Jimmy Buffett's unyielding commitment to following his dreams and embracing life. His songs transport us to sandy beaches, where the stresses of life fade away. He reminds us that sometimes we all need to kick back, relax, and take a moment to savor the simple pleasures of life. As Jimmy would put it, ''it's 5 o'clock somewhere.''

In honoring Jimmy Buffett, we celebrate the man who, through his music, brought us with him on many of his adventures around the Sun, from the Pascagoula Run to the shores of paradise, and we are all better for it.

I have so much gratitude for the joy, laughter, and the inspiration that Jimmy Buffett brought into so many Americans' lives. His music is a timeless reminder that no matter where we come from, we can all find a bit of paradise within ourselves, and, come Monday, it will be all right.

Jimmy Buffett is a true southern storyteller who was generous enough to share his piece of paradise with the world. I have no doubt his legacy will continue to inspire generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut.

EGYPT

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I want to paint a picture for you just for a moment. It takes place on a tarmac in the Zambian capital of Lusaka, just a few weeks ago, in fact.

A small private jet arrives from Egypt. It lands there, hoping to go unnoticed because of what is on board that jet. But it does get noticed by Zambian authorities. They board the plane, and they find inside a cargo that sounds like something out of a James Bond movie. On board that plane is $5.7 million in U.S. currency, 602 bars of gold, five pistols, and 126 rounds of ammunition.

To make the story even more bizarre, it turns out that the gold was not actually real. It was fake bars of gold. The currency is real, the ammunition is real, but the gold is fake.

Zambia arrests 12 people, 6 of whom are Egyptian citizens. Immediately, as you can imagine, speculation begins about what is exactly going on.

That is an interesting story, right? But the reason I tell you this story isn't because of what happened in Zambia. It is because of what happened next in Cairo. Six of these individuals were Egyptian citizens. The plane came from Egypt. So, of course, journalists in Cairo start to do some digging. A fact-checking platform named Matsadaash—I am probably butchering the pronunciation, but it is Arabic, roughly, for ''don't believe it.'' They report on the alleged involvement of former Egyptian security officials in the incident, but this kind of truth telling is just not allowed in Egypt today.

Egypt is a closed society. It is a dictatorship in which political dissent is crushed. The free press is essentially nonexistent, and as a consequence, top officials are allowed to enrich themselves without any accountability.

So what happened to the journalists at Matsadaash is interesting, but it is, frankly, par for the course in Egypt. Here is what happened. In response for doing this reporting, Egyptian security officials went straight to the home of the journalist. They raided his home. They forced him to log onto his computer as they were there, and they forced him to delete the Facebook posts about the issue at hand.

Egypt just wanted this story to disappear, and they were willing to do whatever it took to make this happen. We may never know the full story of what happened in that airport—what was going on with that plane—but what we do know is that the Egyptian Government's reaction is part of a completely predictable pattern to muzzle and silence the truth tellers by force.

Beyond these attacks on Matsadaash, two other journalists covering the episode were also detained immediately after without charge. One of the last remaining independent media outlets in Cairo, Mada Masr has repeatedly been refused a legal license to operate.

Websites that report on this kind of activity of Egyptian officials are shut down as soon as they appear. Activists are regularly jailed for ''spreading false news'' about human rights violations. Over and over again, the government's playbook is just the same: Shut down voices that are critical of the government and throw in jail people who don't comply.

Around this same time last year, I came down to the Senate floor to make a very similar speech, to talk about an annual decision that the administration has to make with regard to our aid to Egypt.

Now, Congress, in a bipartisan way, cares about this campaign of brutal repression against the press and political dissent in Egypt. That is why our annual appropriations bill limits the amount of money the administration can send to Egypt, depending on the government's human rights record.

Specifically, this year, Congress has said that $320 million of the aid we send, which is roughly about a quarter of the aid, can't go to Egypt unless the administration certifies that Egypt has made real progress on these questions of political climate, $85 million of which is tied to the release of specific political prisoners and the remaining $235 million on broader improvements on questions of human rights and democracy.

Now, I just want to be honest with you. In the past, the Bush administration, the Obama administration, the Trump administration, they just routinely waived these conditions and sent the full amount without any real progress. They said it was about American national security, without any actual evaluation as to what the consequence of withholding the money would be to our national security. But

to the Biden administration's credit, over the past 2 years, they have withheld a portion of Egypt's military aid because of these human rights violations.

And last night, as I was writing this speech, the administration rightly decided to withhold that first tranche—$85 million tied to the release of political prisoners—because there is just no question, there has not been enough progress.

Why do we know that? Because while Egypt released and has released more than 1,600 political prisoners since early 2022—that is good news—during that same time, they have jailed 5,000 more.

So for every political prisoner Egypt releases, three more are jailed. That is one step forward and three steps back. That is not the kind of ''clear and consistent progress in releasing political prisoners'' that the law requires. The administration was right to withhold the $85 million.

But what about the remaining $235 million? I would argue that the answer is just as simple. The Biden administration needs to hold the line. As evidenced by the response to the fake gold-filled plane, political repression is getting worse, not better, in Egypt.

Now, every year there are some people who argue that even though Egypt really hasn't made any progress on human rights, they should get the money anyway, in the name of national security; that if we dare to withhold even a small portion of that money, Egypt is going to stop cooperating with us and they are going to run to Russia or China instead.

But as we have seen in the last 2 years when the administration did withhold a portion of the $1.3 billion, the sky did not fall. Yes, I will admit to you our diplomats in Cairo probably had some very tough conversations, and the Egyptians certainly have made life a little bit more difficult for our diplomats around the edges, but the core security relationship remains intact. Why is that?

It is because the things that we want Egypt to do that are good for our national security—like working to keep the situation in Gaza as stable as possible through its relationship with Hamas, ensuring the free flow of commerce and U.S. warships through the Suez Canal, keeping counterterrorism operations going in the Sinai—President Sisi does all those things because it is in Egypt's independent national security interest to do so, not because we pay them to do it.

Maybe when we started giving them a billion dollars in aid back in the 1980s, Egypt, in fact, complied with our national security requests because of that monetary relationship, but today Egypt engages in those activities because they have an independent reason to do so.

In fact, it is telling that even though the Egyptians continue to receive a billion dollars per year in military aid, even with that money, they are reportedly, and have been reportedly, seeking to do deals with the Russians and the Chinese.

Earlier this year, reporting on leaked documents revealed that Egypt had made a secret deal to provide Russia, in the middle of the Ukraine war, with 40,000 rockets. Now, only after a flurry of high-level diplomatic interventions did the Egyptians change course.

And despite a reported request in March of this year from Secretary Austin for Egypt to help Ukraine, the Egyptians have not yet done so. And so the question is, Is this the behavior of a country that we call a key security partner?

And let me be clear, this decision that the administration is going to make, it matters far beyond Egypt. If we say human rights and democracy matters to America, then it has to matter in more than words. When we cut corners and we fail to hold our partners accountable for human rights abuses, people notice.

Now, I am not naive. I know that the question of whether we withhold a couple hundred million dollars in security assistance from President Sisi is not going to convince him to end his brutal campaign of political repression. But when we walk the walk, not just talk the talk, on human rights, another audience hears us: activists, the people who are doing this work on the streets in places like Cairo. Those who are fighting for democracy and human rights in countries with little of either, they gather courage from knowing that the United States is on their side. And it is those forces, those organic, domestic forces, that truly make change. But when we keep on doing business as usual with Saudi Arabia or Tunisia or Egypt, despite their behavior, we send a signal to democracy activists that we aren't serious, that we don't have their back.

And so I am glad for the administration's decision last night to withhold a part of the funding that Congress has required to be withheld unless we see significant progress on human rights. And my belief is that there is only one decision to be made on the remaining dollars because the record is clear, Egypt continues to help us on national security priorities where our interests align, and there is good reason to continue a security relationship with Cairo to preserve those interests.

In other areas like the war in Ukraine, Egypt has not been a helpful partner, and we need to be clear-eyed about our security relationship with Egypt and also about Egypt's human rights record.

The decision the administration will make this week about holding the Egyptians accountable for progress on human rights, it is critical to American credibility. And for that reason, I would urge the administration to finish the job and withhold the full $320 million as required by the fiscal year 2022 appropriations act until Egypt's human rights and democracy record improves.

I yield the floor.

VOTE ON BRADSHER NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Bradsher nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays are requested.

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 Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 224 Ex.]

YEAS—50

Baldwin	Heinrich	Rounds
Bennet	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schatz
Booker	Kaine	Schumer
Brown	Kelly	Shaheen
Cantwell	King	Sinema
Cardin	Klobuchar	Smith
Carper	Luján	Stabenow
Casey	Manchin	Tester
Cassidy	Menendez	Van Hollen
Coons	Merkley	Warner
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Warnock
Durbin	Murray	Warren
Feinstein	Ossoff	Welch
Fetterman	Peters	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Reed	Wyden
Hassan	Rosen	

NAYS—46

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

NOT VOTING—4

Cruz	Markey
Duckworth	Padilla

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

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 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. 124, Jeffrey Irvine Cummings, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

Charles E. Schumer, Richard J. Durbin, Brian Schatz, John W. Hickenlooper, Margaret Wood Hassan, Gary C. Peters, Mark Kelly, Jack Reed, Tammy Duckworth, Christopher Murphy, Sheldon Whitehouse, Catherine Cortez Masto, Mazie K. Hirono, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jeanne Shaheen, Tammy Baldwin, Angus S. King, Jr., Alex Padilla, Robert Menendez, Michael F. Bennet.

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 Jeffrey Irvine Cummings, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois, 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 Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 44, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 225 Ex.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—44

Barrasso	Grassley	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tuberville
Crapo	McConnell	Vance
Daines	Moran	Wicker
Ernst	Mullin	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NOT VOTING—5

Cruz	Markey	Tillis
Duckworth	Padilla	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUJÁN). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 44.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Jeffrey Irvine Cummings, of Illinois, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Illinois.

NOMINATION OF JEFFREY IRVINE CUMMINGS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, today, the Senate will vote to confirm Judge Jeffrey Cummings to the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

Judge Cummings received his bachelor's degree from Michigan State University and his J.D. from the Northwestern University School of Law. Following law school, he clerked for Judge Ann Claire Williams on the Northern District of Illinois.

Judge Cummings then entered private practice in Chicago, where he developed expertise in various civil rights issues, including employment discrimination, voting rights, and housing discrimination.

He has spent nearly his entire practice litigating in Federal courts and has tried eight cases to verdict. Notably, he worked on the largest ever hospice-related recovery for the United States in the history of the False Claims Act.

While in private practice, Judge Cummings also served as an administrative hearing officer for the city of Chicago Commission on Human Relations and as a hearing officer for the city of Chicago Police Board, where he was responsible for conducting contested disciplinary hearings in cases involving allegations of misconduct against Chicago police officers.

In 2019, Judge Cummings was selected by the district judges of the Northern District to serve as a magistrate judge. Since joining the bench, he has handled both civil and criminal matters and has presided over three jury trials.

The American Bar Association unanimously rated Judge Cummings ''well qualified,'' and he has the strong support of Senator DUCKWORTH and myself. Given his vast litigation background and experience on the bench, he will be a tremendous addition to the court. I am honored to vote for his confirmation, and I urge my colleagues join me.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 1:16 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUJÁN).

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR—Continued

VOTE ON CUMMINGS NOMINATION

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

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, 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 senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ).

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 226 Ex.]

YEAS—50

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

NAYS—45

Barrasso	Grassley	Ricketts
Blackburn	Hagerty	Risch
Boozman	Hawley	Romney
Braun	Hoeven	Rounds
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Budd	Johnson	Schmitt
Capito	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Cassidy	Lankford	Scott (SC)
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cotton	Lummis	Thune
Cramer	Marshall	Tillis
Crapo	McConnell	Tuberville
Daines	Moran	Vance
Ernst	Mullin	Wicker
Fischer	Paul	Young

NOT VOTING—5

Cruz	Markey	Sanders
Duckworth	Padilla	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELCH). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The Senator from Maine.

APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be 2 minutes equally divided prior to the next rollcall vote.

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

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this motion is the first procedural vote to consider an appropriations package containing the fiscal year 2024 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, Agriculture, and Transportation and Housing appropriations bills.

In order for us to consider amendments to these bills, we have to get on the bills; and that is what this vote is all about. These bills were reported unanimously, all three of them, by the Senate Appropriations Committee, and I urge my colleagues to vote yes on proceeding to the bills and then we can have a robust amendment process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. I echo the words of Vice Chair COLLINS and thank her for her tremendous work on this.

A lot of work has gone into these bills. All three of them were reported unanimously out of our committee after a tremendous amount of work. To finish that work and to allow all the Senate to speak, we need to vote yes to get on this bill.

I urge a ''yes'' vote.

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 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 motion to proceed to Calendar No. 198, H.R. 4366, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

Charles E. Schumer, Patty Murray, Jack Reed, Alex Padilla, Richard J. Durbin, Chris Van Hollen, Martin Heinrich, Debbie Stabenow, Richard Blumenthal, Christopher Murphy, Brian Schatz, Tina Smith, Margaret Wood Hassan, Christopher A. Coons, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tammy Duckworth, Benjamin L. Cardin.

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 motion to proceed to H.R. 4366, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, 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 Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 85, nays 12, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 227 Ex.]

YEAS—85

Baldwin	Grassley	Reed
Barrasso	Hagerty	Risch
Bennet	Hassan	Romney
Blackburn	Heinrich	Rosen
Blumenthal	Hickenlooper	Rounds
Booker	Hirono	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sanders
Britt	Hyde-Smith	Schatz
Brown	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Shaheen
Capito	Kelly	Sinema
Cardin	Kennedy	Smith
Carper	King	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Cassidy	Lankford	Tester
Collins	Lee	Thune
Coons	Luján	Tillis
Cornyn	Manchin	Van Hollen
Cortez Masto	McConnell	Vance
Cotton	Menendez	Warner
Cramer	Merkley	Warnock
Crapo	Moran	Warren
Daines	Mullin	Welch
Durbin	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Feinstein	Murphy	Wicker
Fetterman	Murray	Wyden
Fischer	Ossoff	Young
Gillibrand	Paul	
Graham	Peters	

NAYS—12

Braun	Hawley	Schmitt
Budd	Lummis	Scott (FL)
Cruz	Marshall	Scott (SC)
Ernst	Ricketts	Tuberville

NOT VOTING—3

Duckworth	Markey	Padilla

(Ms. KLOBUCHAR assumed the Chair.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WELCH). On this vote, the yeas are 85, the nays are 12.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn having voted in the affirmative, the motion is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Cloture having been invoked, the Senate will resume legislative session.

The clerk will the report the motion to proceed.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 198, H.R. 4366, a bill making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, at the start of the year, when Vice Chair COLLINS and I took over as leaders of the Senate Appropriations Committee, we announced something ambitious: We were going to return the committee to regular order.

The first thing everyone told us was: That is great. We all want to return to regular order. We all want to show the American people that Congress can actually function; that we can work together and solve problems and pass bills to make their lives better.

But the second thing they told us was essentially: Good luck. You are going to need it.

Well, Vice Chair COLLINS and I went to work. We said: Look, if this is going to happen, we have to show we are serious about writing these bills that can actually be signed into law. That meant a few things.

First of all, it meant we had to work with the funding levels in the debt ceiling deal struck by President Biden and Speaker MCCARTHY, a deal that I had—and I still have—concerns about and which required tough funding decisions across each of our 12 bills. But the President and Speaker shook hands, and that is the agreement that Congress passed into law. We can't produce serious bills if we start by throwing that framework out the window.

Secondly, it meant we had to work together to find common ground, including on tough and thorny issues, and compromise where necessary to produce spending bills that could make it through both Chambers and to the President's desk. That meant avoiding poison pills that could sink these bills.

And, third, we wanted to make sure that we had an open, bipartisan process. We wanted to give each and every one of our colleagues the chance to weigh in on these bills and the American public the chance to see our work on them. So we held over 40 hearings this spring to assess our Nation's needs for the year ahead. We sought input from all of our colleagues. We wrote these bills together, and then we held markups for the first time in 2 years. We televised the markups—the first time ever—so people could follow this debate from home. And at those markups, we discussed the draft legislation, considered amendments, and voted on our bills.

The result: For the first time in 5 years, we passed all 12 of our funding bills out of our committee, and we did it with overwhelming bipartisan support. Nine of the twelve bills passed unanimously or had just a single ''no'' vote. In total, 97 percent of the votes on our bills in committee were ''yes'' votes.

These are not the bills I would have written on my own. They are not what Vice Chair COLLINS would have written on her own. They are the bills we wrote together, along with our colleagues on the committee and with input from nearly every Senator on both sides of the aisle.

They are serious bills that can be signed into law, which is how this process should work. We should come together, look for common ground, and build on it to write bills that solve problems and make people's lives better and give our Nation and communities the resources they need to stay safe and competitive, to grow and thrive. That is exactly what the three bills in this package do.

As chair of the Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies, I am

pleased to say I was able to work with Senator BOOZMAN to put together a bill that gets our military and our veterans the support we owe them, the support that they need.

This is essential to keeping our Nation safe because our ships and submarines and aircraft are only as good as the infrastructure they rely on and the troops who operate them. So this bill provides DOD with $19.1 billion for military construction. That is an increase over fiscal year 2023 levels.

This funding will help with construction needs across our country at base installations for projects like childcare development centers to make sure our servicemembers and their spouses can go to work knowing that their children are safe and housing like the barracks project at Joint Base Lewis-McChord in my home State and other facilities across the country to support our troops.

It will help make sure that our shipyards, like the naval base in Kitsap and the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, are up-to-date and up to the challenges of this moment.

These investments will build our presence around the world, especially in the Indo-Pacific regions, and strengthen our military infrastructure to keep it resilient in the face of threats like severe weather and earthquakes.

And I am really glad we included funds to address harmful PFAS chemicals and other toxins at former installations that could put our communities in harm's way.

I am also very proud of the work we have done in this bill to support veterans and their families. As the daughter of a World War II veteran, I take the promises we made to those who fought for our country very seriously, and this bill ensures that we keep those promises by fully funding VA's budget request. We are talking about increased funding for mental health, suicide prevention programs, the caregivers program, expanding the childcare pilot program—that continues to be a huge priority for me across all of our appropriations bills—funding for homelessness prevention programs for our veterans, rural health programs, and, of course, women veterans' healthcare.

By the way, women are the fastest growing demographic of veterans overall. Our MILCON–VA funding bill also increases VA infrastructure funding so we can begin to address the challenges related to VA's aging medical facilities, and it reflects the much-needed pause and reset happening with the electronic health record modernization program.

I was raising the alarm from day one about how the unacceptable botched rollout of that program hurt veterans in my home State, and I am watching closely to make sure we see changes that provide real results for our veterans and our VA providers because, at the end of the day, these investments are not just about programs and contracts. This is about our promise to get veterans the benefits they earned and need to stay healthy, like prescriptions, mental health care, cancer screenings, and more.

So the stakes could not be higher for those families, and we owe them that much, which is why I am proud this bill sends a clear, bipartisan message: We are not going to shortchange our veterans and servicemembers, and we will live up to our obligation to provide them with the resources that they need.

The next bill in this package—from the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies—makes sure we are living up to another crucial obligation, and that is to keep our food supply safe and secure, and support rural communities across our country, because, at the most basic level, we can't have strong communities if people can't put food on the table. That means making sure that the food that is sold in our country is safe. It means protecting families from shortages—so avoiding and mitigating supply chain disruptions, addressing climate crises, like droughts, which can threaten crops we all rely on. It means addressing food insecurity so people can afford—and access—the food they need to keep their families healthy and fed. And it means supporting our Nation's farmers, who are such a huge part of our economy. For example, every day in my home State of Washington, we ship apples, cherries, wheat, potatoes, pulse crops, and so many other commodities across the country and across the world.

So I want to thank Senator HEINRICH and Senator HOEVEN for their very hard work to help put together a bipartisan bill that delivers on those crucial issues. This bill will make sure the FDA has the resources it needs to keep grocery stores and dinner tables safe and to implement the bipartisan cosmetics legislation that we negotiated last year and that many of us worked on very hard to pass.

It also includes crucial funding to support our farmers, for example, increased investments in agricultural research. Just last month, I was home and visited my alma mater, Washington State University, which is home to world class agricultural research programs. This funding will help universities like WSU to tackle problems that our farmers are facing, like, in my State, smoke exposure to wine grapes, herbicide resistance, and little cherry disease; not to mention efforts that we need to make to address water shortages, improve our yields, use inputs, and more.

The bill also funds absolutely critical nutrition programs like WIC, which is a lifeline that keeps so many families from going under. This bill fully funds WIC at the level included in the President's budget request, and we know that participation and costs for the program are changing. So as we work to get final appropriations bills signed into law, I will keep working around the clock to make sure that no one loses their WIC benefits and no one is forced to be on a wait list. We have got to maintain the strong bipartisan support for that program going forward and continue to fully fund it, and that is a top priority for me.

My family had to rely on food stamps for a short time, and thanks to that help that we got when I was young, every one of my six brothers and sisters and I have been able to now grow up and give back to our communities because our country had our back when we needed it.

So make no mistake, our investments in WIC are not just the right thing, the moral thing; it is an investment in the future of America.

So if I haven't painted a picture yet, investments like this, which maintain our nutrition programs, support our farmers, and keep our food supplies safe and secure are truly mission critical to our Nation's future, but they are also bipartisan. There are things that we can all agree on that are important for America.

Finally, this package includes the funding bill from the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee. I previously led this subcommittee alongside Vice Chair COLLINS, as the chair and ranking member, and, I can tell you, investments here are critical to help prevent people from living on the streets or being out in the cold and to get people and goods where they need to go in a safe and timely way.

Washington State, like so many other States in our country, has really been grappling with our Nation's housing and homelessness crisis for years. So I am glad that we are able to maintain and build on some key investments in this bill that provide rental assistance to families in need, increase our housing supply, support maintenance for distressed properties, and connect people with healthcare, education, unemployment programs, and other support services.

And I hope we can come together in a bipartisan way to do more to tackle those challenges in a serious way in the future, because while this bill does take important steps and includes necessary investments, our housing and homelessness crisis is going to take a lot more than flat funding in most areas and modest funding increases in some programs, which is what was possible to negotiate under the tough budget caps in this debt ceiling deal.

When it comes to our Nation's transportation infrastructure, the investments in this bill are especially important in light of some of the derailments and disasters and disturbing close calls we saw this year. I am very pleased that we were able to increase funding for the Federal Aviation Administration so it can address the shortage of air traffic controllers, reduce flight

delays, increase efficiency, modernize technology, and critically improve safety, which is so important given the concerning number of near misses we have seen recently.

This bill also increases the Federal Railroad Administration's funding for its safety work to make sure we have enough inspectors to keep our rails safe and that we can research important questions to improve rail safety and efficiency.

So I really want to thank Senator SCHATZ and Senator HYDE-SMITH for their excellent work putting that bill together.

Each and every one of the appropriations bills in the package before us today is the result of an open, bipartisan process that invited input from every single Senator. In fact, that is true for all 12 of the bills our committee passed—all in overwhelming, bipartisan votes.

And, as my colleagues know, the Senate Appropriations Committee has plenty of Members on opposite ends of the political spectrum—strongly progressive Democrats and deeply conservative Republicans. In other words, getting here took a lot of hard work, late nights, and early mornings. And we had to really set politics aside, listen to each other, focus on the problems, and find common ground.

I think I speak for everyone when I say this work has not been easy. And, of course, I know as well as anyone that our work is not done. I think we all understand a CR will be necessary to see this process through. And we all understand supplemental funding is absolutely essential to respond to some of the urgent challenges our States are facing, like delivering disaster relief that communities desperately need today, paying our wildland firefighters, continuing to have our Ukrainian allies' back, and addressing the fentanyl crisis, not to mention the need, as I have spoken, of addressing the childcare funding cliff that threatens to put childcare further out of reach for too many families.

And, of course, even after we pass this funding package before us today, we need to get all the rest of our appropriations bills across the finish line. But by passing this package and the rest of our appropriations bills, we are showing the American people that there is a clear, bipartisan path for us to do our jobs and fund the government.

There is absolutely no reason for chaos or a shutdown, and I will continue working nonstop with my colleagues to make sure we get that job done. This was never going to be easy, but none of us came here because we thought it was easy. We came here because we wanted to make life better for folks back home, helping people and solving problems. I have said that a lot during my time here in the Senate, and I have brokered a lot of bipartisan deals, always in service to the people I represent back home, the friends and neighbors that I grew up with. Helping people and solving problems, that is our job, and I would like to see us do more of that together—Democrats and Republicans.

So I urge all of our colleagues: Let's keep this momentum going. Let's show the American people that Congress can work for them. There doesn't have to be a calamity over funding the government. Let's show that there can and will be major policy disagreements on any number of issues, but their elected leaders can come together on what we agree on, and we will fund the government responsibly so they don't have to worry about chaos or shutdowns.

And on that note, I would like to encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come to the floor and talk about these bills—what they mean for your State, what they mean for your constituents, what your priorities are here—and to talk to me and to talk to Senator COLLINS if you have amendments and ideas for how we can make these bills better, because Senator COLLINS and I are working now to clear a managers' package and set up votes. Our staffs are still working too, and we are happy to work with your team so we can pass the strongest bills possible.

We have been working closely from day one to run an open, bipartisan process and to get input from all of our colleagues and to make sure everyone can make their constituents' voices heard.

One issue Vice Chair COLLINS and I heard about from many of our colleagues is the need to support communities rebuilding after recent disasters. I will have more to say on that in the days ahead, but it is front of mind for both of us and the Appropriations Committee as a whole to take care of our communities that are working so hard to rebuild after the recent horrible disasters, which include, as we know, the wildfires in Hawaii and in areas in Washington State, flooding in Vermont and California, as well as the damage caused by Hurricane Idalia.

So, as we get started on this bill, I say to all of my colleagues: Come to the floor. Talk to us. Work with us so we can get this funding package passed, help people, and solve problems.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am very pleased to join Chair MURRAY as we begin debate on the first of what I hope will be a series of fiscal year 2024 appropriations packages considered on the Senate floor in the coming weeks. And I want to commend Chair MURRAY for her leadership, for her bipartisanship, for her relentlessness in getting us to where we are today. It did take a lot of work, and it has been a pleasure to be her partner.

When Chair MURRAY and I took the helm of the Appropriations Committee at the beginning of this year, we set forth the goal of returning regular order to the appropriations process. Now, Chair MURRAY and I have served in the Senate long enough that we remember what regular order means. It means going through the committee process, reporting bills out after hearings and a markup, and bringing them to the Senate floor. But many of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have never experienced regular order. That is how long it has been since we have done the process the right way.

The system just works better when we adhere to regular order, with committee members having the opportunity to shape legislation, and the Senate as a whole having the chance to work its will.

Regular order is not easy. In fact, it is a lot of work. Our committee members spent much of the winter and spring in hearing rooms, holding nearly 50 subcommittee hearings and briefings on the President's fiscal year 2024 budget requests. We scrutinized the funding levels, evaluated the programs, and asked the tough questions.

In June and July, our members were hard at work at developing, drafting, and advancing the fiscal year 2024 funding bills. For the first time ever, our committee markups were televised so that our deliberations and our votes on amendments and on passage of each bill were fully transparent. The result, as Senator MURRAY has said, for the first time in 5 years, the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported each and every one of the 12 appropriations bills. All of them passed with strong bipartisan support. Seven of them were approved unanimously.

Today, we take the next important step in restoring deliberation to the appropriations process as we bring the first package of funding bills to the Senate floor. I know that both Chair MURRAY and I are committed to doing our part to ensure a constructive floor debate with a robust amendment process. This will require the cooperation of all Members, and I hope we will be able to work together toward that goal. It is critical that we succeed in this effort so that we do not once again find ourselves in December faced with the unpalatable choice among a 4,000-plus-page omnibus bill, a yearlong continuing resolution, or, worst of all, a government shutdown.

The Republican leader spoke this morning about the importance of the package of bills before us. He noted that this legislation ''is designed to address a trio of important commitments—to America's farmers, to our veterans, and to investing in transportation infrastructure.'' He went on to note that ''seven percent of American adults are veterans of our Armed Forces.'' I am pleased to say that in Maine, that percentage is even higher. We rank among the top in the country in the number of veterans on a per capita basis who have answered the call to serve. The leader also noted that ''ten percent of American jobs are supported

by agriculture. And our entire economy hinges on safe and efficient railroads, airports, roads, and bridges.'' The leader's remarks succinctly sum up the importance of these bills.

Our package includes the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs bill, led by Senators MURRAY and BOOZMAN. It was approved by the committee on June 22, so Members have had a great deal of time to scrutinize and read the language of that bill. This wasn't something assembled hastily, behind closed doors, at the last minute. To the contrary, it was subject to in-depth hearings, negotiations, and transparent markups.

We are also going to include, I hope, the Agriculture, Rural Development, and Food and Drug Administration bill written by Senators HEINRICH and HOEVEN, which was also approved on June 22. It is a very important bill to the State of Maine, where potatoes are our No. 1 crop.

I grew up in Northern Maine, where potatoes are grown, and I helped to pick potatoes when I was age 10. The schools would recess so that the schoolchildren could help the farmers get in the crop before the heavy freeze made that impossible.

Of course, Maine is also known for its wonderful wild blueberries and many other crops.

We are also going to look at and include the Transportation and Housing bill drafted by Senators SCHATZ and HYDE-SMITH, which was approved on July 20.

Each of these bills—each one of them—was reported unanimously. That hardly ever happens around here. It is a tribute to the chairmen and chairwomen of those subcommittees and the ranking members and how hard they worked to put together a bill that reflected not only the views of their subcommittees and the full committees and input from Chair MURRAY and me but from so many other Senators who wrote to us with their priorities.

The first bill, the MILCON-VA appropriations bill, invests in critical Department of Defense infrastructure. It provides funding to support the European and Pacific Deterrence Initiatives, unfunded construction priorities of the Active Guard and Reserve Forces, and improved housing for our servicemembers and their families, which is so important at a time when we are experiencing recruitment problems.

I am particularly pleased that this bill fully funds the Shipyard Infrastructure Optimization Program, including the President's request for $545 million for Drydock No. 1 at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard located in Kittery, ME—an essential national security asset for our submarine fleet.

This bill also keeps our commitment to our veterans by funding VA medical care and veterans' benefits, including disability compensation programs, education benefits and vocational rehabilitation, and employment training.

Like Senator MURRAY, I, too, am the daughter of a World War II veteran, and thus, our commitment to our veterans is very personal to me. My father was a combat veteran in World War II who fought in the Battle of the Bulge. He was wounded twice and earned two Purple Hearts and a Bronze Star. It was he who taught me to honor our veterans.

I will never forget as a child his taking me to the Memorial Day parade every year in our hometown of Caribou, ME. He would hoist me high on his shoulders so that I could see the veterans march by and salute our flag.

I will never forget those lessons, and they are the reason I care so deeply about the service of our veterans.

I want to commend Chair MURRAY and Ranking Member BOOZMAN for their great work on this bill, and I know they will describe its provisions in more detail. In fact, Senator MURRAY, Chair MURRAY, already has.

The second bill in the package is the Agriculture appropriations bill, which funds programs that support our farmers, ranchers, and rural communities. Both the Presiding Officer and I, I think, represent two of the most rural States in America. It also protects our Nation's food and drug supply and ensures that low-income families have access to critical Federal nutrition programs.

I am particularly pleased that despite this tight budget environment, this bill provides increased funding for agriculture research to support food security and sustainability and for FDA initiatives focused on drug and device shortages, food safety, and critical research focused on neuroscience and ALS. I commend Chairman HEINRICH and Ranking Member HOEVEN for putting together such a strong bill.

Finally, the third bill in the package provides essential funding for the Departments of Transportation and Housing and Urban Development and related Agencies.

Both Chair MURRAY and I have a soft spot in our hearts for this bill because each of us spent many years as either the chair or the ranking member of the THUD Subcommittee.

It supports the RAISE grant transportation program and the Bridge Formula Program that help address our Nation's deteriorating infrastructure.

It invests in the FAA, supporting the addition of 1,800 air traffic controllers. We have a huge shortage in Bangor, ME. I heard from the air traffic controllers about how terribly understaffed they are. And the bill would modernize outdated systems, such as the Notice to Air Missions System that went offline earlier this year, shutting down the Nation's airspace for several hours.

I am especially pleased that this bill contains support for shoreside infrastructure improvements at our Nation's State maritime academies—including Maine Maritime Academy—that are necessary for docking the newly constructed national security multimission vessels that are also the training ships for the maritime academies.

At a time when virtually every State faces an affordable housing shortage, this bill also maintains existing rental assistance for more than 4.6 million households and continues to make meaningful investments aimed at tackling the persistent and growing problem of homelessness, especially among our Nation's veterans and youth. I thank Chair SCHATZ and Ranking Member HYDE-SMITH for their tremendous efforts on this bill.

I also want to mention that both Senators from Hawaii—and Senator SCHATZ again today—have talked to all of us about the tragic loss of life, the devastation that the recent wildfires have caused in their beloved home State. I note that the Presiding Officer, representing the State of Vermont, also has had a need for disaster assistance, as have the State of Maine and so many other States. We need to support the people of States that have been hit by these devastating disasters in their time of need.

Let me conclude my opening remarks by expressing my heartfelt gratitude to all of our committee members—particularly our subcommittee chairs and ranking members—for their extraordinary work in getting us to this point. Again, I especially want to commend Chair MURRAY for her leadership and commitment.

I look forward to a productive floor debate as we move forward, and I ask my colleagues for their support. The choice before the Senate is clear: Do we want to pass, with amendments, carefully considered funding bills or do we want to default to either an omnibus bill many thousands of pages long and with very little transparency or, worse, a yearlong resolution that funds programs that are no longer needed, prevents new programs from starting up, wastes taxpayer dollars, and is subject to indiscriminate cuts due to the provisions of the Fiscal Responsibility Act? The choice is very clear. The Senate should proceed to debate, consider amendments, and pass the appropriations bills.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois, the Democratic whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this is indeed a historic moment in the U.S. Senate.

As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee for more than two decades, I can remember a time when, in fact, 12 different appropriations bills came to the floor of the Senate for consideration. It has been at least 5 years—maybe longer—since we have done that. Instead, we bundled all of the appropriations in one big omnibus bill and handed it over to leadership to decide. We waited for that desperate vote where they said: You have to vote for this; it is take it or leave it.

Well, we are back in the stage of due deliberation on appropriations, and I want to commend those who have brought us to this moment.

If you asked me at the beginning of this session to pick two Senators—one a Democrat and one a Republican—who could achieve this goal, I would have chosen the two who are here on the floor today, Senator PATTY MURRAY and Senator SUSAN COLLINS. They are extraordinary legislators, some of the hardest working people in the U.S. Senate, and they truly have dedication to a national purpose beyond anything that partisan politics might generate.

I have seen them at work for years and worked with them together. I can't think of a better team, and I am more than happy to work with them to achieve their goal for 12 appropriation bills considered and passed on the floor of the Senate. It will be historic, and it will serve the American people better than most of them could imagine today because it will mean we will take the time to do each of these bills in a thoughtful, careful way. So let me start by commending them for being here today and for the work that has brought us to this moment.

UNITED AUTO WORKERS NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. President, on July 12, the United Auto Workers and the Big Three automakers—General Motors, Ford and Stellantis—began contract negotiations to determine their next 4-year labor deal. Since it was founded nearly 90 years ago, the United Auto Workers have fought for and won victories that have helped strengthen America's working families. The UAW has won better pay for its members, safer working conditions, employer-funded pensions, health insurance, education benefits, and much more. UAW helped to allow autoworkers and their families to buy homes, take vacations, send their children to college, and retire with dignity. Autoworkers work hard; they deserve their opportunity to enjoy the American dream.

But the legacy that I have just described is in danger. Over the last 20 years, autoworkers have faced dozens of plant closures, lost jobs, wage cuts, and contract concessions. In 2009, the UAW made major concessions in its contracts to help these same automakers receive government assistance. This included job security provisions, cost-of-living adjustments, and financing for retiree healthcare. They made sacrifices so that their employer companies survived during that terrible situation in our economy.

How have they done? The automakers have reaped billions of dollars in profit since. But these benefits have not been passed down to the workers, and UAW members have seen their wages and standards of living suffer. Over the past 4 years, the CEOs of the Big Three that I have listed have seen 40-percent wage hikes on average, while autoworkers have seen 6.1 percent.

Decades ago, the ratio between CEO and median worker pay was around 20 to 1, which meant the big shots in the boardrooms were making 20 times what the fellow was making on the assembly line. Today it has changed. No longer 20 to 1; it is 300 to 1. Should CEOs be earning 300 times more than autoworkers? I don't think so.

Stellantis, General Motors, and Ford have reported collective profits of nearly—get ready—$250 billion between 2013 and 2022 and a combined profit of $21 billion alone in the first 6 months of this year—$21 billion.

The salaries of their CEOs—listen to these—$29 million for the CEO of General Motors, $21 million for Ford's CEO, $24 million for Stellantis—further evidence of this notion of corporate royalty. In 2007, the average wage for workers at Chrysler, Ford, and General Motors was $28 an hour—in 2007—while the starting wage was $19.36 an hour. In today's dollars, that is $28.50. Today, the starting wage for autoworkers at the Big Three is $18.04 an hour—more than $10 lower than what starting wages would be if they had kept up with inflation since 2007. Eighteen dollars an hour.

In Springfield, IL, coming back from picking up some hardware at Lowe's, I passed a Taco Bell. The sign out front said starting pay $17 an hour at Taco Bell. Autoworkers—professional men and women who work hard—are being offered $18; Taco Bell, $17.

Meanwhile, these same workers who are making $18 an hour for the automobile manufacturers are asked to work 10- to 12-hour days, 6 to 7 days a week. And 61 GM, Ford, and Stellantis plants have been idle or closed since 2003. Thousands of jobs have been lost. And I can tell that story personally because one of the idled plants was a Belvidere assembly plant in Belvidere, IL, owned by Stellantis. That plant opened 58 years ago. They once had 4,500 union workers. In February, they laid off 1,350 workers who were blindsided at the time by that announcement. This was devastating, not just to the families of the workers but to the community.

I begged Stellantis: Reconsider this decision. And I have spoken to the president of the United Autoworkers who tells me it is one of his highest priorities. Workers are fed up. Earlier this year, autoworkers struggled to breathe in factories across Illinois and other States due to unprecedented wildfire smoke in Canada. Now they are saying, in this negotiation: Enough.

At the same time, Congress and the Biden Administration have made major investments in clean energy—including the production of electric vehicles.

Corporations cannot impose the cost of transitioning to electric vehicles on the shoulders of today's workers. We can and should invest in these vehicles while making sure they continue to be produced with union labor. These corporations that I talked about—the Big Three—have benefited from billions of dollars in profits in recent years. Why haven't the workers benefited as much?

In just two days on September 14, contracts covering 150,000 UAW workers at Ford, General Motors, and Stellantis will expire. At the same time, Stellantis put plants on critical status for 90 days.

What does that mean for the current workers before the contract would be announced? It would mean that they would work 7 days a week, 12-hour shifts. Why are they doing this? They are trying to pile up inventory.

Under critical status, workers can only receive 1 day off every 30 days, unless they use family medical leave. Meanwhile, Stellantis complains that it is behind thousands of units, while it continues to lay off workers. It just doesn't add up.

I urge the Big Three and the UAW to negotiate in good faith, reach an agreement before September 14—just 2 days away—and prevent a strike that will cost billions of dollars and impact 150,000 hard-working autoworkers.

This agreement must be fair to workers, include a restoration of the benefits that autoworkers sacrificed more than a decade ago, to keep these families afloat. And Stellantis must reconsider the closure of Belvidere assembly plant and welcome back the workers it laid off in February.

There is a lot at stake. The automobile industry is a major part of our economy. Autoworkers have done their best; they have sacrificed right and left to make sure that this industry stays as strong as it is—and even stronger—in America. The CEOs need to show a spirit of cooperation and teamwork to make sure that when they reopen this with a new contract, we are going to have many more years of prosperity for American automakers.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. RES. 336

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to Democrats' mandates that forced our young Senate pages to be vaccinated three times. In a free society, no one should be forced to take an injection; no one should be forced to have a surgery; no one should be forced to submit to a medical procedure—particularly a medical procedure that was approved under emergency-use authorization.

Democrats' support for medical choice when it comes to vaccines appears to be inconsistent and selective. But I fear they won't be persuaded by any arguments towards liberty, so I would like to direct the majority of my remarks to the actual science about whether or not adolescents should have to be forced to have three COVID vaccines.

Initially, there were arguments made saying: We must forcibly vaccinate these kids or they will infect the older folks, the antiquarian Senators. But it turns out that argument fails because the science in the end showed that the vaccine didn't prevent transmission of the disease.

In fact, in August 2021, CDC Director Rachel Walensky admitted for COVID–19 that the vaccine does not stop transmission:

> Our vaccines are working exceptionally well . . . But what they can't do anymore is prevent transmission.

So the government, the proponents, those for the mandates argue: Well, we have to do it; it will stop the disease and we won't have any more spread.

Well, it turns out that wasn't true. The vaccine does not stop transmission. With that, it should have been the end of the arguments for mandates, because you are no longer talking about your health versus someone else's health. The only argument that those who are for the mandates argue now and those who argue for taking the vaccine is that it reduces your health risk—the individual who chooses to get vaccinated. However, when you look at the data, that appears only to be true for targeted populations.

If you are at risk for being hospitalized or dying from COVID, over age 75, immunocompromised, have other health concerns, there is some argument for a vaccine. But for a young, healthy person, there is no logical argument. If you look and ask yourself will taking a booster reduce transmission, the argument is no. Whether you are at risk or not, it does not reduce transmission.

If you are at risk for hospitalization or death, it may well reduce that. But the young pages we are talking about are not at risk for that. In fact, when we look at it, throughout Europe, there was a study of 23 million folks—young folks—and they found the death rate was zero. Israel looked at this: Death rate zero for young, healthy people. Germany looked at this, ages 5 to 17: Death rate for young, healthy people, zero.

And people say, well, what is the big deal? The vaccine is not that big a deal. You know, certainly, it is not going to hurt them. It has to be better than having COVID. Well, it turns out when you weigh the risks versus the benefits for a particular age group, it is actually not true. If you look at the risks of side effects from the vaccine—and the main worrisome side effect that we are concerned with is an inflammation of the heart called myocarditis or pericarditis—a study by Prasad and Knudsen looked at 29 different studies and found that the incidents, averaged out, was a little over 2 per 15,000.

The Vaccine Safety Datalink looked at this again and found also it was about 2, 2.5 out of 15,000. Even the CDC admits that the risk of myocarditis for young people is about 1 in 15,000. Tracey Beth Hoeg looked at a retrospective study of those who have been injured by vaccines and found the incidence of adverse cardiac events was about 1.62 per 10,000. So it's not like every kid is going to get myocarditis, but you have to weigh the incidence of 1 or 2 or 3 out of 15,000 getting a serious disease that could affect their health or even debilitate them.

The risks and benefits are different for every individual. That is why in a free society, the individual or the individual and their parents make this decision with their doctor; sometimes they get more than one opinion. But we don't mandate—in a free society, we don't just tell them: Do what you are told or else. But that is what is happening.

It is not just happening here in the Senate—although, the Senate is setting a terrible example for the country. Many universities are still doing this. It is actually medical malpractice to require these vaccines for kids. It turns out when you look at the incidence of myocarditis, over 90 percent of the heart inflammation that occurs in young people occurs after the second dose.

You can get rid of 90 percent of—admittedly, not a real common problem—but you can get rid of 90 percent of the risk of this vaccine by not requiring more than one. But we are not talking about just the second dose, where 90 percent of the inflammation comes from the second dose. We are talking about Senate Democrats—because Republicans would like to get rid of this—Senate Democrats are requiring three vaccines. There is absolutely no scientific evidence. In fact, when this went to the committee studying this, the first committee that looked at this was the FDA Vaccine and Related Biological Products Advisory Committee, and Dr. Paul Offit sits on this committee.

They voted not to advise giving the booster to anyone unless they are over 65. They said: Let's look at the risks and the benefits. The disease COVID appears to be affecting the older generation. They are more at risk. We can put up with some risk for the vaccine; but for the kids, it is not worth it. The committee voted.

So then it went from the FDA's committee to the CDC's vaccine committee. Guess what? They voted against recommending the booster also. They said, reserve the booster for those who are at risk, for at-risk populations.

So how did we get a booster mandate? How did we get a booster advice from the CDC saying everybody from the age of 2 months should get a booster? How did we get it? The CDC political appointee of the Biden administration overrode the FDA vaccine committee and overrode the CDC committee.

Dr. Paul Offit was and still is on the Vaccine Related Biological Products Advisory Committee, and he voted to reserve the booster for those at risk. He is the director of Vaccine Education Center and professor of pediatrics in the Division of Infectious Diseases at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.

He is not someone who is opposed to vaccines. He spent his whole life advocating for vaccines. He is on a committee that has approved the COVID vaccine. He just simply said the vaccines should be targeted, and it should be extended and advised—not even mandated but advised—for people over 65 but not for kids. His committee voted no. The FDA committee on vaccines voted no; don't give the vaccine to kids.

The CDC committee on vaccines voted no; don't give it to kids.

What do Senate Democrats want? Put their heads in the sand and make a political decision because they love central authority to mandate that these kids get three vaccines, even though the science goes against all of it.

Paul Offit, when asked whether or not his son who was 24 would get the vaccine, he said:

> He shouldn't get the vaccine.

So we are stuck with a situation where there is no evidence and no historical precedent for mandating this kind of treatment. There is no historical precedent for mandating that the Senate and Senate Democrats intervene between the doctor of these children and making their own medical decisions. It is taking away the idea that risk and benefit are debated and discussed based on your risks and benefits. So what we find is that advice that actually probably is good, if you are over 65, to consider getting a booster—although it still should be voluntary—we are going against the best advice to actually promote that these kids get a vaccine that may well be harmful to them.

The CDC has admitted it doesn't stop transmission. But then you want to ask yourself, what are other countries—what are they doing around the world? They looked at 23 million people, ages 12 and up, in Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden. What did they find? They found that after two doses of the mRNA COVID vaccine, the risk of myocarditis was higher than compared with those who were not vaccinated. This is exactly why much of Europe is now limiting the vaccine and not giving the vaccine to certain age groups.

What they found in these studies is that adolescent males, particularly between the ages of 12 and 26, are at a heightened risk for this. In fact, Tracy Beth Hoeg, in her study, looked at the possibility of adverse cardiac events versus a possibility that someone their age could go to the hospital over a 120-day period. They found that the possibility of an adverse cardiac effect was about five times greater than any of these kids even going to the hospital.

But what we did find is—and this is why several countries have actually limited this—Germany, France, Finland, Sweden, Denmark, and Norway now restrict the mRNA vaccine and don't advise giving the vaccine to this age group, particularly don't advise giving them three vaccines.

A study in December in the Journal of Medical Ethics found about 14.7

cases of myocarditis—actually, 1.47 cases per 10,000 in ages 18 to 29. They also found that those who had the heart inflammation, 3 months later were still suffering from the inflammation of the heart.

Dr. Offit, who sits on the committee that voted against recommending this for adolescents and for children, wrote in an op-ed that ''[a]healthy young person with two mRNA vaccine doses is extremely unlikely to be hospitalized with covid, so the case for risking any side effects—such as myocarditis—diminishes substantially.'' That is why they did recommend against the third vaccine, which is exactly the opposite of what the Democrats are doing. They do and want to mandate three vaccines on these kids.

As one editorial put it last year, if being boosted becomes a prerequisite for participation in normal life, the vaccine's diminishing efficacy means the boosting campaign will never end.

Dr. Marty Makary, professor of Johns Hopkins School of Medicine, wrote in the Wall Street Journal:

> The U.S. government is pushing Covid-19 vaccine boosters for 16- and 17-year-olds without supporting clinical data. A large Israeli population study, published in the New England Journal of Medicine . . . found that the risk of Covid death in people under 30 with two vaccine shots was zero.

Germany showed zero deaths among healthy kids ages 5 to 17.

There is no scientific rationale for mandating three COVID vaccines for healthy kids. Even World Health Organization Chief Scientist Dr. Soumya Swaminathan said last year that ''there's no evidence'' that suggests healthy children and adolescents need booster shots—no evidence. This is the head of the WHO. These are not opponents of vaccines. These are people saying that there is no evidence and that it might harm these kids to get vaccinated, and yet Democrats will vote today, the lot of them, to say that basically we must force these kids to get three vaccines or they can't be up here.

Now, you might say: Well, gosh, we are just so worried and we don't know everything and so what do we do?

Well, how about all the other people who work up here? At any point in time, the other 10 or 15 people in this room, are they required to get vaccines? No. We are only requiring one group subset to do it. These kids have to get three vaccines. They are the least likely to get sick from COVID. They get COVID, and they don't even know it. The vaccine doesn't stop them from getting COVID. They have naturally acquired immunity as well. If you don't ask yourself what that means, you are not paying attention to any science.

Wouldn't you want to know whether they have had it? Even if you really thought a vaccine mandate was great, what if I have already had COVID? Do I need three more vaccines? Because I have already had COVID, I developed natural immunity.

Dr. Martin Kulldorff of Harvard Medical School says that mandating people who have already had COVID that they still get vaccinated makes zero sense from a scientific point of view, and it makes zero sense from a public health point of view. A study in Lancet supported this view, stating that current evidence does not appear to show a need for boosting in the general population.

That is why the FDA committee and the CDC committee both voted against advising it. It is not only bad advice; it is a horrific mandate. It would be one thing if you want to give advice to tell people that we think it is a good idea, but it is another to tell them they have got no choice. Do you want to participate in the elite program here in the Nation's Senate? You can't come unless you do what Democrats want, submit to three vaccines, even though it may increase your risk of heart inflammation. They don't care. Mandates are fine.

A study at Lancet looked at this and said that it was a bad idea. It says: Currently available evidence does not show the need for widespread use of booster vaccination in populations that have received an effective primary vaccine or who have already been infected with the disease.

When we consider the rules for the pages, we ought to ask: Will these policies be expected to continue indefinitely? The virus mutates about every 3 or 4 months. You have got a brandnew virus. You have got a virus now you didn't have 3 or 4 months ago. The vaccines also lose their potency. Are you going to mandate until the end of time? It is also not the same.

Are you going to stick your head in the sand and say this is 2020? No, the virus in 2020 actually was more lethal.

One of the good things about viral evolution is they typically evolve to become less dangerous and more transmissible. You can catch COVID by looking at somebody wrong, but fortunately it is not as deadly as it once was.

Are there still some people dying from COVID? Yes, people who are at high risk. If you go to a doctor and you have chest pain and you are 12 years old, he doesn't or she doesn't treat you the same way as if you would go in and you are 60 years old.

If you walk into an emergency room and you are 15 years old with chest pain, they usually might think of asthma or other problems but typically not a heart attack. People are treated differently based on their age. Doctors think of what is common in that age group.

If I go in with chest pain, they are going to do heart enzymes. They are going look for a heart attack. That is the first thing they are going to look for. But they don't treat everyone the same.

This is blindly what we are being told by the Democrats; that everybody is the same, submit or else. But it is not just the pages whom they are hurting here. It is not just the pages that they are increasing their risk for this heart inflammation. They are setting an example and other universities are doing it. Still, tens of thousands of young American kids are being forced to take three vaccines.

You say: Well, they are not being forced. They can choose not to go to Yale or Harvard. What if your dream had always been to go to one of these schools? You have to give up your medical freedom and your good judgment just simply so you can do exactly what Democrats tell you to do?

Multiple scientific studies have shown a heightened risk of this heart inflammation or myocarditis for children and teenagers after taking the vaccine. Ninety percent of the myocarditis comes after the second or the third vaccine. If you simply went to one vaccine, you would get rid of 90 percent of the problem. And yet, they are still insisting that we do something that is actually medical malpractice, that these kids be forced to take three.

Multiple countries have begun restricting the vaccine for certain age groups. Germany, France, Denmark, Finland, and Sweden all have restricted Moderna's vaccine for young people. Norway, South America, and the UK all chose to recommend only one dose of Pfizer due to the risk of cardiovascular side effects for boosters in children. And yet what we would get today is not a discussion, not we are open to compromise, no maybe the science has changed and we will reevaluate it; you will get from the Democrats: No, get three boosters or you can't come to the Senate.

Why is the U.S. Senate choosing to ignore the risk other countries have acknowledged when mandating these vaccines for young people who are in peak physical condition? What happened to a belief in medical choice? What happened to a belief in medical freedom?

Public health measures should be backed up with proof that the benefits outweigh the burdens, and if you want to treat everyone the same—you want to say that teenagers are the same as 75-year-olds—that is not good medicine; that is not good science.

There is no evidence that when it comes to vaccination and booster mandates, especially for teenagers who as a group are less vulnerable to the virus than any Senator, that is why I am asking unanimous consent today that we pass my resolution to get rid of this ridiculous and unscientific mandate.

So, therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 336, which is at the desk; further, that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. First of all, I want to assure the pages that we normally don't spend this much time debating you guys.

At the end of the July session, there was a verbal assault on pages who were in the Rotunda, which caused both Senator SCHUMER and Senator MCCONNELL to rise to the pages' defense.

We have now spent an inordinate amount of time this week debating healthcare policies related to the pages.

Second, while Senator PAUL and I often find common cause, I am continually stunned at his unseriousness about the scope of this ongoing tragedy. No matter how many times I hear Senator PAUL rail against vaccines, I am still heartbroken by the fact that so many of my colleagues don't understand the devastation that has been wrought in this country, as 1.1 million Americans—1.1 million Americans—have died from COVID, in large part, because of the ongoing attacks against vaccines that work that has undermined the public's confidence in one of the very best tools that we have to combat the worst of this disease and this virus.

I am looking at a scientific study from earlier this year naming COVID–19 as the eighth leading cause of death for children in this country. It is true, it is rare for a child to die from COVID, but when you have 1.1 million people dying of COVID in this country, of course there is going to be an unacceptable number of children who die from COVID.

COVID–19 deaths displaced influenza and pneumonia, becoming the top cause of death for children caused by any infectious or respiratory disease. It caused substantially more deaths for children than any vaccine-preventable disease, historically, this study showed.

And so, yes, our pages are working for us. We are responsible for them while they are here. And, yes, children are not immune from COVID. And, lastly, the only mandate that we are talking about as we consider Senator PAUL's resolution is the mandate in his resolution. Right now, there is no statutory or rules-based vaccine mandate. The Senate has been silent on this question.

So it is up to the public servants who run the Senate and the medical advice they rely on as to whether or not pages should be required to get vaccinated.

There is no mandate.

Senator PAUL's resolution is a mandate. Senator PAUL says under no circumstances can pages be required to be vaccinated, even if the virus mutates, even if a new vaccine comes along that is even more efficacious—under no circumstances can there be a requirement for a vaccine. Under current policy, under current statute, under the current rules of the Senate, it is up to the Senate leadership. It is up to the medical advice that they rely on, and they could change that advice as time goes on. Under Senator PAUL's mandate, they could only make one choice.

COVID cases are rising. People are at risk again, and this constant campaign to use every mechanism possible to try to undermine people's faith in medicine and science and vaccines is not just about the pages who serve here; it is about the entire American public that is disserved by a U.S. Senate that continues to try to undermine the basic tools that we have to try to fight this ongoing epidemic that still plagues too many in this Nation.

For that reason, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, in no way, shape, or form have I opposed vaccines for those who are at risk. Back when my in-laws, who are 92 and 86, first became eligible for the vaccine, the first thing we did was call the health department to see if we could get them a vaccine. Unfortunately, the health department wouldn't answer the phone, but they did have a useful message. They said, if we knew anybody who was not wearing a mask, we could report them to the police, but they didn't do anything about vaccines.

But I have never been opposed to vaccines. In fact, a lot of the vaccine hesitancy that we have in our country comes from the unscientific, unfounded, and half-baked ideas of the Democrats on this. When Democrats tell you that we should force 15-year-olds to be vaccinated—because that makes no sense and because their parents know it makes no sense and they know it makes no sense—that leads to the distrust of the government on other fronts.

So I mentioned earlier—and this, apparently, was lost and not necessarily received by the other side—that the FDA committee, in looking at boosters, advised not to give boosters to teenagers. Now, they hide behind that by saying: Oh, there is no mandate. Ask these kids if there is a mandate. Ask their parents. Ask the media. Call them up. Ask them: Is there a mandate? No, they can't be here unless they have three vaccines. There is a mandate. We have the chance to undo the mandate, and that is what the vote would be about.

The FDA didn't even advise giving it. The FDA didn't even advise giving it to them, but they definitely didn't advise mandating it. The CDC said the same thing. The only reason we got any kind of approval for this booster is that the political appointee of the Biden administration overrode both of the vaccine committees in order to approve it.

Normally, you would have to prove efficacy—a reduction in hospitalization. Well, transmission would be one. The Senator came to the floor and said this is a vaccine-preventable disease. Well, this isn't a vaccine-preventable disease because it doesn't stop transmission; it doesn't stop you from getting it.

But here is the thing: If you look at kids and boosters and you want to prove whether they are good for kids—and this is all we are talking about. We are not talking about the elderly or the infirm or people who have risk factors. We are talking about these kids. If you look at these kids and you ask, ''Do they have any risk factors or are any of them dying?'' we will refer to some statistics here. Well, the statistics aren't accurate. If you look at healthy kids—there was not one healthy kid. The answer wasn't a few. It was zero. In Germany, zero healthy kids died. In Israel, zero healthy kids died. A handful of unfortunate cases of children in our country did die. I think it was a little over 100 kids in a country of 330 million, and, sadly, every one of those cases had a severe medical illness and a problem.

I think it is an abomination that they want to say, ''Oh, we are the only ones who care about the million people who died,'' when we are the only ones who have been trying to figure out where this virus came from. For the last 3 years, I have been asking every day: Did this virus escape from a lab?

And not one Democrat will stand up and say: I will help you find out. We will look at it together.

Every Democrat has said: We don't care. We don't know, and we don't want to know where the virus came from.

But if it came from a lab, maybe we should quit funding this research. Should we quit sending our money to China, to a lab that operates in an unsafe manner? That would be a way to show you care about a million people.

But this is, make no mistake, a mandate on these young pages. It is wrong. It is malpractice. It shouldn't happen. There is no scientific evidence, and the government's own vaccine committees don't advise it. Yet Democrats, today, have said they don't care about the pages. They don't care about their parents. They don't care about their medical privacy. They don't care about their ability to discern the risks and benefits of having a medical procedure. So medical choice be damned. Democrats are going to tell you what to do, and just remember that. Just remember that they don't care at all about your own choice about your own body.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as the Members of the Senate know, this week, we are expected to vote on a series of three appropriations bills—3 out of the 12 appropriations bills that passed out of the Senate Appropriations Committee a couple of months ago. With just 2½ weeks left before the end of the fiscal year, time is of the essence. Unless Congress funds the government in the next 18 days, the government will shut down.

Now, you might ask yourself, if these appropriations bills passed out of the committee with strong bipartisan votes months ago, why are we waiting until 18 days before the deadline to begin the debate and vote on these appropriations bills—and not all of the appropriations bills, just a subset of three.

Well, we know shutdowns do not benefit anybody. I notice on social media there is a lot of anger out there in Washington, and people say: Yes, let's shut down the government. That is a good thing. It is too big. It is too intrusive. It is doing things I don't like.

But, if you think about this for a moment, with a shutdown, servicemembers—members of our military—will have to work without pay. Veterans won't get the benefits or services that they have earned. Mortgages and other loan applications will be delayed. Passport processing will grind to a halt. Maybe there is even a risk that Medicare and Social Security payments will not be delivered on time. So shutdowns are a blunt instrument. I think we have realized that, with a shutdown, when the government reopens, the same problem is staring you right in the face, so you might as well deal with it on the front end rather than on the back end.

From minor inconveniences to major disruptions, the American people are affected by lapses in government funding. We have learned that lesson before. The surest way to avoid any funding drama, which is what we are experiencing now, drama—the surest way to avoid that is to pass spending bills on time and in a transparent, normal process, something we call regular order around here. That means using the processes that are already in place to write, debate, and pass quality legislation. And it is done in a transparent sort of way, where every Senator—all 100 Senators—can participate. If they have got a better idea, they can offer an amendment. They can try to persuade colleagues, and they can get a vote.

Well, at the start of this summer, I was feeling somewhat optimistic about the government funding process. The day the Senate passed legislation to lift the debt ceiling and curb government spending, Leader SCHUMER and Leader MCCONNELL issued a joint statement about the funding process. They asked the chair and vice chair of the Appropriations Committee to get the regular process back on track. They also pledged to work in a bipartisan fashion to advance funding bills and noted ''expeditious floor consideration would be key to preventing automatic funding cuts.''

Well, there is no question our friends on the Appropriations Committee, led by Senator MURRAY and Senator COLLINS, have done their job. They did. As a matter of fact, I think three of these bills—maybe the three in front of us—passed with unanimous votes in the Appropriations Committee, and all of them passed with broad bipartisan support. The point is the Appropriations Committee passed all 12 regular appropriations bills before the Senate adjourned for the August recess. To show you how rare that is these days, this is the first time in 5 years that the Appropriations Committee actually processed all 12 bills.

I want to commend Senator MURRAY and Senator COLLINS and the entire Appropriations Committee, on a bipartisan basis, for doing their job and for doing it on a timely basis.

Well, thanks to their hard work, the Senate was in a strong position to advance these appropriations bills on an individual basis or, if necessary, to combine a few of them in what sometimes are called minibuses. We were well positioned to do that well in advance of the September 30 deadline.

As Senator SCHUMER affirmed in that joint statement earlier this summer, expeditious floor consideration is key, but his actions don't match those words. Today, more than 80 days after the Appropriations Committee passed its first spending bill, the full Senate is beginning—beginning—to consider the first batch of those bills. This is 80 days after the first bill passed. That is not what anybody would call expeditious.

The American people may or may not know it, but the majority leader has tremendous power. He has near-full ball control in terms of the Senate's agenda and the timing of legislation. He actually determines which bills come to the floor, when they receive a vote, and how many amendments will be considered. The majority leader is in the driver's seat. Senator SCHUMER could have called any of these bills up for consideration, debate, and a vote at any time in the last couple of months, starting with the first one that was passed 80 days ago.

Senator SCHUMER has been around here a long time. He is a smart guy. He is a shrewd operator and a worthy adversary when it comes to politics, but he knows the Senate can't complete its work in 18 days. Plus, in addition to the 12 funding bills, we need to pass the farm bill, the Federal Aviation Administration reauthorization, and the final version of the National Defense Authorization Act. That is a lot of work in an impossibly short amount of time. The majority leader knows that, and he knows, if he actually wanted to keep his commitment to the Senate, to Senator COLLINS, and to Senator MURRAY, that he should have started this process far earlier than today.

The Senate had a 2-week recess over the Fourth of July, and we had a 5-week recess in August. There has got to be some time in there that we could have used on something other than routine nominations, whereby Senator SCHUMER could have put these bills on the floor, and we could have kept to his commitment of the expeditious consideration of the bills. I understand that these recesses are sacrosanct. I am not sure we needed 5 full weeks for the August recess. Maybe 4 weeks would have been good but with a little notice so that everybody could plan.

My point is that Senator SCHUMER, apparently, had no interest in seeing each of these 12 bills being voted on on the Senate floor before the deadline. So here we are.

Now, you may ask: Why would Senator SCHUMER sabotage the regular order process for the appropriations bills? Well, there are a couple of reasons. One is that it maximizes his power because he knows, once you get down to the deadline, that four or five people are the ones who are going to basically figure out how to get out of this box canyon.

Meanwhile, the rest of the Members of the Senate, all 98 or so of us, are left with no options. We can't engage on behalf of our constituents. We can't cut what needs to be cut. We can't prioritize the spending. We can't offer amendments. We can't vote. All of that goes down the drain when the majority leader sabotages the timing of this appropriations process.

Senator SCHUMER waited 18 days before a potential government shutdown before putting the first funding bill on the floor. Now, if there is a shutdown, and I don't recommend it, it was engineered by the majority leader himself, which is why it should be called a Schumer shutdown.

I hope that doesn't happen, but he knows that the House is in a different place than the Senate in terms of the spending levels. He knows that Speaker MCCARTHY has a razor-thin majority. He knows the politics of what is happening in the House. He has already been quick to blame the House for a potential shutdown. But, as I have explained here, any potential shutdown is Senator SCHUMER's own making.

The press has already taken hook, line, and sinker the narrative that this is somehow the fault of Republicans in the House.

While the majority leader is quick to say the Senate passed 12 bipartisan appropriations bills through the committee, we are engaging in a bipartisan process this week, maybe next week. Well, he knows we can't get through this process between now and the end of this month. So he knows that basically what he has engineered is one of two options: He has either engineered a shutdown, or he has engineered a continuing resolution, which essentially means postponing or continuing the funding at current levels to some future date. Of course, that is going to have to be negotiated, what that date looks like.

This is not a genuine effort to return to regular order. It is, frankly, political theater. It is an attempt to make good on the promise to return to regular order without actually doing it.

I have been fortunate to have been in the Senate for some time now. I have seen this place work well, where every Senator gets to contribute to the process, where the committees do their

work, where the majority leader gives the Members of the Senate an adequate time to debate bills and to vote on amendments and to pass legislation. When you do that, it is much easier to build consensus, bipartisan consensus, to actually get things done, and the work product is far superior because everybody has had a hand in crafting it.

Every Member of this Chamber—and by extension, all 330 billion of our constituents—deserves a say in this legislation. Regardless of where they are from, which committees they sit on, or how long they have been in the Senate, all 100 Senators should have a voice in this process.

The majority leader has squandered valuable time that could have been spent debating, amending, and passing appropriations bills on a timely basis. That is why everyone knows that a continuing resolution is the probable outcome of this disaster.

It did not have to be this way. And if there is a shutdown, which I hope there is not for the reasons I have tried to explain, I think it should be called the Schumer shutdown.

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.

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

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

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise with many of my colleagues today to mark a new era for patients in this country.

Last year, we decided that enough is enough, and we put an end to the sweetheart deal that let drug companies charge seniors on Medicare whatever they wanted for some of the most common lifesaving and life-improving prescription meds on the market. Now the Big Pharma companies are trying to stop this legislation with absurd lawsuits.

I will talk about that effort in a moment, but for now, let me say unequivocally that allowing Medicare to negotiate lower prices is a victory for seniors, a victory for taxpayers, a victory for patients and their families, and a victory for America.

Mr. President, thank you for your work on this as the Senator from Vermont. When you were the House Member for Vermont, you led this bill in the House, and I led it in the Senate. We worked together to allow for negotiation on drugs. Finally, this bill has been passed into law as part of larger legislation.

A number of our colleagues, including Senator WYDEN of Oregon, have long been leaders on this issue.

I think we all know this progress could not have come soon enough. We know that Americans pay the highest prices in the world for the same brand name prescription drugs. In fact, prescription drug prices in the United States are more than 250 percent higher than drug prices in other industrialized countries. Not only are prices sky high, we have all watched them get higher.

As Senator WYDEN has worked on it; as you, Mr. President, have worked on this; as Senator SCHUMER has worked on this, we have continued to battle, sadly, the other side when it comes to putting our provision into law that allows Medicare to negotiate better prices. Finally, we did it on our own. We did it on our own but not really. We did it with the seniors of this country, with AARP at our side, with so many advocacy groups.

Taxpayers should not have to foot the bill to have the money go into higher profits for companies that already are making much more than the average company on the stock exchange.

Not only are we seeing high prices, but it literally makes it unaffordable for some patients. What good are treatments and cures if they go unused because they are unaffordable? The average price of the 25 brand name medications that Medicare spends the most on, 25 top blockbusters, has tripled on average, tripled since the drug hit the U.S. market.

Think about it. We all believe in competition. We believe in capitalism. Well, if you allow for real competition and generics to get on and you don't mess around and play around with the patent system and change this little thing so you get a longer patent and you don't put into law a sweetheart deal that says Medicare can't negotiate any prices for 50 million seniors—which, by the way, affects everyone else because when that, the biggest negotiating group in the country, is locked out from the table, when they are locked out of the room, it hurts everyone else as well.

This change alone, when the administration just put the first 10 drugs on the negotiating table, 900—900—we have so many people involved and who will be affected by this that we will save over $300 billion. That is a big, big deal.

Not only are prices sky high, we know that the numbers only grow more shocking as you learn about the people behind them and about the profit margins of the big drug companies.

I am thinking of Kerry and his wife, who live in Cloquet, MN. Both take Jardiance. This prescription drug costs them $750 each for just 1 month's supply, and that is on top of the cost of their other meds.

I know of a 71-year-old Medicare beneficiary from Oak Grove, MN, who also relies on Jardiance to control a heart issue. Last year, the drug cost her about $530 for a 90-day supply, roughly a sixth of her take-home pay from her job at a senior care residence.

Another Minnesotan, a 67-year-old Medicare beneficiary from Glenville, paid roughly $750 total for a 90-day supply of Jardiance and Januvia and stopped taking the drugs altogether due to the cost.

Then there is another patient from Rochester, MN, southern Minnesota, who was diagnosed with a rare form of blood cancer. She was relieved to find that she would be able to take an oral medication instead of invasive chemotherapy treatments, but it was going to cost $680 per month, nearly half of her monthly Social Security check. Her daughter applied for grants and figured out a way to make ends meet, but it just shouldn't be that hard.

Those are just a few of the many Minnesotans who have had to tighten their belts to satisfy Big Pharma's greed. You will hear the stories from Oregon. You will hear the stories from every State in the country. In fact, Big Pharma makes almost, as I said, three times the average profit margin of other industries on the S&P 500 exchange, three times larger profit on average of other industries on the S&P stock market. Yet nearly 30 percent of Americans say they haven't taken their medications as prescribed due to costs. That is unacceptable.

The Presiding Officer, over in the House, and I led these bills to get rid of that sweetheart deal. And, yes, we got this in through the Inflation Reduction Act, got it signed into law.

A couple of years ago, Medicare announced the first 10 drugs selected for price negotiation, including, as I mentioned, Jardiance, which treats heart failure and diabetes; Januvia, another prescription for diabetes; Enbrel, for rheumatoid arthritis and psoriasis treatment; and Xarelto and Eliquis, medications to prevent blood clots. Taken together, those two—Xarelto and Eliquis, to prevent blood clots—are taken by 5 million Medicare beneficiaries.

I want to correct one statistic I used. It is up to 9 million Americans with Medicare Part D who take the drugs that were selected, and they have spent—I said 300—they have spent $3.4 billion in out-of-pocket costs. Up to 9 million Americans with Medicare Part D take those 10 drugs, paying an average of between $121 and $5,200 a month out-of-pocket. And $5,200 a month—how much is that per year? The pages can do the math. That is $60,000 on average per year.

What does this mean for a senior on a fixed income? That relief is finally coming.

For years, we toiled on this legislation, as the Presiding Officer and Senator WYDEN know, but it was Joe Biden who finally got it over the finish line and signed it into law, giving Medicare the power to negotiate with drug companies to help bring the price of medications in the United States down.

The law also, as we all know, has other provisions—$35 out-of-pocket monthly cap on insulin. This new policy has lowered the cost of daily living for over 1.5 million Americans already.

We now have drug companies that have voluntarily, for non-seniors, capped it. I predicted this would happen—several of us did—because it is kind of hard to say: Well, seniors get $35, but a 15-year-old has to pay $100 a month. So you are starting to see that change. That law also provides free recommended vaccines, like the shingles or pneumonia shots. That is going to help the average Minnesota senior save 100 bucks. Then, of course, the legislation puts a $2,000 cap on out-of-pocket spending for Medicare beneficiaries starting in 2025.

What happened? Lawsuits. Johnson & Johnson—let's name them—Johnson & Johnson has sued. I thought when we passed it, signed into law by the President of United States—anyone who knows ''Schoolhouse Rock!'' knows you have both Houses, a bill signed by the President, it is law. What do these guy do? They go out, and they sue in court, like: Oh, we made a sweetheart deal 20 years ago, and we want it back, so we are going to sue. They hired tons of lawyers.

Johnson & Johnson, Merck, Bristol Myers Squibb, Boehringer Ingelheim, and Novartis, as well as the industry trade group, the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, better known as PhRMA—they have all sued.

We know that this effort is patently absurd. Government Agencies negotiating on drug prices isn't novel or unprecedented. The VA has done it for years.

End story: We persisted after nearly $400 million was spent on lobbying in Congress. After every Member of Congress had three lobbyists assigned to them, we still passed this bill.

We still passed this bill. So big surprise, they have gone to court. But we will win there, too. Their legal argument is somewhat absurd, that somehow this is a taking, when in fact it is their choice to participate in capitalism and provide these drugs and be part of a competition. It is not a taking if they don't want to sell drugs to 50 million Americans. I guess that is up to them.

These first 10 drugs are just the beginning. We must go then to the next 15, the next 15, the next 20. That is how the law works and, at the same time, take on these patent cases that Senator GRASSLEY and I have done, Senator CORNYN, Senator BLUMENTHAL, others in Judiciary are leaving those to take on the sham petitions, take on the product hopping, and take on all the bad stuff that keeps competitors off the market.

But in the end, this should be a celebration. This has finally begun, and they are not going to end the celebration for 50 million seniors with all their lawyers, no matter how many they hire, and no matter how many they bring to the courthouse.

With that, I yield to my wonderful colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, Senator KLOBUCHAR has said it very well, and I want to pick up on her remarks. And we are here to reflect on the extraordinary achievement in the Inflation Reduction Act in order to provide for the first time a real measure of relief—a real measure of relief—for these staggering costs seniors and others pay for medicine in our country. And I am going to talk about the negotiation issue.

And I want to say, this is just the next and essential piece of what we are doing to get relief for the consumer. For example, through most of the summer, I talked about the price-gouging penalty that we got in the law.

And I see my friend Senator STABENOW, my colleague who has been my seatmate on the Finance Committee—we sure wish she wasn't retiring—but the price-gouging penalty is the first such thing in Federal law. This is a penalty that it has imposed, as Senator STABENOW remembers, when drug companies hiked their prices over inflation. They have to pay a rebate to Medicare, which is used to lower the out-of-pocket costs for seniors. And Senator STABENOW and I have been out crunching the numbers on this issue. And one of the areas that we found is that these drugs, particularly those that are administered in a doctor's office, already are producing massive savings.

Senator STABENOW, we found a drug a couple of weeks ago where seniors are saving several hundred dollars per dose—per dose—I would say to my colleagues—on one of these cancer drugs you get in the office. And this is just the beginning, as Senator KLOBUCHAR has said.

So this legislation, which didn't, unfortunately, get a single Republican vote, represents a seismic shift in the relationship between consumers and Big Pharma and especially authority for Medicare to negotiate prices of prescription drugs with manufacturers.

And I just want to take a few minutes to pick up on this issue of the barrage of legal actions Big Pharma and their allies are taking to stop Medicare drug price negotiation. And we have been talking about all these lawsuits that the big companies—and I gather the Chamber of Commerce is with them all the way—have filed to prevent seniors and families from getting a break on medicine.

So these legal actions that the big companies and the Chamber of Commerce are taking beg the question that I just want to offer up this afternoon: What would happen in America if our country didn't negotiate in our economy?

The fact is, negotiating on price is the underpinning of the American marketplace. It ensures you bring two sides together to get a fair deal. And the question really has to become: Are these companies that have filed these suits really arguing that the government shouldn't try to get a fair price on medicine for more than 50 million American seniors?

Senator STABENOW, that is the essential question—are they really arguing to the American people—and by the way, this is taxpayer money, much of this is taxpayer money—are they really arguing that seniors and taxpayers shouldn't get a fair deal?

Now, the fact is that Medicare, in particular, with such strong taxpayer backing has a special argument for being a program that negotiates to get fair prices on because Medicare is not just a slip of paper, as we have examined in the Finance Committee often.

I see Senator WHITEHOUSE, our distinguished colleague.

Medicare is not just a slip of paper with a few words on it. Medicare is a guarantee; it is a guarantee for seniors of good quality coverage. And it just begs the question: If you have a guarantee and a guarantee of something specific—good quality coverage—wouldn't you automatically say that the taxpayer should be able to have a friend and advocate negotiating for them in order to get the best possible deal? And I think the answer to that question is pretty obvious.

Now, Big Pharma has, unfortunately, taken a very different position. They have been guarding the prohibition on price negotiation in this country like the Holy Grail. And they don't like that we have closed this chapter. And the first 10 drugs were not drawn out of a hat. Congress made it clear in black letter law the criteria of the Federal Government has to use.

And so what we are doing now, Senator STABENOW—we have been talking to many of the members of the Finance Committee—is we are looking at the fact that these 10 drugs also were ones where we made sure and put in the criteria specifically where you had significant taxpayer support in terms of getting the drug to market. So again, another argument for why you ought to negotiate, the costliest drugs and drugs that get to market with taxpayer money.

Now, Senator KLOBUCHAR, I thought, very eloquently described a number of the drugs, but I think—and I want to give my colleagues a chance to make their remarks—I think we ought to reflect on the importance of making sure that, when Big Pharma has been double-dipping into taxpayers' wallets for these important medications—groundbreaking research from the National Institutes of Health are another research arm of the Federal Government. Then, after the research was funded by taxpayers, manufacturers sell the drugs developed using taxpayer-funded research back to taxpayers at sky-high prices, are they really not going to have a chance to get a better deal?

Enbrel, which is the drug we mention often on the floor, was discovered at Massachusetts General Hospital using NIH-supported research. The hospital sold the patent rights to the drug manufacturer that has profited off Enbrel

at the expense, Senator STABENOW, of taxpayers for now going on 30 years.

My colleagues are going to have a chance to go into further detail about this, but I think when you are talking about Big Pharma and a new law that considers among a host of other factors prior to Federal financial support, provided by the taxpayers that we have the honor to represent, it means that the government should stand up for seniors and taxpayers to make sure that they get a good deal.

An investment in basic science funded by American taxpayers is based on our record in the Finance Committee, often the foundation of the new drug—and when drug manufacturers use this taxpayer-funded research to make a drug, the price of the drug should be lower to reflect taxpayer investment, and you get the best possible deal for those taxpayers when you negotiate.

And I will just close by saying, I think my colleagues know from talking to people at home, most people when you discuss this issue think it is absurd that for all these years, nobody could negotiate for them. What they are surprised about is not so much that a law passed, even though Senator KLOBUCHAR talked about beating all these lobbyists, what they are surprised about is how people with a straight face have made the case for years that, with all of the taxpayers' support for medicine that I just outlined, that you wouldn't have started negotiating for taxpayers and seniors a long time ago.

I really appreciate Senator KLOBUCHAR doing this. I see the Chair, who has been our champion in the other body for many years, my seatmate, Senator KLOBUCHAR—we have an exciting new Member from the west who has also joined us. This is an important chance to really think through where we are headed. And Senator STABENOW knows we have got a lot more to do. We are taking on the PBMs, the middle men, who are also a factor in driving up prices.

But tonight is a chance because Senator KLOBUCHAR has taken this time for us to outline what the negotiation issue is all about. I have tried to go through some of the history about how you were stunned to hear over the years that you couldn't negotiate. That has been changed.

My colleagues are going to continue this discussion, and you are going hear a lot more about it because, for all of those people, all of those people that I knew, starting with the Gray Panthers who were standing in those pharmacy lines, getting mugged at the pharmacy counter trying to figure out how they were going to choose between their food and their rent, they are going have new hope because prices are going to be negotiated. There is going to be hope for them, and there is going to be hope for American taxpayers. And it is long overdue.

I yield to my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, when I first arrived in this building a couple of years ago, Senator KLOBUCHAR—one of the first things she brought up was the cost of pharmaceuticals, drug prescriptions for the American people.

Well, this is the beginning of the end for Americans getting the short end of the stick from pharmaceutical companies peddling prescription drugs. For years, we all have been paying much more than those in other countries pay for the same drugs. But now, Medicare has taken the first step towards ending that stranglehold on lifesaving drugs.

Let's be clear: This is not some unfair assault on global drug companies. Rather, this is a transition that is going to give Americans the same opportunity to afford lifesaving drugs as others in other countries are given.

According to Kaiser Family Foundation, the U.S. spends far more than any other industrialized country for prescription drugs, from getting charged $150 more for Xarelto—which reduces the risk of coronary artery disease—to getting ripped off by paying $1,600 for Enbrel, an arthritis drug.

Eliquis, a very common blood thinner—and one that I have occasion to use myself—prevents blood clots but costs an extra $514 out of pocket for Medicare enrollees in Colorado. In Germany, it is only $96. It is five times more in the United States.

Why should we pay more than Germans and Canadians and the Swiss? What possible rules of common sense should permit drug companies the right to charge us many times more than what the rest of the world pays for the same drugs?

Part of the answer is that, up until now, we have let them. Medicare—the largest buyer of prescription drugs in the United States—has never been allowed to negotiate the price of drugs with pharmaceutical companies.

As Senator WYDEN was making painfully clear, the losses to the American people have been substantial. Until now, Medicare has had to accept whatever price Big Pharma dictated, even when Medicare knew we were subsidizing the rest of the world.

Well, that changes today. Thanks to the Inflation Reduction Act we passed last year, Medicare finally has the ability to negotiate with Big Pharma and get us a fair price for these drugs. Medicare will take the 10 most expensive drugs each year and negotiate their prices down.

But the impact goes far beyond the impact just on seniors or just for those 10 drugs. First, every year—every year—Medicare will negotiate down 10 more drugs, so the costs will keep coming down each year. In future years, Medicare will be able to negotiate even more drugs.

Second, because Medicare is the largest buyer in the American market, there is a darn good chance that other big buyers, like private insurance companies, are going to negotiate to bring the price they pay down to what Medicare will pay. A falling tide lowers all prices.

So what exactly does that mean now? Medicare has announced the first drugs it will negotiate. They include the two I mentioned, Xarelto and Enbrel, along with eight others. Four of the drugs treat diabetes. The others treat or prevent blood clots, heart failure, kidney disease, blood cancers, and arthritis.

In 2022, Medicare enrollees taking these 10 drugs paid $3.4 billion in out-of-pocket costs. That is what they paid out of their own savings. The average per-enrollee cost was a staggering $5,247 for the most expensive drug on the list, Imbruvica, which treats blood cancer.

It is a big deal in every State. It is a big deal in my home State of Colorado. Over 100,000 Medicare enrollees in Colorado take these 10 drugs, and 43,000, including me, take Eliquis—this is a blood thinner to help prevent blood clots—with an average out-of-pocket cost of over $500. Twenty-one thousand take Xarelto and pay $447, on average, out-of-pocket costs.

The bottom line: Seniors on Medicare are getting ripped off, and going forward, they are going to spend less. They are finally going to spend less on the prescription drugs they need, in many cases, just to stay alive. If all goes according to plan, the rest of us will also pay less once insurance companies follow Medicare's lead.

This isn't a fix to all the problems in the healthcare system in this country, but it is a pretty big step, and it is a reminder that we are not helpless to fix the other problems we face that are still out there. All it takes is the will to come together and get things done. Hopefully, this is just the beginning.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. I will be very brief. I wanted to come to the floor to thank all of my colleagues for coming to the floor and talking about this issue. Our Democratic caucus has been persistent champions in the fight to lower drug costs for Americans.

I want to thank Senator KLOBUCHAR, who has been such a leader on this issue, for calling us together tonight.

It was said year after year, decade after decade: They are never going to take on the big drug companies. They are never going to get those high costs—in some cases, outrageously high costs—down.

But last summer, we did, and we won. Now millions of Americans are seeing their drug costs go down as the Inflation Reduction Act goes into effect. The 10 prescription drugs which my colleagues have talked about are not drugs used by a rare few but are used by millions that affect so many different illnesses, and they will treat things like diabetes and heart failure and cancer and kidney disease and blood clots and more.

The pain you feel when you talk to a parent who says: My child has been diagnosed with cancer, but it costs $1,000

a month for the drug, and I can't afford it. What am I going to do?

What pain. Well, that pain is going to be greatly reduced in hundreds of thousands of cases now that we have done this.

We are not stopping. We are going to keep going. It is a huge deal. We are capping the price of insulin at $35. We did it for seniors on Medicare, and now we are going to fight to get it for everybody else. The Presiding Officer is helping to lead that charge. The cost of all drugs, which once was unlimited, will start at $3,000 a year in January and go to $2,000 in 2025.

The No. 1 thing our constituents are asking about is high costs. The No. 1 thing that bugs them about the government is that no one seems to get a handle on those high costs. Well, this is a shining example where we are reducing their costs by taking on the special interests. We are not stopping here.

I yield the floor and thank my colleagues for being here.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, I really feel like this is a celebration because we have been talking about how Americans have been taken advantage of for years—forever—in terms of high prices. We have been paying the highest prices in the world forever and oftentimes three and four times more than people in other countries.

I know I receive messages from families every day who are struggling to pay for their prescription medications. The truth is, we understood this. We finally had the opportunity where we had President Biden and a Democratic majority in the House and the Senate. We took on Big Pharma, and we won. So this is really a celebration.

We are not done. We have more to do. We are just getting started, but this is a big deal. It is a big deal.

One out of four Americans can't afford their medicine right now—one out of four. That is shameful in the United States of America. Back in 1998, when I was a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives, I took busloads of seniors from Detroit, one side of the Ambassador Bridge to the other side. A few minutes across the bridge was Windsor, Canada. We crossed the bridge and cut prescription drug prices by 40 percent by crossing a bridge.

It has made no sense to me. The reason I have been championing this for so long and so appreciate the leadership of Senator KLOBUCHAR and so many of us who have worked together is that this just simply makes no sense, and it has cost lives and people's livelihoods, trying to pay for their medicine. You shouldn't have to skip doses or split pills in half or choose between paying your electric bill or taking your medicine.

So the good news is, despite the fact that if you just look at the U.S. Senate—just in the Senate, there are 15 lobbyists for every Senator, and they work every day to try to stop us from lowering prices. But despite that, we took on Big Pharma, and we won.

I want to thank the Presiding Officer for your leadership on the first thing we were able to do that is so tangible.

In Michigan, we have nearly 67,000 Michiganders on Medicare who now benefit from a cap on insulin of $35 a month—not the $600 or $700 that the average person was paying; $35 a month. That is saving lives.

By the way, insulin is something that was discovered and developed 100 years ago—100 years ago. It costs $10 to make, and we had to go through a major fight to cap it at $35. But our Presiding Officer, the Senator from Georgia, led that, and I want to thank you for doing that.

We have nearly 673,000 Michiganders who are going to save an average of $356 thanks to the $2,000 total cap we are going to put on. Right now, folks are, on average, paying $14,000, $15,000 a year and oftentimes thousands of dollars more than that. We are capping that. This next year, it is capped at $3,200; next year, $2,000, and that is it—$2,000-a-year out-of-pocket costs for seniors. It is extraordinary. It will save lives.

So this is a time, I think, of celebration.

We have nearly 1.8 million Michigan seniors who are now going to be able to get free shingles vaccines and other critical vaccines that before they maybe just didn't do because, on average, it was $300 or $400 to do, and now they can protect themselves with vaccines. That is a big deal.

Senator WYDEN was talking about his provision, which is so very important, which is to say that if a drug company, under Medicare Part D—which are the drugs you get in the hospital or in the doctor's office—that if they go up faster than the rate of inflation—the Biden administration now has the authority to check every 3 months—if it goes up faster than inflation, they will roll the price back. As of July 1, it was an average of over $470 per dose on a cancer drug. So this is a big deal. It is a big deal that we are talking about right now.

The biggest of all: Medicare is beginning to negotiate prices just like the VA, which gets a 40-percent discount, by the way. That is the ultimate.

When I first came to the Senate after taking those bus trips across the border, I really took on this whole question about prescription drugs and really leaned in in so many ways. I was excited we were going to do Medicare Part D that passed under the Bush administration until I saw the fine print where it prohibited Medicare from negotiating prices. That was the fine print. It sounded great, but the drug companies were able to insert the language that says: You can't negotiate. We get to charge whatever we want.

That is what has happened since then.

So here we are. The first 10 drugs that will be negotiated through Medicare were announced just a week or so ago, and we are talking about those drugs that will deal with blood clots and heart failure, diabetes, psoriasis, blood cancers, arthritis, and so many more things. These are the top drugs in terms of usage and price—the first 10. Then there will be more, and there will be more, and there will be more until we get the full negotiation.

We know that negotiating on just these 10 drugs will help more than 9 million people—9 million people—lower their costs—just those first 10. This is a big deal. We know we have more to do to lower costs, more to do together to address healthcare costs and other costs that people pay.

But I think it is pretty safe to say that the prescription drug companies are the biggest lobby here. We finally had the votes. We had the President who was willing to do it, President Biden. We had the majority in the House and the Senate to do what we knew needed to be done regardless of how much clout they have, and so that is what we did.

You know, I get letters like all of you do and talk to people all the time, but Diane of Bloomfield Hills, who is retired and on Medicare, shared with me that she is a diabetic, and she takes two types of insulin, or four injections per day—four injections per day. She told me that she used to pay a copay of $650—$650 or more—for a 3-month supply for just one of her prescriptions. She takes four injections a day—for just one of her prescriptions. But not anymore. Back in January, Diane went to the pharmacy like usual, and the pharmacist told her that her 3-month supply would be $105; not $650—$105. She said: ''I paid and walked away with a big smile on my face.''

The Presiding Officer led that effort to put a smile on her face and, I am sure, create a little more capacity for her to take care of herself and to be able to have a good life.

People like Diane should not have to go without the medicine they need. They shouldn't be forced to skip doses or take less than was prescribed to save money. They shouldn't have to choose between their medicine and putting food on the table or paying the bills. That is what this is about.

So it is a celebration, and I am so proud that we joined with President Biden to take the first step to make sure that people are going to be able to afford the medicine they need.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am very happy to be here and resolve a—I guess, celebrate the resolution of a longstanding wrong done to the American people. Senator STABENOW can correct me if I am wrong, but my recollection is that the ban that Congress put on Medicare negotiating with the pharmaceutical companies the way, say, the Veterans' Administration already does was a magical appearance of

a tiny little bit of language, not in the Senate, not in the House, but in the secret confines of the conference committee that merged the two bills.

It just slipped in as a sentence. Nobody took credit for it. I still can't identify who slipped that thing in there; but once it got slipped in, the pharmaceutical industry defended it with all the venom and power and money and muscle that they had. And we beat them. We took it away.

Now, just like the Veterans' Administration, Medicare gets to negotiate and drive prices down, and that is going to make a big difference for Rhode Islanders with diabetes, with cancer, with blood clots, with heart disease, with rheumatoid arthritis. This happened because all of us—Senate Democrats—got together, stuck to our guns, and made it happen through the Inflation Reduction Act which came out of the Budget Committee, originally—the authorization. We are lowering the prices of these 10 very expensive drugs; and even though the pharmaceutical industry is going to try to wrassle around in court, it is pretty hard to say that Medicare doesn't have the same authority that its sister Agency, the Veterans' Administration, has to negotiate for pharmaceuticals.

It shows how much they will try to try to get that little slippery sentence that got slipped into that bill back to defend their price gouging.

Vaccines are now free with Medicare. Insulin is capped at $35 a month. Drug companies are penalized if they jack up their prices higher than the rate of inflation. A $3,250 cap on out-of-pocket spending for seniors is just about to go into effect, and the next year it drops to a $2,000 limit. I think that will cover 11,000 Rhode Islanders who now pay higher out-of-pocket costs than those.

These changes will save tens of thousands of Medicare Part D enrollees in Rhode Island over $23 million. That is a big number in our small State. I would like to think that the Inflation Reduction Act was bipartisan. It would be great if this had passed with bipartisan support. It didn't. Not a single Republican vote came. I regret that, but we are going to continue. There is more progress to be made. We have shown that it can be done.

And while we are at it, we need to strengthen Medicare—both Social Security and Medicare, and we have a bill that has had its hearing in the Budget Committee to strengthen Social Security and Medicare by making people who are making over $400,000 a year and the superrich—who hide their income through all sorts of tricks so it doesn't show up as regular income—pay a fair share, support these essential programs.

So we can celebrate a win today, and we can go forward with confidence to future wins.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in celebrating a major and long overdue achievement allowing the American people to have the benefit of a government that will stand up to negotiate prices and try its best to make the prescription medications that they need for themselves and the people they love to be affordable.

You know, what is a greater responsibility that a government has to its citizens to help create a healthcare system that is accessible and is affordable? Why is it that in this country, the citizens that we all represent are getting hammered on the cost of medications that if they just go across the border to Canada, they can get at one-tenth, one-fifth of the price?

Why is it? It is because until this day, we have been the only government that has not been willing to use price negotiation to protect consumers from price gouging by Big Pharma, and it is really brutal. I mean, every one of us—I talk to Vermonters, Senator STABENOW was talking about Michiganders, Senator WHITEHOUSE was talking about constituents in Rhode Island—by the way, some of whom are Republicans, some of whom are Democrats, some of whom are Independents, many of whom don't even bother to pay much attention to the political process. But when they have to get access to that medication that is really essential to their well-being, they can't afford it.

We are paying, they are paying—all our citizens—in many cases, 2½ times, on average, what folks across the border in Canada or in Europe are paying for the same medication. And, you know, it is terrific when Big Pharma, through their research, comes up with medications that can extend our life. But if they charge so much that we can't afford it, what does that do?

And time after time, we have seen folks make these horrible decisions about cutting back on their medication at the threat to their own life and safety because they literally can't afford it.

Now, the pharmaceutical industry, let's give them credit: They have created lifesaving drugs. That is a tremendous thing. But they can't use the fact that they are doing something good to jack up prices to make it unaffordable just for self-enrichment.

You know, we, as a government, have done an enormous amount to help pharma with the innovation side, and they are suggesting that this legislation is going to interfere with that capacity. Is it true? No. Think about what we have done—we, the government, taxpayers. No. 1, the intellectual property is protected; so for that period of time, oftentimes well over a decade, they can charge whatever they want to charge and they have the exclusive right to have that drug on the market. And they charge a lot.

No. 2, we have created an employer-sponsored healthcare system where we have employers in all of our States where it is really important to that employer to provide good-quality healthcare to its employees, and they have to pay whatever the premiums are that are, oftentimes, inflated as a result of us having the highest prescription drug prices in the world.

Third, we have a Medicare/Medicaid program, which is a guaranteed purchasing pool to buy the products that they create. So pharma has protection on its profits with an exclusive period; it has a government that stands behind the right of citizens to have access to healthcare through Medicare particularly, Medicaid, and also employer-sponsored healthcare.

And then what you see is the pharmaceutical industry going beyond the patent rights that it has for that market exclusivity and do the things that Senator KLOBUCHAR was talking about where they try to extend the life of the patent well beyond what that limited period was supposed to be.

And then, by the way, Wall Street gets in the game here, because what many of the companies have claimed is research is a corporate buyout. Company A buys company B that has a patent, a popular and necessary drug. They pay billions for it; and then to pay for the purchase price, they inflate the cost of that prescription drug. And they can do it; they get away with it.

So, you know, Senator HICKENLOOPER asked the question: Why is the outrage not about that we let it go on for so long?

So pharma is going to do fine and keep doing what they are going to be doing. They are going to have the patent exclusivity; they are going to have a government and a Senate with Republicans and Democrats maintaining the Medicare program so that folks who are going to need prescription drugs are going to be able to get them. They are going to do fine.

But, finally, we have price negotiation so that, in effect, if you or I are going to the pharmacy to buy aspirin and we buy a hundred because the per-unit cost is a lot less, we get to pay wholesale—we get to decide about bargaining by what we purchase, a big amount or a little amount. Medicare should be able to do the same thing.

So this is so overdue and so beneficial to everybody that we all represent, regardless of, politically, whose side they are on. This is about a shared need that our society has for access to prescription medication. And, of course, to the Presiding Officer, we all appreciate the focus that you put on insulin. I mean, if there isn't a more shocking example of a rip-off. This drug has been around for decades; there is no new innovation. But what there is, is pricing power. So those companies that had the ability to set the price, to raise the price, and to do it again kept going up and up and up, even though there were not any additional intellectual breakthroughs with the actual core of what insulin is.

You know, we in this country know that working Americans are struggling

to pay their bills. Things are expensive, and it is not just inflation. Things are expensive in many cases because there is real corporate power, and they can set the price they want. Nowhere do they do that with more abusive consistency than in pharmaceutical prescriptions. And we can decide, as a Senate, that we are going to find ways to make things affordable by stopping the rip-off.

Having the capacity for Medicare to negotiate prices is a major breakthrough. It is no small thing. It is the beginning; it is not the end of our efforts. And I thank all of my colleagues for working together to help all of our constituents, regardless of who they voted for, because the thing they all have in common is they want to protect, especially, the people that they love.

And in the arguments from pharma, what I find so alarming is that what they prey upon is the love that people in America have for their families because, if you are a mom or you are a dad and you have got a son or a daughter who needs a prescription drug and you can't afford it, you will take out a second mortgage or you will sell the house or you will get rid of your retirement account. You will do whatever it takes to save the person you care about. And pharma, with their pushback, saying this is going to threaten innovation is preying on those fears that all of us have about what will happen if we don't do everything we can to help the person that we love.

And you know what, it is not about that for pharma. They are doing pretty well. Those salaries are astonishing. Those corporate buybacks are very rich. So I am proud to be with my colleagues here to stand up for the right that our citizens have—affordably, confidently, securely—to be able to have, when they need it, access to the prescription medication that is going to extend their life and save their loved ones.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, there are over 578,000 Nevadans across my State enrolled in Medicare, and their hard-earned Medicare benefits provide coverage for their healthcare expenses.

The problem is, when I travel around my State and I speak to Senators, the No. 1 thing that I hear about is how difficult it is to afford the prescription drugs that they need. Let me give you an example.

Sue Bird and her husband Tom, they live in rural Nevada in Fernley, NV. Tom has diabetes; and even though they are both on Medicare, covering all their healthcare expenses costs them nearly $1,000 a month. That can be a crushing amount for two retirees on a fixed income.

The stress of Tom's diabetes alone affects his blood sugar, but add in the worry over the price of their medication, their dental and vision and other healthcare costs, and it becomes almost too much to handle for them.

So why are Tom and Sue's medications so expensive? I will tell you why, and you have heard it from my colleagues over and over this afternoon: Because, year after year, Big Pharma has decided that they need to jack up prescription drug prices. All the while, their executives are raking in millions of dollars in profits.

These pharmaceutical companies are driving higher prices. They are forcing millions of older Americans to pay more in premiums and out-of-pocket costs.

Our seniors made this country what it is today. Tom is a fourth-generation Nevadan. We really have a duty to ensure quality affordable healthcare for people like Tom and Sue and seniors across the country when they retire.

That is exactly what Democrats did when we passed the Inflation Reduction Act. We capped the cost of insulin at $35 a month for people with Medicare. We made vaccines free to seniors, and we are holding drug companies accountable for raising the prices faster than the rate of inflation.

Now you are hearing, in a major victory that has been decades in the making, that we finally gave Medicare the green light to negotiate lower prescription drug prices directly with Big Pharma. This is going to make a huge difference for Nevadans and for Americans across the country.

The Biden administration just selected the first 10 drugs for price negotiations under Medicare Part D. These are widely used medications. About 10 million people with Medicare take one or more of these drugs each year to treat serious conditions like diabetes, heart failure, blood clots, and cancer, and they are extremely expensive. Medicare enrollees taking any of these 10 medications paid a total of $3.4 billion out of pocket in 2022.

For his diabetes, Tom Bird takes Jardiance, one of 10 drugs on the list. This month, he paid about $466 for it.

Now, these 10 drugs cost Medicare over $50 billion last year alone. That is outrageous. Think about where that money is going. Think about where it is going. How much money is enough for these Big Pharma companies?

But do you know what? The fact that Democrats fought to ensure that Medicare can negotiate directly with drug companies is going to change all that. It will give seniors a fair deal. It will lower healthcare costs, and it will also cut back on Federal spending by $25 billion. That is $25 billion that we are saving taxpayers across the country.

And this is just the beginning. Each year, more medications will be added to the negotiation list, allowing Medicare to keep bringing down prescription drug costs and saving more taxpayer dollars.

And I will tell you what, our seniors across this country, like Tom and Sue, who helped build our country and make it what it is today, will be able to breathe a sigh of relief. This is all thanks to the Inflation Reduction Act, which continues to benefit Nevadans and Americans across the country.

I am proud of the work that we all did when we passed this legislation. I am proud of the Biden-Harris administration for not only supporting the passage of it and working to get this done but also the implementation.

I can tell you that I know my colleagues and I are going to make sure and keep working to ensure that seniors across this country, whether they are in Nevada or across this country, see lower healthcare costs, because every senior should be able to retire with dignity. They have worked for it. They have worked hard to make that happen, and we should at least make sure that we are lowering those costs to help them.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. I rise today to stand alongside the over 80 percent of Americans who support Medicare being able to negotiate the price of prescription drugs, because despite being the wealthiest Nation in the world, too many Americans are struggling to afford the medications that they need to survive. More than 5 million Medicare beneficiaries are struggling to afford their medications.

I have heard devastating stories from Wisconsin seniors who have been put in impossible situations and forced to ration or forego their medications, all while the drug companies turn record profits.

No American, and especially our seniors who are on fixed incomes, should have to choose between putting food on the table or accessing the prescription drugs that they need to stay healthy. That is why I was so proud to support the Inflation Reduction Act to finally provide some relief for Wisconsin families and hold the big drug companies accountable for prioritizing profits over people.

And now, we are seeing the results. We capped the cost of insulin out-of-pocket at $35 a month for seniors, we lowered healthcare premiums for millions of Americans, and we penalized drug companies for raising their costs faster than inflation.

Last month, we reached a new milestone that has been a long time coming. Medicare announced the first 10 drugs that they will negotiate with drug companies. These are lifesaving medications that millions of Americans take to stay healthy, treating everything from diabetes to heart disease, to blood cancers. By lowering the costs of these drugs, fewer seniors will have to choose between buying groceries and taking their medication, and fewer families will lie awake at night worrying about how they are going to afford the cost of their loved one's medication.

Most importantly, Medicare finally stepping up and taking on the big drug companies means that fewer Americans will be priced out of the care that they need to live healthy lives. We have more work to do, but the Inflation Reduction Act was a historic step in the right direction.

Every American deserves access to affordable and comprehensive healthcare, and I am committed to finishing what we started last year with the passage of the Inflation Reduction Act.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

BUDGETARY REVISIONS

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023—the FRA, by its initials—which Congress passed 3 months ago, represented a bipartisan agreement. It resolved a manufactured default crisis. It avoided an economic catastrophe that was threatened, and it set funding levels for the upcoming year. Pursuant to section 121 of that Act, I previously filed, on June 21, budgetary aggregates and committee allocations for fiscal year 2024. Today, I am adjusting those levels to account for Senate amendment No. 1092 to H.R. 4366, the proposed package making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024.

This first package includes the fiscal year 2024 Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies; Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies; and Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies appropriations bills.

Section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by the FRA, establishes statutory limits on discretionary funding levels for fiscal years 2024 and 2025, and allows for adjustments to those limits. Sections 302 and 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act allow the chairman of the Budget Committee to revise the allocations, aggregates, and levels consistent with those adjustments. Senate amendment No. 1092 is eligible for an adjustment. Division C, the Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2024, includes $10.8 billion of budget authority and $8.3 billion of outlays that are designated as emergency funding. The emergency funding in this division is consistent with the bipartisan agreement tied to the enactment of the FRA.

In addition, the Senate Appropriations Committee has reported eight other bills that include funding eligible for an adjustment. I am also making those adjustments in today's filing.

In total, I am revising the allocation to the Appropriations Committee by $62.2 billion of budget authority and $23.8 billion of outlays. Excluding off-budget amounts, I am revising the budgetary aggregates by $61.9 billion of budget authority and $23.5 billion of outlays.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these accompanying tables, which provide details about the adjustment filing, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

REVISIONS TO BUDGET AGGREGATES—BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS

(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 and Section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

($ in billion)

	2024
Current Spending Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	4,878.570
Outlays	5,056.741
Adjustment:	
Budget Authority	61.854
Outlays	23.541
Revised Aggregates:	
Budget Authority	4,940.424
Outlays	5,080.282

REVISIONS TO THE ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

(Pursuant to Section 121 of the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023 and Section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

($ in billions)

	Current Allocation	Adjustments	Revised Allocation
Revised Security Budget Authority	886.349	8.000	894.349
Revised Nonsecurity Budget Authority	703.651	54.198	757.849
General Purpose Outlays	1,813.382	23.830	1,837.212

DETAIL OF ADJUSTMENTS TO THE ALLOCATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

(Pursuant to Sections 302 and 314 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974)

($ in billions)

Detail of Adjustments Made Above	Emergency	Disaster Relief	Program Integrity	Wildfire Suppression	Total
Commerce-Justice-Science:					
Budget Authority	2.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.250
Outlays	0.927	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.927
Defense:					
Budget Authority	8.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	8.000
Outlays	2.209	0.000	0.000	0.000	2.209
Energy and Water:					
Budget Authority	1.365	−0.003	0.000	0.000	1.362
Outlays	0.666	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.666
Financial Services:					
Budget Authority	0.000	0.143	0.000	0.000	0.143
Outlays	0.000	0.110	0.000	0.000	0.110
Homeland Security:					
Budget Authority	4.300	20.261	0.000	0.000	24.561
Outlays	1.605	1.216	0.000	0.000	2.821
Interior and Environment:					
Budget Authority	2.195	0.000	0.000	2.650	4.845
Outlays	1.711	0.000	0.000	0.910	2.621
Labor-HHS-Ed:					
Budget Authority	4.500	0.000	2.447	0.000	6.947
Outlays	2.295	0.000	1.974	0.000	4.269
State-Foreign Operations:					
Budget Authority	3.250	0.000	0.000	0.000	3.250
Outlays	1.939	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.939
Transportation-HUD:					
Budget Authority	10.840	0.000	0.000	0.000	10.840
Outlays	8.268	0.000	0.000	0.000	8.268
Total:					
Revised Discretionary Budget Authority	36.700	20.401	2.447	2.650	62.198
Revised Discretionary Outlays	19.620	1.326	1.974	0.910	23.830

Note: Emergency-designated funding in the Defense bill adjusts the revised security allocation; other emergency-designated funding adjusts the nonsecurity allocation. Of the program integrity amounts, $344 million of budget authority and $289 million of outlays are from the Disability Insurance Trust Fund and are off-budget. The off-budget amounts are not included in the adjustment to the budget aggregates.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

DISCLOSURE OF CONGRESSIONALLY DIRECTED SPENDING ITEMS UNDER RULE XLIV OF THE STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I certify that the information required by rule XLIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate related to congressionally directed spending items has been identified in the committee reports which are incorporated by reference in Senate amendment 1092 to H.R. 4366 and that the required information has been

available on a publicly accessible congressional website at least 48 hours before a vote on the pending bill.

TRIBUTE TO PAT HUGHES

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, for nearly three decades, the crack of the bat, the smell of fresh cut grass, the greening of the ivy, and the sound of Pat Hughes' voice reporting from the ''beautiful and historic Wrigley Field'' has let Cubs fans far and wide know, it is time for baseball. This July, Pat Hughes—the voice of Cubs baseball and a Chicago legend—was awarded the 2023 Ford C. Frick Award by the National Baseball Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, NY—the highest honor in broadcasting.

Born in Tucson, AZ, Pat was raised in San Jose, CA. His father worked in the education department at San Jose State University, where Pat would later enroll. Pat would frequent the university's sporting events with his father and brother, smitten by the cadre of future greats that took the field for the Spartans. At around 17 years old, he realized he wasn't quite good enough to make a career playing, but his passion for sports fueled his determination to find a sports career.

Just hours before Pat's acceptance speech at Cooperstown, he recounted that, ''It kind of feels a little bit surreal. As if it's almost happening to someone else, and I'm just kind of watching.'' Ironically, watching on sidelines was where Pat's broadcasting career began.

At San Jose State University, while sitting on the bench for his college basketball team, he started to announce the game unfolding in front of him before his first listening audience: the other benchwarmers on the team. One of his teammates complimented Pat's knack for play-by-play. Once basketball season was over, Pat called his first baseball game, San Jose State versus the University of California Santa Barbara.

In 1978, Pat graduated from San Jose State University with a degree in radio/TV journalism and began his baseball broadcasting career for a minor league team: the San Jose Missions. After a season with the Columbus Clippers, he joined the Minnesota Twins broadcast team in 1983 before moving to Milwaukee just a year later, where he called Brewers games on radio with Milwaukee legend Bob Uecker.

I first heard Pat when my son Paul enrolled at Marquette University. Back then, Pat was calling basketball games for Marquette, and even then, Pat had the distinct style that we all have come to appreciate. Pat would go on to call basketball games for Marquette for 16 seasons, including years spent alongside local legend, Coach Al McGuire.

Since 1996, Pat has been the radio play-by-play announcer for the Chicago Cubs. The 2022 season marked the 40th consecutive year that Hughes served as a Major League Baseball announcer. With nearly three decades in Chicago, Pat is a Cubs institution. And, not only has he been a fixture in Wrigley since 1996, he almost never misses work. For nearly 11 years, he called nearly every inning of every Cubs game before he finally took a day off.

A student of the game and a master of his craft, Pat regularly studied broadcasters he admired. He would listen to recordings of games that he called, analyze the modulation of his voice, eliminate filler, and perfect his catchphrases, setting the standard of meticulous preparation that he carries with him today. And just like the benchwarmer back in the 70s that called the basketball game, Pat seizes every moment.

Never one to rest on his laurels, when Pat learned that he would be the just the third broadcaster to be inducted into the Cubs Hall of Fame, he went right back to calling the play, completely awestruck, but like the true professional he is, he never missed a beat. And little did he know that just a few months later, he would be getting the call from Cooperstown. Pat lives his life play-by-play—staying in the moment, constantly improving, and transporting Cubs fans everywhere to Wrigley Field with his distinctive voice. During Pat's acceptance speech in Cooperstown, he thanked Cubs fans for making him part of the Cubs family, inviting him to graduations, bar mitzvahs, and birthdays. And he was quick to give credit to the line-up of broadcasters that he deeply admired.

Many remember Pat's time in the booth with Cubs Hall of Famer, the late Ron Santo, his broadcasting partner from 1996 until 2010. The ''Pat and Ron'' show was a favorite for the fans as Hughes worked well with the former third baseman, who wasn't shy to hide his love for the Cubs. A nine-time winner of the Illinois Sportscaster of the Year Award, Pat also won three straight Wisconsin Sportscaster of the Year Awards from 1990–92. He has called more than 6,000 MLB games, including eight no-hitters, the 25-inning White Sox v. Brewers contest in 1984 that was the longest game in American League history, and Kerry Wood's 20-strikeout game in 1998.

On November 2, 2016, when the Chicago Cubs ended a 108-year drought by winning game seven of the World Series, it was Pat who called the final out. He will forever be a part of Chicago Cubs history, and just as Pat studied other broadcasters, his legacy will be one to learn from.

I congratulate Pat; his wife Trish; their daughters Janell and Amber; and his entire family on this achievement. Cubs fans everywhere are flying the W for you. And, as Pat would say, ''Get out the tape measure, Long Gone!''—all the way to Cooperstown.

REMEMBERING DR. SHANNON KULA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise to honor the life and legacy of Dr. Shannon Kula, former Senator Barbara Mikulski's chief of staff and a beloved member of the Maryland congressional team and Capitol Hill community. Shannon passed away recently after a long and heroic fight against breast cancer.

As Senator Mikulski remarked, ''Her vibrant, inspirational personality made an impact on us all. She had such dedication, during those long hours—always with a smile and encouraging word. Shannon was a great friend, great advisor and brilliant strategist who took charge of making things happen all while making everyone feel good while she did it. She had a luminous spirit that blessed us all.''

We all know the role that our staff plays in the work and life of the Senate. Shannon helped Senator Mikulski on so many of her accomplishments—from the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act, to guaranteeing access to women's preventive healthcare to policies that support military families—Shannon was by Senator Mikulski's side. She also helped organize the bipartisan women Senators and played an important role in helping elect more women to the U.S. Senate.

Shannon played an important role in developing and enacting policies that improved people's lives. She also improved the lives of those who had the good fortune to work with her. The friendships she developed with the Mikulski staff and the wider Senate community were deep and lasting. She led with grace and humor. She mentored younger staff. She set a tone of civility and kindness, even in the rough and tumble world of politics. She was a valued colleague to so many people and a leader of what we in the delegation like to call ''Team Maryland.''

Shannon received B.A. degrees in political science and government and in psychology from the University of Rochester. She was the first person in her family to attend college. While Shannon was working in the Senate, she finished her master's degree and doctorate at Georgetown University, a truly remarkable accomplishment for anyone who knows the long and unpredictable hours Senate staff routinely work. After she left the Senate, she continued to serve, as director of the University of Saint Joseph's Women's Leadership Center and when she ran for a Congressional seat in her home State of Connecticut.

Shannon married her college sweetheart, Dr. Ron Clark, a U.S. Marine who served 20 years in the Corps. Everyone who knew the couple recognized what an incredible team they were. She was a loving aunt who was very involved in the lives of her nieces and nephews, traveling the world with them and encouraging them through their educations and military service.

Shannon's death is a tragedy. But her life was a triumph. I join Senator Mikulski and so many others in our Capitol community in honoring her extraordinary life. May her memory be a blessing to her family and friends; may her life be a continuing inspiration to all who, like Shannon, strive to serve others.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING RICHARD HAYES CESLER, SR.

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, with my fellow Members of Idaho's congressional delegation Senator JIM RISCH and Representatives MIKE SIMPSON and RUSS FULCHER, we pay tribute to an outstanding Idahoan, Richard ''Rich'' Hayes Cesler, Sr., who served our country and its veterans with great distinction. He passed away on July 16, 2023.

Rich not only assisted living veterans and their families, but also made sure thousands were recognized and honored after their passing. Rich partnered with Fred Salanti in cofounding the nonprofit Missing in America, MIA, Project. Rich served as the MIA Project's national cemeteries/laws coordinator. Since 2006, the duo led MIA Project volunteers nationwide who have interred the unclaimed cremated remains of nearly 5,800 veterans.

As a Vietnam veteran, Rich connected with the many veterans and their families he helped. He grew up in Portsmouth, VA, and joined the U.S. Air Force directly after high school. He obtained the rank of sergeant during his service from 1966 to 1972. He was trained as a jet aircraft mechanic and aircraft maintenance technician and served as a crew chief in Saigon, Vietnam, working on F–111 aircraft.

His loved ones characterize Rich as ''a true renaissance man'' who dabbled in many different hobbies and occupations. His obituary includes a list of his vocations after his military service noting that in no particular order he ''was a life insurance agent, a police officer, Veteran Service Officer, small business owner, general contractor, cargo/baggage handler, senior customer service agent, international head judge for car stereo contests, promoter, Director of two State Veteran cemeteries, beta tester, trainer, VFW state commander, he drafted legislation, delivered seminars, was a competitor at car stereo contests, a published writer, and a die-hard veteran supporter and advocate.'' In fact, he was recognized with a 2011 Spirit of Freedom: Idaho Veterans Service Award for his unselfish dedication to his fellow veterans and their families. His work as director of two State veterans cemeteries to ensure veterans and their spouses received the burials they were promised and his founding of the MIA Project were among the many examples of his dedicated service to others cited in his award recognition.

Honoring Rich Cesler in Congress in September during National POW/MIA Recognition Month, a time set aside to highlight ongoing efforts to seek answers for families of America's prisoners of war—POWs—and missing in action—MIA—is deeply fitting as Rich made sure lost soldiers were honored here at home. He saw firsthand that America's veterans did not only go missing overseas. He recognized that the shelves of funeral homes, coroner's offices, and State hospitals and even far less ceremonial locations should not be the final resting places for veterans who do not have remaining family or have lost touch with their families. MIA Project volunteers' commendable efforts to honor veterans lost right here at home were rightly recognized. This includes our understanding that he was being considered for a Presidential award for his Missing in America Project. Rich said, ''The MIA Project has become the voice for those who have none and continues to be dedicated to remembering our forgotten heroes.''

Rich accomplished one of the greatest things we can achieve in our lifetime: He used his talents and experiences to meaningfully help others. His actions demonstrated his deep understanding that great personal rewards came from giving to others instead of seeking personal gains. And, despite his solemn work, he found and shared joy. Rich was known for his amazing sense of humor. As noted in his obituary, ''This was one of his greatest joys, to laugh and make others laugh.'' May the joy, levity, and dedication he gave to so many during his time on earth comfort his many friends and loved ones, including his wife of 47 years Joyce; six children and their spouses; 17 grandchildren; 20 great-grandchildren; and many others. We join in mourning this great Idahoan and American and pay tribute to his extraordinary legacy.•

TRIBUTE TO DAVID HECKER

• Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I rise today to honor an accomplished and highly regarded leader in Michigan's labor movement, David Hecker, president of the American Federation of Teachers—AFT—Michigan. David has made an immeasurable impact on the State of Michigan and its many educators and healthcare providers over the past 40 years, and it is a privilege to recognize him here today and celebrate his upcoming retirement.

David's engagement with the labor movement first began in 1977, when he became a member of AFT Local 3220, a union of graduate assistants at the University of Wisconsin-Madison where he earned his Ph.D. in industrial relations. Following his graduation, David's commitment to strengthening the labor movement continued to grow, serving as the executive assistant to the president of the Metropolitan Detroit AFL–CIO from 1986 to 1996, where he worked to protect the welfare of Michigan's labor force and support the activities of local unions.

David's history with the Michigan chapter of the AFT began with his service as secretary-treasurer for the organization in the late 1990s. In 2001, David was named the president of AFT Michigan, a role which he has occupied with distinction since. Under his leadership, AFT Michigan has organized many new locals that represent thousands of Michiganders working in public education and healthcare, in addition to expanding partnerships in the State and overall strengthening Michigan's labor movement.

In 2004, David expanded his involvement with the labor movement to a national level, and began his service as a vice president of the national AFT, which included serving on the AFT executive committee and cochairing the AFT organizing committee. For many years, he has been a member of the Michigan State AFL–CIO and Metro Detroit AFL–CIO's executive mommittees and has also been a member of AFT delegations to the Education International World Congress, worked with the National Union of Teachers in England, the Cambodian Independent Teachers Union, and higher education unions in Israel and the occupied territories.

David's legacy of leadership and service expands beyond the labor movement. His work includes serving as the chair of Community in Schools Michigan and the Green and Health Schools Coalition; as cochair of the Metropolitan Affairs Corporation; on the boards of Promote the Vote, the Michigan League for Public Policy, the Education Alliance of Michigan and New Detroit; and finally, as an officer-at-large of the Michigan Democratic Party.

I cannot understate the impact that David Hecker has had on Michigan's workforce and labor movement. A lifelong trade unionist, he has over these many years steadfastly promoted positive change in our communities and created a model for public service that is unmatched. Though his leadership at the American Federation of Teachers Michigan will be sorely missed, his legacy will most certainly endure and continue to inspire.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL KEVIN P. BURNS

• Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I recognize Kevin P. Burns as he retires from a distinguished 52–year career in the U.S. Air Force as an Active-Duty pilot and later as a civil servant at Eglin Air Force Base in Florida.

Kevin graduated from the U.S. Air Force Academy in 1975 and served honorably as an Active-Duty pilot until 2002. As a fighter pilot during the Cold War, he was deployed to Iceland where he intercepted and escorted Soviet bombers away from U.S. bases. He later served as a test pilot and flew more

than 65 different aircraft, including F–15s, F–16s, F–4s, and A–10s as well as other developmental aircraft. His last flight was in a B–52 Stratofortress out of Barksdale Air Force Base in Louisiana in June 2022.

Kevin retired from Active Duty in October 2002, after serving as the vice wing commander of the 46th Test Wing at Eglin Air Force Base. Following Active Duty, Kevin continued his service to our great country as a civilian, leading the development of policy, products, and standards for the Air Force's 53rd Test Management Group, the U.S. Air Force's largest operational test wing, at Eglin Air Force Base.

Kevin's work over the decades has had an immeasurable impact on America's national security. His dedication to the mission and tireless efforts have contributed to the safety of all Americans.

I extend my best wishes to Kevin and his family on his retirement and thank him for his service.●

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–1973. A communication from the Yeoman Petty Officer First Class, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Pier 15 Fireworks; San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0349)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1974. A communication from the Yeoman Petty Officer First Class, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Pier 15 Fireworks; SFSU Graduation Fireworks; San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0344)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1975. A communication from the Yeoman Petty Officer First Class, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zones; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0481)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1976. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''State Enforcement of Inland Navigation Rules'' ((RIN1625–AC81) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0071)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1977. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Regulated Navigation Area; Hampton Roads, VA'' ((RIN1625–AA11) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0059)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1978. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Henderson Bay, Henderson Harbor, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0308)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1979. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Back River, Baltimore County, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0464)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1980. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Henderson Bay, Henderson Bay, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0429)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1981. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; City of Toledo Fireworks; Maumee River; Toledo, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0509)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1982. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Marysville Funfest Fireworks, St. Clair River; Marysville, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0375)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1983. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Roosertail Fireworks, Detroit River, Detroit, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0377)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1984. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0580)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1985. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Mercury Powerboat Race; Sheboygan Harbor, Sheboygan, Wisconsin'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0490)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1986. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Henderson Bay, Henderson Harbor, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0309)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1987. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Kaiser Fireworks, Lake St. Clair; Grosse Pointe Park, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0616)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1988. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Presque Isle Bay, Erie, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0560)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1989. A communication from the Legal Tech, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Anchor Bay Bass, Brew, and BBQ Fireworks, Lake St. Clair; Chesterfield, MI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0503)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1990. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Type of Regulation; Lake of the Ozarks MM.5 - 1, approximately 500 feet off the Bagnell Dam, Lake of the Ozarks, MO'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0457)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1991. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway (AICW) and Miami Beach Channel, Miami, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0371)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1992. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Type of Regulation; Lake of the Ozarks MM.5 - 1, approximately 500 feet off the Bagnell Dam, Lake of the Ozarks, MO'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0457)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1993. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zone; Cooper River, Charleston, SC''

((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0517)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1994. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Security Zones; Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Corpus Christi, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA87) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0569)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1995. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Horsepower on the Hudson, Hudson River, Castleton-on-Hudson, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0015)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1996. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; St. Mary's River, St. George's Creek, Piney Point, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0418)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1997. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Horsepower on the Hudson, Hudson River, Castleton-on-Hudson, NY'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0015)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1998. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Los Angeles Harbor, San Pedro, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0473)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–1999. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Back River, Baltimore County, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0462)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2000. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulation; Back River, Baltimore County, MD'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0461)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2001. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Special Local Regulations and Safety Zons; Recurring Marine Events, Fireworks Displays, and Swim Events held in the Coast Guard Sector Long Island Sound Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA08) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0001)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2002. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Recurring Fireworks Displays and Swim Events in Coast Guard Sector New York Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0075)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2003. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zones; Recurring Fireworks Displays and Swim Events in Coast Guard Sector New York Zone'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0075)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2004. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Corpus Christi Bay, Corpus Christi, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0544)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2005. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Glorietta Bay, Coronado, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0144)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2006. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River, Prairie du Chien, WI'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0465)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2007. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Atlantic Ocean, Virginia Beach, VA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0524)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2008. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Firework Display; Appomattox River, Hopewell, VA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0452)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2009. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Marathon July 4th Fireworks, Marathon, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0508)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2010. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Key West July 4th Fireworks, Key West, FL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0369)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2011. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Savannah River 4th of July Fireworks Show, Savannah, GA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0518)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2012. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Vineyard Wind 1 Wind Farm Project Area, Outer Continental Shelf, Lease OCS–A 0501, Offshore Massachusetts, Atlantic Ocean'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0277)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2013. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Kanawha River, Charleston, WV'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0355)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2014. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Fireworks Display, Delaware River, Philadelphia, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0421)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2015. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Laguna Madre, South Padre Island, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0463)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2016. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Potomac River, Between Charles County, MD, and King George County, VA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2022–0145)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2017. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of

Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Ohio River, Racine, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0197)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2018. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Chinese Harbor; Santa Cruz Island, California'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0009)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2019. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Illinois River Mile Markers 163.3 to 162.7, Peoria, IL'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0229)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2020. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Sausalito Fireworks Display; San Francisco Bay, Sausalito, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0415)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2021. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; San Francisco Giants Drone Display; San Francisco Bay, San Francisco, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0454)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2022. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Kanawha River, Charleston, WV'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0353)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2023. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Kanawha River, Charleston, WV'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0355)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2024. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River MM 660.5–659.5, Lansing, IA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0664)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2025. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Coast Guard Island, Alameda, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0623)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2026. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Ohio River Mile Markers 90.4–91, Wheeling, WV'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0610)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2027. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Ohio River MM 469.5–470.5 and Licking River MM 0.0 to 0.3, Cincinnati, OH'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0256)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2028. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Kanawha River, Mile Markers 41.5 to 42.5, Nitro, WV'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0613)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2029. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Fleet Week Maritime Festival, Pier 62, Elliot Bay, Seattle, Washington'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0614)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2030. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Delaware River, Chester, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0574)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2031. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River MM 660.5–659.5, Lansing, IA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0564)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2032. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Port of Los Angeles, San Pedro Bay, CA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0528)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2033. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Laguna Madre, South Padre Island, TX'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0547)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2034. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Kanawha River, Nitro, WV'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0354)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2035. A communication from the Legal Yeoman, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety Zone; Delaware River, Fireworks Display, Philadelphia, PA'' ((RIN1625–AA00) (Docket No. USCG–2023–0557)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2036. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts, including Coast Guard military personnel accounts, from any discretionary cap sequestration in fiscal year 2024, if a sequestration is necessary; to the Committees on Appropriations; Armed Services; and the Budget.

EC–2037. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Mid-Session Review of the Budget of the U.S. Government for Fiscal Year 2024''; to the Committees on Appropriations; and the Budget.

EC–2038. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''(2S)-5-Oxopyrrolidine-2-carboxylic Acid (L–PCA); Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 11022–01–OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2039. A communication from the Associate Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Flg22-Bt Peptide; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance'' (FRL No. 11264–01–OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2040. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Spinetoram; Pesticide Tolerances'' (FRL No. 11035–01–OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2041. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Process for Establishing Rates for Veterinary Services User Fees'' ((RIN0579–AE67) (Docket No. APHIS–2021–0052)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2042. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs

Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Allocation of Supply Assistance (SCA) Funds to Alleviate Supply Chain Disruptions in the School Meal Programs'' received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2043. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Child Nutrition Program Integrity'' (RIN0584–AE08) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2044. A communication from the Chief of the Planning and Regulatory Affairs Branch, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Thrifty Food Plan Cost Estimates for Alaska and Hawaii'' received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 23, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2045. A communication from the Director of the Regulations Management Division, Rural Development, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fertilizer Production Expansion Program'' received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2046. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Reporting and Information Requirements Derivatives Clearing Organizations'' (RIN3038–AF12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2023; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–2047. A communication from the Chief of Staff, United States Army, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report by the Armed Forces on Out-Year Unconstrained Total Munitions Requirements and Out-Year Inventory Numbers (OSS–2023–0760); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2048. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2049. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Industrial Base Policy), transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim response to the reporting requirement on any negotiated comprehensive subcontracting plan that the Secretary determines did not meet the subcontracting goals negotiated in the plan for the prior fiscal year; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2050. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on Department of Defense Fiscal Year 2022 Purchases from foreign entities''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2051. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition and Sustainment), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Report to Congress on Distribution of Department of Defense Depot Maintenance Workloads for Fiscal Years 2022 through 2024''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2052. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Industrial Base Policy), transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim response to the reporting requirement on any negotiated comprehensive subcontracting plan that the Secretary determines did not meet the subcontracting goals negotiated in the plan for the prior fiscal year; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2053. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2054. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2055. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2056. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2057. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the first session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–2058. A communication from the Alternate Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Defense Commercial Solutions Opening'' (RIN0750–AL57) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 6, 2023; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–35. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging and requesting the United States Congress to support the extension of funding for the Affordable Connectivity Program (ACP) of 2021, which provides their citizens with access to broadband services; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 103

Whereas, in August of 2019, by executive order, Governor John Bel Edwards created the Broadband for Everyone in Louisiana commission. This commission facilitates private sector providers, public entities, and other broadband stakeholders to improve both the adoption and availability of broadband service for Louisiana residents by providing universal access to broadband service; and

Whereas, during the 2020 Second Extraordinary Session of the Legislature of Louisiana, the legislature created the office of broadband and connectivity within the governor's office to promote and encourage broadband adoption for households in an effort to eliminate the digital divide in Louisiana by 2029; and

Whereas, the office of broadband and connectivity's mission is to coordinate federal, state, and municipal efforts by identifying best practices and tactics necessary in their goal; and

Whereas, in 2021, as part of the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act's historic investment in broadband infrastructure and digital equity, Congress appropriated more than fourteen billion dollars for the ACP; and

Whereas, Congress assigned the Federal Communications Commission to administer the ACP, the successor program to the Emergency Broadband Benefit, which helped almost nine million households afford internet access during the pandemic; and

Whereas, under the ACP, eligible households can receive up to thirty dollars per month discount toward internet services and up to seventy-five dollars per month for households on qualifying tribal lands; and

Whereas, eligible households may also receive a one-time discount of up to one hundred dollars to purchase a laptop, desktop computer, or tablet from participating providers; and

Whereas, Louisiana was the first state to receive broadband award approval from the bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act and is number one in the nation for ACP enrollment with an estimated forty-six percent of eligible households enrolled; and

Whereas, currently, there are more than nine hundred thousand eligible households within the state that may qualify for the ACP and four hundred and twenty-two thousand, two hundred and fifty-seven households that have enrolled; and

Whereas, based on current take rates, the more than fourteen billion dollars in funding appropriated for the ACP program could be exhausted in late 2023 or early 2024; and

Whereas, the ACP has been a critical tool in helping bridge the ''digital divide'' that exists between those who have access to modem information and communications technology and those who do not; therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby urge and request each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation to support continued funding of the ACP so that low-income Louisiana households can continue to receive the support they need to participate in the digital marketplace; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–36. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana urging and requesting the Transportation and Security Administration (TSA) of the United States to have discussions with the Department of Public Safety and Corrections (DPS&C) regarding the development of guidelines and procedures for individuals released from DPS&C custody and those on probation or parole for a pre-application process for Transportation Worker Identification Credential cards (TWIC cards) while in custody and to work on a process to streamline felony conviction automatic denials; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 275

Whereas, the Maritime Transportation Security Act of 2001 (MTSA) was introduced following the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, and became P.L. 107–295 in 2002; and

Whereas, the MTSA provided that TWIC cards were to be issued to workers who have access to secure areas of the nation's maritime facilities and vessels; and

Whereas, TSA and the United States Coast Guard jointly administer the TWIC card program; and

Whereas, TSA has rules and regulations in place to address an applicant's criminal history on a case-by-case basis through an appeals and waiver process; and

Whereas, DPS&C releases over thirteen thousand individuals back into the community each year and supervises over forty-four thousand individuals; and

Whereas, securing a TWIC card as soon as possible after release provides for more opportunities for employment; and

Whereas, according to the Ports Association of Louisiana, five hundred twenty-five thousand jobs in Louisiana are tied to the state's ports; additionally, there are over two hundred sixty thousand jobs related to the oil and gas industry in Louisiana; many of the jobs require a valid TWIC card; and

Whereas, employment is critical to the success of those on supervision and studies show that unemployment is a major predictor of recidivism; and

Whereas, it is critical to our national security to protect and secure the nation's maritime facilities and vessels through the TWIC card process; and

Whereas, it is also critical that opportunities are available to those who have demonstrated rehabilitation and are seeking a second chance; and

Whereas, according to TSA, individuals in the custody of DPS&C are not eligible to apply for a TWIC card until after they have been released from custody; and

Whereas, TSA issues TWIC cards within its current regulations to individuals with certain felony convictions; and

Whereas, the appeal and waiver process takes months for TSA to review conviction details, circumstances, proof of rehabilitation, and whether the person is in the process of rehabilitation before issuing a waiver or ruling on an appeal; and

Whereas, applying for a TWIC card and beginning the appeal and waiver process prior to a person's release from DPS&C will increase chances of employment shortly after release: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby urge and request the Transportation and Security Administration of the United States to have discussions with the Department of Public Safety and Corrections regarding the development of guidelines and procedures for individuals released from the custody of the Department of Public Safety and Corrections and those on probation or parole for a pre-application process for Transportation Worker Identification Credential cards while in custody and to work on a process to streamline felony conviction automatic denials; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the secretary of the Department of Homeland Security of the United States, the administrator of the Transportation and Security Administration, presiding officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Louisiana Congressional Delegation.

POM–37. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Wyoming recognizing and congratulating the United States Air Force on the 75th anniversary of its founding; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 5

Whereas, the UnIted States Air Force was founded in 1947 and has had a continuous and active presence in Wyoming since that time; and

Whereas, The United States Air force's heritage in Wyoming pre-dates the Air Force founded as a separate military branch and includes the significant training mission of strategic bomber crews at the Casper Army Air Field during World War II; and

Whereas, Francis E. Warren Air Force Base is the oldest continuously active, Air Force based in the Nation; and

Whereas, Francis E. Warren Air Force Base has played a vital role in the strategic defense of the United States and its allies by maintaining the first fully operational Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM), the Atlas D, in 1959; and

Whereas, Francis E. Warren Air Force Base is home to the 90th Missile Wing, one of three active missile wings currently operating the Minuteman III ICBM and the headquarters of 20th Air Force, which commands all. three (3) missile wings; and

Whereas, the 90th Missile wing was the only military unit to operate the Peacekeeper ICBM, the most advanced ballistic missile fielded to date which was deployed exclusively in Wyoming; and

Whereas, the 90th Missile Wing will continue to play a vital role in the strategic defense of the United States now and into the future and be the first unit to deploy the new Sentinel ICBM; and

Whereas, the University of Wyoming has a strong history of supporting the United States Air Force by establishing Air Force ROTC Detachment 940 in 1952 and counting Samuel C. Phillips, the leader of the Air Force's Minuteman ICBM program, as an alumnus; and

Whereas, the Wyoming Air National Guard has continuously supported our state and nation since 1946; and

Whereas, the Wyoming Air National Guard became part of the Air Force in 1947 and ever since has honorably, ably and faithfully been the ''Sword and Shield'' for our state and nation; and

Whereas, the Wyoming Air National Guard, as the Sword, has played a vital role in guarding the United States and defending freedom in nearly every major conflict and contingency by repeatedly answering the nation's call in places such as Korea, Kuwait, Afghanistan, Iraq and around the world; and

Whereas, the Wyoming Air National Guard, as the Shield, has fought fires on the ground and in the air in Wyoming and throughout the West, mitigated flooding in Saratoga, Fremont county and elsewhere, and most recently provided desperately needed manpower for medical facilities throughout the state during the height of the COVID–19 pandemic; and

Whereas, the State of Wyoming is dedicated to memorializing the story of the Air Force through the Wyoming Veterans Memorial Museum and Quebec 01 Missile Alert Facility State Historic Site. Now, Therefore

Be it Resolved by the Members of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming:

Section 1.

(a) The State of Wyoming commends the United States Air Force on its 75th anniversary.

(b) The State of Wyoming acknowledges the strong historic relationship between the United States Air Force and the State.

(c) The State of Wyoming recognizes the significant service that the United States Air Force currently provides in protecting our vital state and national interests.

(d) The State of Wyoming is determined to continue the strong partnership between the State and the United States Air Force.

Section 2. That the Secretary of State of Wyoming transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Wyoming Congressional Delegation, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, the Commander of the 90th Missile Wing, 20th Air Force and the Commander of the Air Force ROTC Detachment 940.

POM–38. A resolution adopted by the Senate of Louisiana memorializing the United States Congress to pass the AMERICANS Act of 2023 to reinstate any service member removed from any branch of the military for refusing the COVID–19 vaccine; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 117

Whereas, in August of 2021, United States Defense Secretary Lloyd Austin required COVID–19 vaccinations for all service members; and

Whereas, at the direction of Congress in January of 2022, Secretary Austin rescinded the COVID–19 vaccination mandate; and

Whereas, during the effective period of the mandate, approximately eight thousand two hundred service members of the armed forces were discharged for refusing to get the vaccine for religious or other reasons; and

Whereas, while the passing of the 2023 National Defense Authorization Act ended the mandate, it did not go far enough to prevent a similar mandate in the future or provide meaningful remedies for service members that were kicked out of the military; and

Whereas, if the AMERICANS Act of 2023 is enacted, service members that were involuntarily separated from their service would be credited with missed retirement pay, have their rank restored, and receive any compensation for any pay or benefits lost due to the demotion or discharge; and

Whereas, the AMERICANS Act of 2023 would also change any ''general'' discharge given to the unvaccinated to ''honorable'' and expunge the records of service members who faced adverse action for their refusal to be vaccinated; and

Whereas, the enactment of the AMERICANS Act of 2023 would result in a fair and just outcome for those loyal service members who were discharged for remaining true to their personal convictions. Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to pass the AMERICANS Act of 2023 to reinstate any service member removed from any branch of the military for refusing the COVID–19 vaccine. Be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this Resolution shall be transmitted to the secretary of the United States Senate and the clerk of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Louisiana delegation to the United States Congress.

POM–39. A resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to assist in the establishment of a Louisiana pilot program for the recruitment of new United States Army members to address the military recruitment shortage; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 239

Whereas, the United States Army was founded to serve the American people, defend the nation, protect vital national interests, and fulfill national military responsibilities; and

Whereas, the United States Army helps to maintain peace and stability in the United States and in regions critical to the interests of the United States; and

Whereas, recruiting and retaining service members is essential for our military members and national security; and

Whereas, in recent years, the United States Army has struggled to recruit qualified and willing recruits; and

Whereas, last fiscal year, the United States Army missed its recruiting goal by fifteen thousand active duty soldiers, or twenty-five percent of its target; and

Whereas, the United States Senate Committee on Armed Services convened recently to explore solutions to the military recruitment crisis; and

Whereas, for decades, Louisiana has had the nation's highest incarceration rate and state leaders have sought programs to reduce recidivism and alternatives to incarceration; and

Whereas, elected officials want to work with the armed forces, law enforcement, and advocates to develop a plan to improve military eligibility which includes nonviolent offenders between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five with a high school diploma or college degree, such as an associate degree or bachelor's degree, to participate in the pilot program and join the United States Army; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to assist in the establishment of a Louisiana pilot program for the recruitment of new United States Army members to address the military recruitment shortage.

Resolved, that the offenders who fail to complete the pilot program or who fail to enlist in the United States Army shall return to the custody of the Department of Public Safety and Corrections with credit for time served in the pilot program.

Resolved, that a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

POM–40. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to assist in the establishment of a Louisiana pilot program for the recruitment of new United States Army members to address the military recruitment shortage; to the Committee on Armed Services.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 90

Whereas, the United States Army was founded to serve the American people, defend the nation, protect vital national interests, and fulfill national military responsibilities; and

Whereas, the United States Army helps to maintain peace and stability in the United States and in regions critical to the interests of the United States; and

Whereas, recruiting and retaining service members is essential for our military members and national security; and

Whereas, in recent years, the United States Army has struggled to recruit qualified and willing recruits; and

Whereas, last fiscal year, the United States Army missed its recruiting goal by fifteen thousand active duty soldiers, or twenty-five percent of its target; and

Whereas, the United States Senate Committee on Armed Services convened recently to explore solutions to the military recruitment crisis; and

Whereas, for decades, Louisiana has had the nation's highest incarceration rate and state leaders have sought programs to reduce recidivism and alternatives to incarceration; and

Whereas, elected officials want to work with the armed forces, law enforcement, and advocates to develop a plan to improve military eligibility which includes nonviolent offenders between the ages of eighteen and twenty-five with a high school diploma or college degree, such as an associate degree or bachelor's degree, to participate in the pilot program and join the United States Army; Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to assist in the establishment of a Louisiana pilot program for the recruitment of new United States Army members to address the military recruitment shortage; and be it further

Resolved, That the offenders who fail to complete the pilot program or who fail to enlist in the United States Army shall return to the custody of the Department of Public Safety and Corrections with credit for time served in the pilot program; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America and to each member of the Louisiana congressional delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. CANTWELL, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 447. A bill to establish a demonstration program for the active remediation of orbital debris and to require the development of uniform orbital debris standard practices in order to support a safe and sustainable orbital environment, and for other purposes.

S. 1303. A bill to require sellers of event tickets to disclose comprehensive information to consumers about ticket prices and related fees.

S. 1669. A bill to require the Secretary of Transportation to issue a rule requiring access to AM broadcast stations in motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. PETERS for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*Robert G. Taub, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Postal Regulatory Commission for a term expiring October 14, 2028.

*Tanya Monique Jones Bosier, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Danny Lam Hoan Nguyen, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Kenechukwu Onyemaechi Okocha, of the District of Columbia, to be an Associate Judge of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia for the term of fifteen years.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

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. SCOTT of Florida (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2762. A bill to award posthumously a Congressional Gold Medal to Robert Cleckler (''Bobby'') Bowden, in honor of his achievements both on and off the football field; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

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

S. 2763. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2395 East Del Mar Boulevard in Laredo, Texas as the ''Lance Corporal David Lee Espinoza, Lance Corporal Juan Rodrigo Rodriguez & Sergeant Roberto Arizola Jr. Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BARRASSO:

S. 2764. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a rebate by manufacturers for selected drugs and biological products subject to maximum fair price negotiation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RICKETTS:

S. 2765. A bill to require a watermark for AI-generated materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. LUJAN (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2766. A bill to amend title V of the Public Health Service Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 2767. A bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update the resource limit for supplemental security income eligibility; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 2768. A bill to protect hospital personnel from violence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CASEY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. SMITH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 2769. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 to prevent wage theft and assist in the recovery of stolen wages, to authorize the Secretary of Labor to administer grants to prevent wage and hour violations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. COONS, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2770. A bill to prohibit the distribution of materially deceptive AI-generated audio or visual media relating to candidates for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. HASSAN (for herself and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 2771. A bill to allow additional individuals to enroll in standalone dental plans offered through Federal Exchanges; to the

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. FETTERMAN):

S. 2772. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve direct certification, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. OSSOFF (for himself, Mr. KELLY, Mr. WARNOCK, Mr. BENNET, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 2773. A bill to amend chapter 131 of title 5, United States Code, to require Members of Congress and their spouses and dependent children to place certain assets into blind trusts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. RUBIO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 2774. A bill to require the denial of admission to the United States for individuals subject to sanctions pursuant to Executive Order 13876, 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. KAINE (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. Res. 335. A resolution designating September 23, 2023, through October 1, 2023, as ''Blue Star Welcome Week''; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. Res. 336. A resolution prohibiting the imposition of vaccination requirements relating to COVID–19 for Senate Pages; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. SMITH):

S. Res. 337. A resolution designating the week beginning September 10, 2023, as ''National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S. Res. 338. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of September 11 through September 17 as ''Patriot Week''; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. Res. 339. A resolution authorizing the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate to conduct a blood donation drive on September 28, 2023; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 26

At the request of Mr. HAGERTY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) were added as cosponsors of S. 26, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made to reporting of third party network transactions by the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021.

S. 76

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 76, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to furnish tailored information to expecting mothers, and for other purposes.

S. 89

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 89, a bill to provide that Members of Congress may not receive pay after October 1 of any fiscal year in which Congress has not approved a concurrent resolution on the budget and passed the regular appropriations bills.

S. 139

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 139, a bill to combat organized crime involving the illegal acquisition of retail goods for the purpose of selling those illegally obtained goods through physical and online retail marketplaces.

S. 140

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the names of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 140, a bill to combat organized crime involving the illegal acquisition of retail goods for the purpose of selling those illegally obtained goods through physical and online retail marketplaces.

S. 596

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 596, 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. 610

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 610, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the frequency of board of directors meetings, and for other purposes.

S. 652

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. FETTERMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 652, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 689

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was withdrawn as a cosponsor of S. 689, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to define currently accepted medical use with severe restrictions, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 689, supra.

S. 743

At the request of Ms. LUMMIS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 743, a bill to establish a national commission on fiscal responsibility and reform, and for other purposes.

S. 940

At the request of Mrs. BLACKBURN, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 940, a bill to establish a demonstration program to provide payments on eligible loans for individuals who are eligible for the National Health Service Corps Loan Repayment Program.

S. 1261

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1261, a bill to clarify the treatment of 2 or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act and the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

S. 1294

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1294, a bill to provide for payment rates for durable medical equipment under the Medicare program.

S. 1307

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1307, a bill to ensure that students in schools have a right to read, and for other purposes.

S. 1529

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1529, a bill to amend the Animal Welfare Act to provide for greater protection of roosters, and for other purposes.

S. 1567

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1567, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to address the teacher and school leader shortage in early childhood, elementary, and secondary education, and for other purposes.

S. 1587

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1587, a bill to provide incentives for States to recover fraudulently paid Federal and State unemployment compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 1665

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1665, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to establish an Advisory Commission on Serving and Supporting Students with Mental Health Disabilities in Institutions of Higher Education, and for other purposes.

S. 1706

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SCHMITT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1706, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the deduction for qualified business income.

S. 1800

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1800, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and extend the Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorders Prevention and Services program, and for other purposes.

S. 1829

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1829, a bill to impose sanctions with respect to persons engaged in the import of petroleum from the Islamic Republic of Iran, and for other purposes.

S. 1930

At the request of Mr. LUJÁN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1930, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to support the buildout of clean school bus charging infrastructure through community facilities direct loans and grants.

S. 1950

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1950, a bill to extend the temporary order for fentanyl-related substances.

S. 2015

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2015, a bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to provide funding for the Gus Schumacher Nutrition Incentive Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2018

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an assessment to identify locations in National Parks in which there is the greatest need for broadband internet access service and areas in National Parks in which there is the greatest need for cellular service, and for other purposes.

S. 2041

At the request of Mr. BRAUN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2041, a bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions.

S. 2085

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG), the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2085, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for Medicare coverage of multi-cancer early detection screening tests.

S. 2272

At the request of Ms. SINEMA, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Ms. LUMMIS) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2272, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for special base rates of pay for wildland firefighters, and for other purposes.

S. 2421

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2421, a bill to require the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation to revise the terms of the Standard Reinsurance Agreement and the Livestock Price Reinsurance Agreement, and for other purposes.

S. 2496

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2496, a bill to amend the National Housing Act to include information regarding VA home loans in the Informed Consumer Choice Disclosure required to be provided to prospective FHA borrowers.

S. 2589

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2589, a bill to amend the Research Facilities Act and the Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 to address deferred maintenance at agricultural research facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 2705

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2705, a bill to grant States the authority to request additional nonimmigrant visas for foreign workers in their respective States, and for other purposes.

S. 2713

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2713, a bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 and the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983 to make commodities available for the Emergency Food Assistance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 2754

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2754, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to publish all information in the possession of the Department of Health and Human Services relating to the origin of COVID–19, and for other purposes.

S. CON. RES. 7

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 7, a concurrent resolution condemning Russia's unjust and arbitrary detention of Russian opposition leader Vladimir Kara-Murza who has stood up in defense of democracy, the rule of law, and free and fair elections in Russia.

S. RES. 260

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 260, a resolution recognizing Tunisia's leadership in the Arab Spring and expressing support for upholding its democratic principles and norms.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 335—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 23, 2023, THROUGH OCTOBER 1, 2023, AS ''BLUE STAR WELCOME WEEK''

Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. SULLIVAN) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 335

Whereas Blue Star Families seeks to empower military families by connecting them with their neighbors, individuals, and organizations to create vibrant communities of mutual support;

Whereas Blue Star Families annually designates the week beginning the second to last Saturday in September and concluding 8 days thereafter as ''Blue Star Welcome Week'';

Whereas, during Blue Star Welcome Week, the Senate recognizes the 600,000 active duty and transitioning military families who move to new communities each year during permanent change of station moves, nearly half of which occur during the summer;

Whereas only 33 percent of military family respondents to the 2022 Military Family Lifestyle Survey conducted by Blue Star Families reported that they feel a sense of belonging to their local civilian community; and

Whereas a sense of belonging is essential to the well-being and readiness of military families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 23, 2023, through October 1, 2023, as ''Blue Star Welcome Week'';

(2) expresses gratitude for the sacrifices made by service members, transitioning veterans, and their families;

(3) commits to ensuring that military-connected families feel a strong sense of belonging to their local civilian communities; and

(4) encourages civilians across the United States to welcome military-connected families into their communities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 336—PROHIBITING THE IMPOSITION OF VACCINATION REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO COVID–19 FOR SENATE PAGES

Mr. PAUL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 336

Resolved,

SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON COVID–19 VACCINATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SENATE PAGES.

A Senate Page or applicant to be a Senate Page may not be required to receive a vaccination for COVID–19.

SENATE RESOLUTION 337—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 10, 2023, AS ''NATIONAL DIRECT SUPPORT PROFESSIONALS RECOGNITION WEEK''

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. WARREN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CASEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. WELCH, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Ms. SMITH) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 337

Whereas direct care workers, including direct support professionals, personal assistants, personal attendants, in-home support workers, and paraprofessionals, are key to providing publicly funded, long-term support and services for millions of individuals with disabilities;

Whereas direct support professionals provide essential services that ensure that all individuals with disabilities are—

(1) included as a valued part of the communities in which those individuals live;

(2) supported at home, at work, and in the communities of the United States; and

(3) empowered to live with the dignity that all people of the United States deserve;

Whereas, by fostering connections between individuals with disabilities and their families, friends, and communities, direct support professionals ensure that individuals with disabilities thrive, thereby avoiding more costly institutional care;

Whereas direct support professionals build close, respectful, and trusting relationships with individuals with disabilities and provide a broad range of personalized support to those individuals, including—

(1) helping individuals make person-centered choices;

(2) assisting with personal care, meal preparation, medication management, and other aspects of daily living;

(3) assisting individuals in accessing the community and securing competitive, integrated employment;

(4) providing transportation to school, work, religious, and recreational activities;

(5) helping with general daily affairs, such as assisting with financial matters, medical appointments, and personal interests; and

(6) assisting individuals in the transition from isolated or congregate settings or services to living in the communities of their choice;

Whereas there is a critical and increasing shortage of direct support professionals throughout the United States, a crisis that was exacerbated by the COVID–19 pandemic, bringing uncertainty and risk to individuals with disabilities;

Whereas direct support professionals do not have their own Standard Occupational Classification for the purposes of Federal data collection, which includes data produced by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor;

Whereas the direct care workforce, including direct support professionals, is expected to grow more than any other occupation in the United States;

Whereas many direct support professionals—

(1) are the primary financial providers for their families;

(2) are hardworking, taxpaying citizens who provide a critical service in the United States; and

(3) continue to earn low wages, receive inadequate benefits, and have limited opportunities for advancement, resulting in high turnover and vacancy rates that adversely affect the quality of support, safety, and health of individuals with disabilities; and

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in Olmstead v. L.C., 527 U.S. 581 (1999)—

(1) recognized the importance of the deinstitutionalization of, and community-based services for, individuals with disabilities; and

(2) held that, under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S. 12101 et seq.), a State must provide person-centered, community-based service options to individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning September 10, 2023, as ''National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week'';

(2) recognizes the dedication and vital role of direct support professionals in enhancing the lives of individuals with disabilities;

(3) appreciates the contribution of direct support professionals in supporting individuals with disabilities in the United States and the families of those individuals;

(4) commends direct support professionals for being integral to the provision of long-term support and services for individuals with disabilities;

(5) encourages the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor to collect data that is specific to direct support professionals; and

(6) finds that the successful implementation of public policies affecting individuals with disabilities in the United States can depend on the dedication of direct support professionals.

SENATE RESOLUTION 338—EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE DESIGNATION OF THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 11 THROUGH SEPTEMBER 17 AS ''PATRIOT WEEK''

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

S. RES. 338

Whereas the events that led to the signing of the Constitution of the United States by the delegates to the Constitutional Convention on September 17, 1787, have significance for every citizen of the United States and are honored in public schools across the United States on Constitution Day, which is September 17 of each year;

Whereas the rule of law, the social compact, democracy, liberty, equality, and unalienable human rights are the essential values upon which the United States flourishes;

Whereas diversity is one of the greatest strengths of the United States, and the motto inscribed on the Great Seal of the United States, ''E pluribus unum'', Latin for ''out of many, one'', symbolizes that individuals in the United States from all walks of life are unified by shared values;

Whereas exceptional, visionary, and indispensable individuals such as Thomas Paine, Patrick Henry, John Adams, John Marshall, George Washington, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Susan B. Anthony, Rosa Parks, Harriet Tubman, Abraham Lincoln, Frederick Douglass, Martin Luther King, Jr., Thomas Jefferson, and James Madison founded or advanced the United States;

Whereas the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Sentiments and Resolutions signed in Seneca Falls, New York, the Gettysburg Address, the Emancipation Proclamation, and the ''I Have a Dream'' speech delivered by Martin Luther King, Jr., express sentiments that have advanced liberty in the United States; and

Whereas the Bennington flag (commonly known as the ''76 flag''), the Betsy Ross flag, the current flag of the United States, the flag of the women's suffrage movement, the Union flag (commonly known as the ''Fort Sumter flag''), the Gadsden flag, and the flags of the States are physical symbols of the history of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the designation of the week of September 11 through September 17 as ''Patriot Week'';

(2) recognizes that understanding the history of the United States and the first principles of the United States is indispensable to the survival of the United States as a free people;

(3) acknowledges, in great reverence to the victims of the September 11, 2001, attacks, that citizens of the United States should take time to honor the first principles, founders, documents, and symbols of their history;

(4) recognizes that each generation should renew the spirit of the United States based on the first principles, historical figures, founding documents, and symbols of the United States; and

(5) encourages citizens, schools and other educational institutions, and Federal, State, and local governments and their agencies to recognize and participate in Patriot Week by honoring, celebrating, and promoting the study of the history of the United States so that all people of the United States may offer the reverence that is due to the free republic.

SENATE RESOLUTION 339—AUTHORIZING THE SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER OF THE SENATE TO CONDUCT A BLOOD DONATION DRIVE ON SEPTEMBER 28, 2023

Mr. CARPER submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 339

Resolved,

SECTION 1. SENATE BLOOD DONATION DRIVE ON SEPTEMBER 28, 2023.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—In addition to blood donation drives conducted under Senate Resolution 78 (118th Congress), agreed to February 16, 2023, the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, in conjunction with the Blood Bank of Delmarva, is authorized to conduct a blood donation drive, at a location in the Senate Office Buildings, from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. on September 28, 2023.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—

(1) LOCATION.—The Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate shall select the location of the blood donation drive described in subsection (a) in consultation with the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate.

(2) PREPARATIONS AND IMPLEMENTATION.—Physical preparations for the conduct of, and the implementation of, the blood donation drive authorized under subsection (a) shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, in consultation with the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, may prescribe.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1094. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1095. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1096. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1097. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1098. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1099. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1100. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1101. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1102. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1103. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1104. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1105. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1106. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1107. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1108. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1109. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1110. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1111. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1112. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1113. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1114. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1115. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. ROSEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1116. Mr. KELLY (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1117. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1118. Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. RICKETTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1119. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1120. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1121. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1122. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1123. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1124. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1125. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1126. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1127. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1128. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1129. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1130. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1131. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1094. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO MODIFY OR REMOVE ANY DISPLAY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS MISSION STATEMENT.

None of the amounts appropriated by this division or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2024 for the Department of Veterans Affairs may be obligated or expended to modify or remove any display of the Department of Veterans Affairs that bears the mission statement ''To fulfill President Lincoln's promise 'to care for him who shall have borne the battle, for his widow, and his orphan' by serving and honoring the men and women who are America's veterans.''.

SA 1095. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ___. DUTY-FREE ENTRY OF INFANT FORMULA; TERMINATION OF TARIFF-RATE QUOTA ON INFANT FORMULA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 19 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended as follows:

(1) By striking Additional U.S. Note 2.

(2) By inserting after Additional U.S. Note 3 the following:

''4. For purposes of subheading 1901.90.57, the term 'infant formula base powder' means a dry mixture of protein, fat, and carbohydrates that requires only the addition of vitamins and minerals in order to meet the definition of the term 'infant formula' in section 201(z) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 321(z)) and that is—

''(a) imported by a party that—

''(1) has been determined by the Food and Drug Administration to be authorized to lawfully market infant formula in the United States; or

''(2) has received a letter of enforcement discretion for the Food and Drug Administration relating to the marketing of its infant formula in the United States; and

''(b) intended to be used in manufacturing infant formula in the United States.''.

(3) By striking subheadings 1901.10.11 and 1901.10.16 and the superior text to such subheadings and inserting the following, with the article description having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 1901.10.62:

''	1901.10.12	Infant formula containing oligosaccharides	Free		$1.217/ kg+ 17.5%	''

(4) By striking subheadings 1901.10.26 and 1901.10.29 and inserting the following, with the article description for subheading 1901.10.23 having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 1901.10.21:

''	1901.10.23	Infant formula	Free		$1.217/kg + 17.5%	
	1901.10.24	Other	$1.035/kg + 14.9%		$1.217/kg + 17.5%	
		Other:				
	1901.10.25	Infant formula	Free		35%	
	1901.10.28	Other	14.9%		35%	''

(5) By striking subheadings 1901.10.33 and 1901.10.36 and the superior text to such subheadings and inserting the following, with the article description having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 1901.10.62:

''	1901.10.34	Infant formula containing oligosaccharides	Free		$1.217/ kg+ 17.5%	''

(6) By redesignating subheadings 1901.90.60 and 1901.90.61 as subheadings 1901.90.55 and 1901.90.56, respectively.

(7) By striking subheading 1901.90.62 and inserting the following, with the article description having the same degree of indentation as the article description for subheading 1901.10.56, as redesignated by paragraph (6):

''	1901.90.57	Infant formula base powder, as defined in additional U.S. note 4 to this chapter	Free		$1.127/kg + 16%	
	1901.90.58	Other	$1.035/kg +13.6%	Free (BH, CL, JO, KR, MA, OM, PE, SG) 20.7¢/kg + 2.7% (P, PA) See 9822.04.25 (AU) See 9823.08.01-9823.08.38 (S+) See 9915.04.30, 9915.04.50, 9915.04.74 (P+) See 9918.04.60-9918.04.80 (CO)	$1.127/kg + 16%	''

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Additional U.S. Note 10 to chapter 4 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States is amended by striking ''1901.90.61'' and inserting ''1901.90.56''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section apply with respect to articles entered, or withdrawn for warehouse for consumption, on or after the date that is 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 1096. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 208 of the amendment, insert between lines 6 and 7 the following:

TITLE VIII—POVERTY MEASUREMENT IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 801. IMPROVING THE MEASUREMENT OF POVERTY IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL BENEFIT.—The term ''Federal benefit'' means a benefit, refundable tax credit, or other form of assistance provided under any of the following programs:

(A) Earned Income Tax Credit (refundable portion).

(B) Child Tax Credit (refundable portion).

(C) Supplemental Security Income.

(D) Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

(E) Title IV–E Foster Care.

(F) Title IV–E Adoption Assistance.

(G) Medicaid.

(H) SCHIP.

(I) Indian Health Services.

(J) PPACA refundable premium assistance and cost sharing tax credit.

(K) Assets for Independence program.

(L) Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Food Program.

(M) School Breakfast.

(N) School Lunch.

(O) Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) Food Program.

(P) Child and Adult Care Food Program.

(Q) The Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR).

(R) Nutrition Program for the Elderly.

(S) Seniors Farmers' Market Nutrition Program.

(T) Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

(U) Section 8 Housing.

(V) Public Housing.

(W) Housing for Persons with Disabilities.

(X) Home Investment Partnership Program.

(Y) Rural Housing Service.

(Z) Rural Housing Insurance Fund.

(AA) Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program.

(BB) Universal Service Fund Low Income Support Mechanism (subsidized phone services).

(CC) Pell Grants.

(DD) Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants.

(EE) American Opportunity Tax Credit (refundable portion).

(FF) Healthy Start.

(GG) Job Corps.

(HH) Head Start (including Early Head Start).

(II) Weatherization Assistance.

(JJ) Chafee Foster Care Independence Program.

(KK) Child Care Subsidies from the Child Care and Development Fund.

(LL) Child Care from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Block Grant.

(MM) Emergency Assistance to Needy Families with Children.

(NN) Senior Community Service Employment Program.

(OO) Migrant and Seasonal Farm Workers Training Program.

(PP) Indian and Native American Employment and Training Program.

(QQ) Independent Living Education and Training Vouchers.

(2) RESOURCE UNIT.—The term ''resource unit'' means all co-resident individuals who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption, plus any co-resident unrelated children, foster children, and unmarried partners and their relatives.

(3) MARKET INCOME.—The term ''market income'' means individual income from the following:

(A) Earnings.

(B) Interest.

(C) Dividends.

(D) Rents, royalties, and estates and trusts.

(E) The monetary value of employer-sponsored health insurance benefits.

(F) Other forms of income, as determined by the Director.

(4) ENTITLEMENT AND OTHER INCOME.—The term ''entitlement and other income'' means income from the following:

(A) Unemployment (insurance) compensation.

(B) Workers' compensation.

(C) Social Security.

(D) Veterans' payments and benefits.

(E) Survivor benefits.

(F) Disability benefits (not including benefits under the Supplemental Security Income program).

(G) Pension or retirement income.

(H) Alimony.

(I) Child support.

(J) Financial assistance from outside of the household.

(K) Medicare.

(5) ENTITLEMENT AND EARNED UNIT INCOME.—The term ''entitlement and earned unit income'' means the sum of all market income and entitlement and other income.

(6) INCOME TAX DATA.—The term ''income tax data'' means return information, as such term is defined under section 6103(b)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

(7) ADMINISTERING AGENCY.—The term ''administering agency'' means a State or Federal agency responsible for administering a Federal benefit.

(8) TOTAL RESOURCE UNIT INCOME.—The term ''total resource unit income'' means, with respect to a resource unit, an amount equal to—

(A) the sum of—

(i) all market income attributable to members of the unit;

(ii) all entitlement and other income attributable to members of the unit; and

(iii) an amount, or cash equivalent, of all Federal benefits received by members of the unit; minus

(B) all State and Federal income and payroll taxes attributable to members of the unit.

(9) EARNED RESOURCE UNIT INCOME.—The term ''earned resource unit income'' means, with respect to a resource unit, all market income attributable to members of the unit.

(10) PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—The term ''personally identifiable information'' means any information that identifies an individual or could reasonably be used to identify an individual that is—

(A) collected pursuant to a survey conducted by the Bureau of the Census; or

(B) disclosed to the Bureau of the Census by an administering agency for the purpose of carrying out subsection (b).

(11) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the Bureau of the Census.

(b) VERIFICATION OF DATA COLLECTED IN THE ANNUAL SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC SUPPLEMENT TO THE CURRENT POPULATION SURVEY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Beginning in fiscal year 2024, in order to more accurately determine the extent of poverty in the United States and the anti-poverty effectiveness of Federal benefit programs, the Director shall collect, in addition to the data collected under the Annual Social and Economic Supplement to the Current Population Survey, data from the appropriate administering agencies related to the following:

(A) Participation in any Federal benefit program and the monetary or cash equivalent value of such benefit for an individual, where possible, and otherwise for resource units or households.

(B) The total amount of market income for individuals.

(C) The total amount of entitlement and other income for individuals.

(D) Payment of income taxes and payroll taxes for individuals.

(E) Total resource unit income.

(F) Total earned resource unit income.

(G) Any other information about benefits or income received by individuals that the Director determines necessary to carry out this section and that is not included in the data relating to participation in Federal benefit programs or market income for individuals.

(2) ADMINISTERING AGENCY DATA.—Not later than 6 months after receiving a request from the Director, the head of each administering agency shall make available to the Director such data (including income tax data) as the Director shall require for the purpose of carrying out this subsection and for the purposes outlined in section 6 of title 13, United States Code.

(3) PUBLICATION OF DATA.—

(A) RATES AND OTHER DATA.—

(i) REPORT.—The Director shall submit to Congress, not later than January 1, 2025, a report detailing the implementation of this section, including—

(I) the availability of related data;

(II) the quality of the data; and

(III) the methodology proposed for assigning dollar values to the receipt of noncash Federal benefits.

(ii) TABLES AND GRAPHS.—The Director shall produce tables and graphs showing for each year the poverty rates and related data calculated using data collected under paragraph (1), including—

(I) the total resource unit income for survey respondents;

(II) the total earned resource unit income for survey respondents;

(III) the total of all amounts described in subparagraphs (A) through (G) of paragraph (1) that are received by survey respondents;

(IV) a breakdown of the amount of income taxes and payroll taxes attributable to survey respondents; and

(V) for 2027 and subsequent years, poverty rates calculated using updated poverty thresholds as described in clause (iii).

(iii) UPDATED POVERTY THRESHOLDS.—For 2027 and subsequent years, the Director shall, in addition to the official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget) and the supplemental poverty measure, provide an alternative poverty measure that uses the personal consumption expenditure price index (as published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis) and accounts for the

data collected under paragraph (1). The Director shall provide a comparison of the official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget), the supplemental poverty measure rate as defined by the Bureau of the Census, and the alternative poverty rate created using the alternative poverty measure under this section.

(iv) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The Office of Management and Budget shall not use the additional data collected by the Director pursuant to paragraph (1) for purposes of defining the official poverty line.

(B) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Consistent with the provisions of sections 8, 9, and 23(c) of title 13, United States Code, the Director shall ensure the confidentiality of information furnished to the Director under this subsection.

(c) PROTECTION AND DISCLOSURE OF PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The security, disclosure, and confidentiality provisions set forth in sections 9 and 23 of title 13, United States Code, shall apply to personally identifiable information obtained by the Bureau of the Census pursuant to this section.

(2) RESTRICTED ACCESS TO PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—Access to personally identifiable information collected to supplement the restricted-use Current Population Survey Annual Social and Economic Supplements in accordance with subsection (b)(1) shall be available only to those who have access to the Current Population Survey data with the permission of the Bureau of the Census and in accordance with any other applicable provision of law.

(3) PENALTIES.—Any individual who knowingly accesses or discloses personally identifiable information in violation of this section shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in an amount of not more than $300,000 under title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

(d) STATE REPORTING OF FEDERAL DATA.—Beginning with the first full calendar year that begins after the date of enactment of this Act, with respect to any Federal benefit that is administered at the State level by a State administering agency, such State administering agency shall submit each year to the Federal administering agency responsible for administering the benefit at the Federal level a report that identifies each resource unit that received such benefits during such year by the personally identifiable information of the head of the resource unit and the amount, or cash equivalent, of such benefit received by such resource unit.

SEC. 802. COMMISSION ON VALUATION OF GOVERNMENT BENEFITS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the United States Census Bureau a commission, to be known as the ''Commission on Valuation of Federal Benefits'' (referred to in this section as the ''Commission'').

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall be composed of 8 members, of whom—

(A) 2 members shall be appointed by the majority leader of the Senate;

(B) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the Senate;

(C) 2 members shall be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(D) 2 members shall be appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(2) CO-CHAIRS.—Of the members of the Commission—

(A) 1 co-chair shall be designated by the majority leader of the Senate; and

(B) 1 co-chair shall be designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

(3) QUALIFICATIONS.—Each member appointed to the Commission shall have experience in—

(A) quantitative policy research; and

(B) welfare or poverty studies.

(c) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 60 days after the date on which the last member is appointed under subsection (b), the Commission shall hold an initial meeting.

(d) QUORUM.—Six members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(e) NO PROXY VOTING.—Proxy voting by members of the Commission shall be prohibited.

(f) STAFF.—The Director of the Census Bureau shall appoint an executive director of the Commission.

(g) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—Members of the Commission shall serve without pay, but shall receive travel expenses in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(h) DUTIES OF COMMISSION.—

(1) RECOMMENDATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall produce recommendations for the valuation of Federal benefits listed under section 801(a)(1) for the purpose of United States Census Bureau estimates of the Federal Poverty Level, including non-cash benefits.

(2) REPORT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to Congress a report of the recommendations required under paragraph (1), including a detailed statement of methodology and reasoning behind recommendations.

(B) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall be made available on an internet website of the United States Government that is available to the public.

(i) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—On request by the executive director of the Commission, the head of a Federal agency shall furnish information to the Commission.

(j) TERMINATION OF COMMISSION.—The Commission shall terminate 90 days after the date on which the Commission submits the report under subsection (h)(2).

(k) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated $1,000,000 to carry out this section.

SEC. 803. GAO REPORTS ON EFFECT OF SUPPLEMENTARY DATA ON CALCULATION OF POVERTY RATES AND RELATED MEASURES.

Not later than January 1, 2028, and every 2 years thereafter, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report that compares the poverty rates and related measures calculated under the Annual Social and Economic Supplement to the Current Population Survey with the poverty rates and related measures calculated using the data collected under section 801(b)(1).

SEC. 804. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect the eligibility of an individual or household for a Federal benefit.

SEC. 805. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to affect the eligibility of an individual or household for a Federal benefit.

TITLE IX—MODIFICATIONS TO SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 901. WORK REQUIREMENTS.

(a) DECLARATION OF POLICY.—Section 2 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''Congress further finds that it should also be the purpose of the supplemental nutrition assistance program to increase employment, to encourage healthy marriage, and to promote prosperous self-sufficiency, which means the ability of households to maintain an income above the poverty level without services and benefits from the Federal Government.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF FOOD.—Section 3(k) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(k)) is amended by striking ''means (1)'' and inserting ''means the following foods, food products, meals, and other items, only if the food, food product, meal, or other item is essential, as determined by the Secretary: (1)''.

(c) GENERAL WORK REQUIREMENTS.—Section 6(d)(1)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)(1)(A)) is amended, in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''60'' and inserting ''65''.

(d) HOUR-BASED WORK REQUIREMENT.—Section 6(o) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(o)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C), by striking ''other than a supervised job search program or job search training program'' and inserting ''including an in-person supervised job search program'';

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''50'' and inserting ''64'';

(B) by striking subparagraph (C); and

(C) by redesignating subparagraphs (D) and (E) as subparagraphs (C) and (D), respectively;

(3) in paragraph (4)(A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''area'' and inserting ''county or county equivalent'';

(B) in clause (i), by striking ''or'' and inserting ''and''; and

(C) by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

''(ii) is not located within a labor market area, as determined by data published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, that has an unemployment rate of over 10 percent.'';

(4) in paragraph (6)(D), by striking ''15 percent'' and inserting ''5 percent'';

(5) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8);

(6) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) WORK OR WORK PREPARATION HOURS REQUIREMENT FOR MARRIED COUPLES WITH CHILDREN.—The total combined number of hours of work or work preparation activities under subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of paragraph (2) for both spouses in a married couple household with 1 or more children over the age of 6 shall not be greater than the total number of hours required under those subparagraphs for a single head of household.''; and

(7) by inserting after paragraph (8) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(9) MINIMUM WAGE RULE.—The limitation under subsection (d)(4)(F)(i) shall not apply to any work requirement, program, or activity required under this subsection.''.

SEC. 902. EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAM OUTCOMES REPORTING.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report, using data from the most recent 5 fiscal years available, detailing the outcomes of beneficiaries of the supplemental nutrition assistance program established under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2011 et seq.) (referred to in this section as ''SNAP'') who participate in employment and training programs (as defined in section 6(d)(4)(B) of that Act (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)(4)(B))) for each of those 5 years that includes the following information:

(1) The number and percentage of SNAP beneficiaries in each State who participated in an employment and training program compared to the number and percentage of SNAP beneficiaries in each State who did

not participate in an employment and training program.

(2) The number and percentage of SNAP beneficiaries in each State who obtained a job while participating in an employment and training program compared to the number and percentage of SNAP beneficiaries in each State who obtained a job but did not participate in an employment and training program.

(3) The number and percentage of SNAP beneficiaries in each State who retained a job for 6 months, 1 year, and 5 years after completing an employment and training program and obtaining a job compared to the number and percentage of SNAP beneficiaries in each State who retained a job for 6 months, 1 year, and 5 years but did not complete an employment and training program prior to obtaining that job.

(4) The increase or decrease in wages, if applicable, for SNAP beneficiaries in each State who retained a job for 6 months, 1 year, and 5 years after completing an employment and training program and obtaining a job compared to the increase or decrease in wages, if applicable, for SNAP beneficiaries in each State who retained a job for 6 months, 1 year, and 5 years but did not complete an employment and training program prior to obtaining that job.

(5) The number and percentage of SNAP beneficiaries who—

(A) previously participated in an employment and training program;

(B) after that participation, obtained a job or stopped receiving SNAP benefits; and

(C) after regaining eligibility for SNAP benefits, reentered an employment or training program.

(6) The average duration that SNAP beneficiaries in each State participated in an employment and training program.

(7) A breakdown of—

(A) the types of employment and training activities offered by the employment and training program of each State; and

(B) the types of jobs that States are preparing employment and training program participants to obtain.

SEC. 903. STATE MATCHING FUNDS.

Section 4 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2013) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) STATE MATCHING FUNDS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State that participates in the supplemental nutrition assistance program shall, as a condition of participation, be required to contribute matching funds in an amount equal to, of the funds received from the Secretary by the State for program administration—

''(A) for fiscal year 2024, 10 percent;

''(B) for fiscal year 2025, 15 percent;

''(C) for fiscal year 2026, 20 percent;

''(D) for fiscal year 2027, 25 percent;

''(E) for fiscal year 2028, 30 percent;

''(F) for fiscal year 2029, 35 percent;

''(G) for fiscal year 2030, 40 percent;

''(H) for fiscal year 2031, 45 percent; and

''(I) for fiscal year 2032 and each fiscal year thereafter, 50 percent.

''(2) ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS PERMITTED.—Nothing in this subsection prevents a State from contributing matching funds in an amount greater than the amount required under paragraph (1) for the applicable fiscal year.''.

SEC. 904. ELIGIBILITY.

Section 5(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(a)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by inserting ''that are limited to families whose income and resources satisfy financial need criteria established in accordance with subsections (c) and (g) by the State for receipt of the benefits'' after ''(42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.)''; and

(2) by inserting after the second sentence the following: ''To be deemed eligible for participation in the supplemental nutrition assistance program under this subsection, a household shall receive a cash or noncash means-tested public benefit for at least 6 consecutive months valued at not less than $50.''.

SEC. 905. COMPLIANCE WITH FRAUD INVESTIGATIONS.

Section 6(d) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2015(d)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(5) COMPLIANCE WITH FRAUD INVESTIGATIONS.—To be eligible to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, an individual shall cooperate with any investigation into fraud under that program, including full participation in any—

''(A) meeting requested by fraud investigators; and

''(B) administrative hearing.''.

SEC. 906. AUTHORIZED USERS OF ELECTRONIC BENEFIT TRANSFER CARDS.

Section 7(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2016(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(15) AUTHORIZED USERS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A State agency shall register—

''(i) at least 1 member of a household issued an EBT card as an authorized user of the card; and

''(ii) an authorized representative of a household as an authorized user of the EBT card issued to the household.

''(B) LIMIT.—Not more than 5 individuals shall be registered as authorized users, including the authorized representative of a household, on an EBT card.

''(C) UNAUTHORIZED USE.—

''(i) IN GENERAL.—An EBT card shall not be used by any individual who is not an authorized user of the EBT card.

''(ii) 2 UNAUTHORIZED USES.—If an EBT card has been used 2 times by an unauthorized user of the EBT card, the head of the household to which the EBT card is issued shall be required to review program rights and responsibilities with personnel of the State agency.

''(iii) 4 UNAUTHORIZED USES.—If an EBT card has been used 4 times by an unauthorized user of the EBT card, the State agency shall suspend benefits for the household to which the EBT card is issued for 1 month.

''(iv) 6 UNAUTHORIZED USES.—If an EBT card has been used 6 times by an unauthorized user of the EBT card, the State agency shall suspend benefits for the household to which the EBT card is issued for 3 months.

''(v) 7 OR MORE UNAUTHORIZED USES.—If an EBT card has been used 7 or more times by an unauthorized user of the EBT card, the State agency shall suspend benefits for the household to which the EBT card is issued for 1 month per unauthorized use.

''(vi) ADMINISTRATION.—Any action taken under clauses (ii) through (v) shall be consistent with sections 6(b) and 11(e)(10), as applicable.''.

SEC. 907. REAUTHORIZATION OF MEDIUM- OR HIGH-RISK RETAIL FOOD STORES AND WHOLESALE FOOD CONCERNS.

Section 9(a)(2)(A) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2018(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''; and'' and inserting '', which, in the case of a retail food store or wholesale food concern for which there is a medium risk or high risk of fraudulent transactions, as determined by the fraud detection system of the Food and Nutrition Service, shall be annually; and''.

SEC. 908. STATE ACTIVITY REPORTS.

Section 11 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2020) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(y) STATE ACTIVITY REPORTS.—The Secretary shall publish for each fiscal year a report describing the activity of each State in the supplemental nutrition assistance program, which shall contain, for the applicable fiscal year, substantially the same information as is contained in the report published by the Food and Nutrition Service entitled 'Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program State Activity Report Fiscal Year 2016' and published September 2017.''.

SEC. 909. DISQUALIFICATION BY STATE AGENCY.

Section 12 of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2021) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) DISQUALIFICATION BY STATE AGENCY.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), a State agency shall permanently disqualify from participation in the supplemental nutrition assistance program an approved retail food store or wholesale food concern convicted of—

''(A) trafficking in food instruments (including any voucher, draft, check, or access device (including an electronic benefit transfer card or personal identification number) issued in lieu of a food instrument under this Act); or

''(B) selling firearms, ammunition, explosives, or controlled substances (as defined in section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act (21 U.S.C. 802)) in exchange for food instruments (including any item described in subparagraph (A) issued in lieu of a food instrument under this Act).

''(2) NOTICE OF DISQUALIFICATION.—The State agency shall—

''(A) provide the approved retail food store or wholesale food concern with notification of the disqualification; and

''(B) make the disqualification effective on the date of receipt of the notice of disqualification.

''(3) PROHIBITION OF RECEIPT OF LOST REVENUES.—A retail food store or wholesale food concern shall not be entitled to receive any compensation for revenues lost as a result of disqualification under this subsection.

''(4) EXCEPTIONS IN LIEU OF DISQUALIFICATION.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A State agency may permit a retail food store or wholesale food concern that, but for this paragraph, would be disqualified under paragraph (1), to continue to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program if the State agency determines, in its sole discretion, that—

''(i) disqualification of the retail food store or wholesale food concern, as applicable, would cause hardship to participants in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; or

''(ii)(I) the retail food store or wholesale food concern had, at the time of the violation under paragraph (1), an effective policy and program in effect to prevent violations described in paragraph (1); and

''(II) the ownership of the retail food store or wholesale food concern was not aware of, did not approve of, and was not involved in the conduct of the violation.

''(B) CIVIL PENALTY.—If a State agency under subparagraph (A) permits a retail food store or wholesale food concern to continue to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program in lieu of disqualification, the State agency shall assess a civil penalty in an amount determined by the State agency, except that—

''(i) the amount of the civil penalty shall not exceed $10,000 for each violation; and

''(ii) the amount of civil penalties imposed for violations investigated as part of a single investigation may not exceed $40,000.

''(C) REPORTING.—

''(i) TO THE SECRETARY.—If a State agency under subparagraph (A) permits a retail food

store or wholesale food concern to continue to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program in lieu of disqualification, the State agency shall annually submit to the Secretary a report describing the justification of the State agency for that action.

''(ii) TO CONGRESS.—The Secretary shall annually submit to Congress a report compiling the information contained in reports submitted to the Secretary under clause (i).''.

SEC. 910. RETENTION OF RECAPTURED FUNDS BY STATES.

Section 16(a) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2025(a)) is amended—

(1) in the second sentence, by striking ''The officials'' and inserting the following:

''(3) PROHIBITION.—The officials'';

(2) in the first sentence—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (9) as subparagraphs (A) through (I), respectively; and

(B) by striking ''section 17(n): *Provided,* That the Secretary'' and inserting the following: ''section 17(n).

''(2) ADMINISTRATION ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS AND IN NATIVE VILLAGES.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary'';

(3) in paragraph (2) (as so designated)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''35 percent'' and inserting ''50 percent''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) USE OF RETAINED AMOUNTS FOR FRAUD INVESTIGATIONS.—The value of funds or allotments recovered or collected pursuant to sections 6(b) and 13(c) that are retained by a State under subparagraph (A) in excess of 35 percent shall be used by the State for investigations of fraud in the supplemental nutrition assistance program.''; and

(4) by striking the subsection designation and all that follows through ''Subject to'' in the matter preceding paragraph (2) (as so designated) and inserting the following:

''(a) ADMINISTRATIVE COST-SHARING.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to''.

SA 1097. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division B, insert the following:

TITLE VIII—OPPORTUNITIES FOR FAIRNESS IN FARMING

SEC. 801. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the ''Opportunities for Fairness in Farming Act of 2023''.

SEC. 802. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) the generic programs to promote and provide research and information for an agricultural commodity (commonly known as ''checkoff programs'') are intended to increase demand for all of that agricultural commodity and benefit all assessed producers of that agricultural commodity;

(2) although the laws establishing checkoff programs broadly prohibit the use of funds in any manner for the purpose of influencing legislation or government action, checkoff programs have repeatedly been shown to use funds to influence policy directly or by partnering with organizations that lobby;

(3) the unlawful use of checkoff programs funds benefits some agricultural producers while harming many others;

(4) to more effectively prevent Boards from using funds for unlawful purposes, strict separation of engagement between the Boards and policy entities is necessary;

(5) conflicts of interest in the checkoff programs allow special interests to use checkoff program funds for the benefit of some assessed agricultural producers at the expense of many others;

(6) prohibiting conflicts of interest in checkoff programs is necessary to ensure the proper and lawful operation of the checkoff programs;

(7) checkoff programs are designed to promote agricultural commodities, not to damage other types of agricultural commodities through anticompetitive conduct or otherwise;

(8) prohibiting anticompetitive and similar conduct is necessary to ensure proper and lawful operation of checkoff programs;

(9) lack of transparency in checkoff programs enables abuses to occur and conceals abuses from being discovered; and

(10) requiring transparency in the expenditure of checkoff program funds is necessary to prevent and uncover abuses in checkoff programs.

SEC. 803. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) BOARD.—The term ''Board'' means a board, committee, or similar entity established to carry out a checkoff program or an order issued by the Secretary under a checkoff program.

(2) CHECKOFF PROGRAM.—The term ''checkoff program'' means a program to promote and provide research and information for a particular agricultural commodity without reference to specific producers or brands, including a program carried out under any of the following:

(A) The Cotton Research and Promotion Act (7 U.S.C. 2101 et seq.).

(B) The Potato Research and Promotion Act (7 U.S.C. 2611 et seq.).

(C) The Egg Research and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(D) The Beef Research and Information Act (7 U.S.C. 2901 et seq.).

(E) The Wheat and Wheat Foods Research and Nutrition Education Act (7 U.S.C. 3401 et seq.).

(F) The Floral Research and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 4301 et seq.).

(G) Subtitle B of the Dairy Production Stabilization Act of 1983 (7 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.).

(H) The Honey Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 4601 et seq.).

(I) The Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act of 1985 (7 U.S.C. 4801 et seq.).

(J) The Watermelon Research and Promotion Act (7 U.S.C. 4901 et seq.).

(K) The Pecan Promotion and Research Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6001 et seq.).

(L) The Mushroom Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.).

(M) The Lime Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6201 et seq.).

(N) The Soybean Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.).

(O) The Fluid Milk Promotion Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 6401 et seq.).

(P) The Fresh Cut Flowers and Fresh Cut Greens Promotion and Information Act of 1993 (7 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.).

(Q) The Sheep Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.).

(R) Section 501 of the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7401).

(S) The Commodity Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 1996 (7 U.S.C. 7411 et seq.).

(T) The Canola and Rapeseed Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 7441 et seq.).

(U) The National Kiwifruit Research, Promotion, and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 7461 et seq.).

(V) The Popcorn Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Act (7 U.S.C. 7481 et seq.).

(W) The Hass Avocado Promotion, Research, and Information Act of 2000 (7 U.S.C. 7801 et seq.).

(3) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—The term ''conflict of interest'' means a direct or indirect financial interest in a person or entity that performs a service for, or enters into a contract or agreement with, a Board for anything of economic value.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 804. REQUIREMENTS OF CHECKOFF PROGRAMS.

(a) PROHIBITIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), a Board shall not enter into any contract or agreement to carry out checkoff program activities with a party that engages in activities for the purpose of influencing any government policy or action that relates to agriculture.

(2) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—A Board shall not engage in, and shall prohibit the employees and agents of the Board, acting in their official capacity, from engaging in, any act that may involve a conflict of interest.

(3) OTHER PROHIBITIONS.—A Board shall not engage in, and shall prohibit the employees and agents of the Board, acting in their official capacity, from engaging in—

(A) any anticompetitive activity;

(B) any unfair or deceptive act or practice; or

(C) any act that may be disparaging to, or in any way negatively portray, another agricultural commodity or product.

(4) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN CONTRACTS WITH INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to a contract or agreement entered into between a Board and an institution of higher education for the purpose of research, extension, and education.

(b) AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO CONTRACTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on approval of the Secretary, a Board may enter directly into contracts and agreements to carry out generic promotion, research, or other activities authorized by law.

(c) PRODUCTION OF RECORDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each contract or agreement of a checkoff program shall provide that the entity that enters into the contract or agreement shall produce to the Board accurate records that account for all funds received under the contract or agreement, including any goods or services provided or costs incurred in connection with the contract or agreement.

(2) MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS.—A Board shall maintain any records received under paragraph (1).

(d) PUBLICATION OF BUDGETS AND DISBURSEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall publish and make available for public inspection all budgets and disbursements of funds entrusted to the Board that are approved by the Secretary, immediately on approval by the Secretary.

(2) REQUIRED DISCLOSURES.—In carrying out paragraph (1), the Board shall disclose—

(A) the amount of the disbursement;

(B) the purpose of the disbursement, including the activities to be funded by the disbursement;

(C) the identity of the recipient of the disbursement; and

(D) the identity of any other parties that may receive the disbursed funds, including any contracts or subcontractors of the recipient of the disbursement.

(e) AUDITS.—

(1) PERIODIC AUDITS BY INSPECTOR GENERAL OF USDA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than every 5 years thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture shall conduct an audit to determine the compliance of each checkoff program with this section during the period of time covered by the audit.

(B) REVIEW OF RECORDS.—An audit conducted under subparagraph (A) shall include a review of any records produced to the Board under subsection (c)(1).

(C) SUBMISSION OF REPORTS.—On completion of each audit under subparagraph (A), the Inspector General of the Department of Agriculture shall—

(i) prepare a report describing the audit; and

(ii) submit the report described in clause (i) to—

(I) the appropriate committees of Congress, including the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate; and

(II) the Comptroller General of the United States.

(2) AUDIT BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not earlier than 3 years, and not later than 5 years, after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(i) conduct an audit to assess—

(I) the status of actions taken for each checkoff program to ensure compliance with this section; and

(II) the extent to which actions described in subclause (I) have improved the integrity of a checkoff program; and

(ii) prepare a report describing the audit conducted under clause (i), including any recommendations for—

(I) strengthening the effect of actions described in clause (i)(I); and

(II) improving Federal legislation relating to checkoff programs.

(B) CONSIDERATION OF INSPECTOR GENERAL REPORTS.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall consider reports described in paragraph (1)(C) in preparing any recommendations in the report under subparagraph (A)(ii).

SEC. 805. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this title or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this title, and the application of the provision to any other person or circumstance, shall not be affected.

SA 1098. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used—

(1) to carry out Socially Disadvantaged Applicant funding under Farm Service Agency farm loan programs; or

(2) for Department of Agriculture loan programs that use race as a criteria for eligibility.

SA 1099. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. CIVIL PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO DISCLOSURE AGRICULTURAL FOREIGN INVESTMENT.

Section 3(b) of the Agricultural Foreign Investment Disclosure Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 3502(b)) is amended by striking ''shall not exceed 25 percent'' and inserting ''shall be equal to not less than 25 percent''.

SA 1100. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. EXCLUSION OF PROPERTY AND FACILITIES LOCATED ON PRIME FARMLAND FROM CERTAIN CREDITS RELATING TO RENEWABLE ENERGY PRODUCTION AND INVESTMENT.

(a) EXCLUSION OF PROPERTY PLACED IN SERVICE ON PRIME FARMLAND FROM RESIDENTIAL CLEAN ENERGY CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 25D(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(9) EXCLUSION OF PRIME FARMLAND.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Expenditures which are properly allocable to property placed in service on prime farmland shall not be taken into account for purposes of this section.

''(B) PRIME FARMLAND DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'prime farmland' means land determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be prime farmland within the meaning of part 657.5 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this section.

(b) EXCLUSION OF FACILITIES LOCATED ON PRIME FARMLAND FROM RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY PRODUCTION CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 45(e) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(14) PRIME FARMLAND EXCLUDED.—The term 'qualified facility' shall not include any facility located on prime farmland (as defined in section 25D(e)(9)).''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to facilities placed in service after the date of the enactment of this section.

(c) EXCLUSION OF PROPERTY PLACED IN SERVICE ON PRIME FARMLAND FROM ENERGY CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 48(a)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting ''or any property located on prime farmland (as defined in section 25D(e)(9))'' after ''any prior taxable year''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this section.

(d) EXCLUSION OF PROPERTY PLACED IN SERVICE ON PRIME FARMLAND FROM CLEAN ELECTRICITY INVESTMENT CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 48E(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(6) EXCLUSION OF PRIME FARMLAND.—Expenditures which are properly allocable to property placed in service on prime farmland (as defined in section 25D(e)(9)) shall not be taken into account for purposes of this section.''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to qualified investments with respect to any qualified facility or energy storage technology the construction of which begins after the date of the enactment of this section.

(e) EXCLUSION OF FACILITIES LOCATED ON PRIME FARMLAND FROM CLEAN ELECTRICITY PRODUCTION CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 45Y(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) PRIME FARMLAND EXCLUDED.—The term 'qualified facility' shall not include any facility located on prime farmland (as defined in section 25D(e)(9)).''.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to facilities placed in service after the date of the enactment of this section.

SA 1101. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. LET ME TRAVEL AMERICA.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Let Me Travel America Act''.

(b) LIMITATION ON AUTHORITY OF SURGEON GENERAL.—Section 361 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 264) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) Nothing in this section shall be construed to provide the Surgeon General, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, or any Federal agency with the authority to mandate vaccination against Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID–19) as a prerequisite for interstate travel, transportation, or movement.''.

(c) INTERSTATE COMMON CARRIERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 805 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''§ 80505. COVID–19 vaccination status

''(a) IN GENERAL.—An entity described in subsection (b) may not deny service to any

individual solely based on the vaccination status of the individual with respect to the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID–19).

''(b) ENTITY DESCRIBED.—An entity referred to in subsection (a) is a common carrier or any other entity, including a rail carrier (as defined in section 10102, including Amtrak), a motor carrier (as defined in section 13102), a water carrier (as defined in that section), and an air carrier (as defined in section 40102), that—

''(1) provides interstate transportation of passengers; and

''(2) is subject to the jurisdiction of the Department of Transportation or the Surface Transportation Board under this title.

''(c) SAVINGS PROVISION.—Nothing in this section applies to the regulation of intrastate travel, transportation, or movement, including the intrastate transportation of passengers.''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The analysis for chapter 805 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 80504 the following:

''80505. COVID–19 vaccination status.''.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section, or an amendment made by this section, shall be construed to permit or otherwise authorize Congress or an executive agency to enact or otherwise impose a COVID–19 vaccine mandate.

SA 1102. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO DISPLAY CERTAIN FLAGS.

None of the funds appropriated by this division or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2024 for the Department of Veterans Affairs may be obligated or expended to display at a facility of the Department any flag other than a flag representing the United States, a State, a territory of the United States, an element of the Armed Forces, prisoners of war, or those who are missing in action.

SA 1103. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. ____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR GENDER TRANSITION SURGERIES AND THE PROVISION OF GENDER AFFIRMING CARE.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be used for gender transition surgeries or the provision of gender affirming care.

SA 1104. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. ____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR ABORTIONS.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be used for abortions, including the provision of abortion services, the use of facilities for an abortion, or the granting of any per diem or travel allowances for the procurement of an abortion.

SA 1105. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Of the funds made available by this division or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2024 for the Department of Defense for the support of Ukraine, not more than two percent may be obligated or expended until the date on which all member countries of North Atlantic Treaty Organization that do not spend two percent or more of their gross domestic product on defense meet or exceed such threshold.

SA 1106. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR MILITARY CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS IN JAPAN.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available for military construction projects in Japan, other than those related to housing or the provision of medical services for members of the United States Armed Forces, until the Secretary of Defense conducts a thorough review of the United States-Japan Status of Forces Agreement and determines that—

(1) Japan is in compliance with all provisions of such agreement; and

(2) there are adequate safeguards in place for members of the United States Armed Forces to ensure access to legal counsel, competent interpretation, and communication with a representative of the United States Government from the moment of arrest or detention and during all states of the legal process.

SA 1107. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS TO IMPLEMENT A MASK MANDATE.

None of the funds appropriated by this division or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2024 for the Department of Veterans Affairs may be obligated or expended to implement a mask mandate at any facility of the Department.

SA 1108. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. ____. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT A VACCINE MANDATE AT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS FACILITIES.

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this division may be used to implement a vaccine mandate at any facility of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

SA 1109. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. TREATMENT OF FUNDS RECEIVED BY NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU AS REIMBURSEMENT FROM STATES.

Section 710 of title 32, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(g) TREATMENT OF REIMBURSED FUNDS.—Any funds received by the National Guard Bureau from a State, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, or the Virgin Islands as reimbursement under this section for the use of military property—

''(1) shall be credited to—

''(A) the appropriation, fund, or account used in incurring the obligation; or

''(B) an appropriate appropriation, fund, or account currently available for the purposes for which the expenditures were made; and

''(2) may only be used by the Department of Defense for the repair, maintenance, or other similar functions related directly to assets used by National Guard units while operating under State active duty status.''.

SA 1110. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS FOR PURPOSES RELATING TO DIVERSITY, EQUITY, OR INCLUSION.

None of the funds appropriated by this division or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2024 for the Department of Veterans Affairs may be obligated or expended for any initiative of the Department relating to diversity, equity, or inclusion.

SA 1111. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 291, after line 22, add the following:

SEC. 155. EXPEDITING COMPLETION OF THE UINTA BASIN RAILWAY.

(a) DEFINED TERM.—In this section, the term ''Uinta Basin Railway'' means the Uinta Basin Railway project, as generally described and approved in the Surface Transportation Board Decision Docket No. FD 36284 (December 15, 2021).

(b) CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND DECLARATION.—Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the timely completion of construction and commencement of the operation of the Uinta Basin Railway is required in the national interest;

(2) the Uinta Basin Railway will serve as a common carrier railway infrastructure asset located within the borders of the state of Utah;

(3) the Uinta Basin Railway will provide needed infrastructure to solve the long-standing freight transportation challenges in the region by connecting northeastern Utah to the existing national railway network;

(4) this common carrier railway will move goods in a safe and cost-effective way to support the economic stability, sustainable communities, and enriched quality of life in the region by providing rail service that is equally open to all freight shippers of a broad range of goods, including oil, gas, minerals, manufactured goods, and agricultural products;

(5) this critical piece of infrastructure is an important economic development project that will create jobs and provide a higher quality of life to the local communities, including the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation.

(c) APPROVAL AND RATIFICATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EXISTING AUTHORIZATIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(1) Congress ratifies and approves all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the construction and initial operation at full capacity of the Uinta Basin Railway; and

(2) Congress directs the Surface Transportation Board, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and the heads of other Federal agencies, as applicable, to maintain such authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the construction and initial operation at full capacity of the Uinta Basin Railway.

(d) EXPEDITED APPROVAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, not later than 21 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Surface Transportation Board, for the purpose of facilitating the completion of the Uinta Basin Railway, shall issue all permits or verifications that are necessary—

(1) to complete the construction of the Uinta Basin Railway across the lands and waters of the State of Utah; and

(2) to allow for the continuing operation and maintenance of the Uinta Basin Railway.

(e) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—

(1) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no court shall have jurisdiction to review any action taken by the Surface Transportation Board, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, or a State administrative agency acting pursuant to Federal law that grants an authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or any other approval necessary for the construction and initial operation at full capacity of the Uinta Basin Railway, including the issuance of any authorization, permit, extension, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval described in subsection (c) or (d) for the Uinta Basin Railway whether issued before, on, or subsequent to the date of the enactment of this section, including any lawsuit pending in any court as of the date of enactment of this section.

(2) EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION.—The Supreme Court of the United States shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any claim alleging—

(A) the invalidity of this section; or

(B) an action taken by a Federal or State official is beyond the scope of authority conferred by this section.

(f) EFFECT.—This section supersedes any other provision of law (including any other section of this Act, any Federal law enacted before the date of the enactment of this Act, and any regulation, judicial decision, or agency guidance) that is inconsistent with the issuance of any authorization, permit, verification, biological opinion, incidental take statement, or other approval for the Uinta Basin Railway.

SA 1112. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. Section 8526(7) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7906(7)) is amended by inserting '', except that this paragraph shall not apply to the use of funds under this Act for activities carried out under programs authorized by this Act that are otherwise permissible under such programs and that provide students with educational enrichment activities and instruction, such as archery, hunter safety education, outdoor education, or culinary arts'' before the period at the end.

SA 1113. Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. MORAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. ____. For an additional amount for ''Agricultural Programs—National Institute of Food and Agriculture—Research and Education Activities'', for competitive grants to assist in the facility construction, alteration, acquisition, modernization, renovation, or remodeling of agricultural research facilities, as authorized by the Research Facilities Act (7 U.S.C. 390 et seq.), there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''Agricultural Programs—Processing, Research, and Marketing—Office of the Secretary'' is hereby reduced by, $2,000,000.

SA 1114. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. THRIFTY FOOD PLAN COST ADJUSTMENTS FOR HAWAII DURING DISASTER DECLARATION.

For the period during which the Presidential declaration of a major disaster for the State of Hawaii is in effect, no cost adjustments shall be made to the thrifty food plan (as defined in section 3(u) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2012(u))) pursuant to paragraph (2) of that section.

SA 1115. Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FETTERMAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Ms. ROSEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for

the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 120, line 15, strike ''2250a.'' and insert ''2250a: *Provided further*, That of the total amount available under this heading, $8,500,000 shall be for necessary expenses to carry out the Urban Agriculture and Innovative Production Program under section 222 of subtitle A of title II of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6923), as amended by section 12302 of Public Law 115–334.''.

SA 1116. Mr. KELLY (for himself and Mr. TILLIS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division A, add the following:

TITLE V—COUNTING VETERANS' CANCER ACT OF 2023

SEC. 501. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Counting Veterans' Cancer Act of 2023''.

SEC. 502. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) According to 2017 data from National Program of Cancer Registries of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, approximately 26,500 cancer cases among veterans were not reported to State cancer registries funded through such Program.

(2) Established by Congress in 1992 through the Cancer Registries Amendment Act (Public Law 102–515), the National Program of Cancer Registries under section 399B of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280e) collects data on cancer occurrence (including the type, extent, and location of the cancer), the type of initial treatment, and outcomes.

(3) The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention support central cancer registries in 46 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, certain territories of the United States in the Pacific Islands, and the United States Virgin Islands.

(4) The data obtained by registries described in paragraph (3) combined with data from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program of the National Cancer Institute and mortality data from National Center for Health Statistics of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention comprise the official United States Cancer Statistics.

(5) The United States Cancer Statistics reflect all newly diagnosed cancer cases and cancer deaths for the entire population of the United States, except for unreported veterans.

(6) Federal law requires the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the National Cancer Institute to collect cancer data for all newly diagnosed cancer cases, but that currently cannot be achieved due to frequent lack of reporting by medical facilities of the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(7) Releasing all data from medical facilities of the Department to State cancer registries will provide more complete data for health care providers, public health officials, and researchers to—

(A) measure cancer occurrence and trends at the local and national level;

(B) inform and prioritize cancer educational and screening programs;

(C) evaluate efficacy of prevention efforts and treatment;

(D) determine survival rates;

(E) conduct research on the etiology, diagnosis, and treatment of cancer;

(F) ensure quality and equity in cancer care; and

(G) plan for health services.

(8) Capturing cancer data from medical facilities of the Department in State cancer registries and the United States Cancer Statistics can benefit veterans by—

(A) improving the ability to identify cancer-related disparities in the veteran community;

(B) improving understanding of the cancer-related needs of veterans, which can be incorporated into State Comprehensive Cancer Control planning for screening and treatment programs funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; and

(C) increasing opportunities for veterans with cancer to be included in more clinical trials and cancer-related research and analysis being done outside of the health care system of the Department.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to improve care for veterans by ensuring all data on veterans diagnosed with cancer are captured by the national cancer registry programs supported by the National Program of Cancer Registries of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results Program of the National Cancer Institute.

SEC. 503. REQUIREMENT THAT DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS SHARE DATA WITH STATE CANCER REGISTRIES.

(a) SHARING OF DATA WITH STATE CANCER REGISTRIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 73 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

''§ 7330E. Sharing of data with State cancer registries

''(a) SHARING BY THE DEPARTMENT.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall share with the State cancer registry of each State, if such a registry exists, qualifying data for all individuals who are residents of the State and have received health care under the laws administered by the Secretary.

''(2) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO DATA SHARED.—In sharing data under paragraph (1) with a State cancer registry, the Secretary shall comply with the requirements for non-Department facilities to report data, in a manner that is as complete and timely as possible, without requiring a data use agreement in place between the Department and each State cancer registry—

''(A) to State cancer registries that are supported by the National Program of Cancer Registries of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention under section 399B of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280e);

''(B) to State cancer registries that are supported by the Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results Program of the National Cancer Institute authorized under the National Cancer Act of 1971 (Public Law 92–218); and

''(C) to State cancer registries as set forth in relevant State laws and regulations that authorize a cancer registry.

''(b) QUALIFYING DATA DEFINED.—In this section, the term 'qualifying data', with respect to a State cancer registry, means all data required to be provided to the registry pursuant to the authorities specified in subparagraphs (A) through (C) of subsection (a)(2).''.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of subchapter II of such chapter is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7330D the following new item:

''7330E. Sharing of data with State cancer registries.''.

(b) SHARING BY STATE CANCER REGISTRIES.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall assist State cancer registries described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 7330E(a)(2) of title 38, United States Code, as added by subsection (a)(1), in facilitating, to the extent allowed under State laws regulating the cancer registry program, the sharing with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of data in the possession of each such registry regarding diagnosis of cancer for each veteran—

(1) enrolled in the system of annual patient enrollment established and operated under section 1705(a) of such title; or

(2) registered to receive care from the Department of Veterans Affairs under section 17.37 of title 38, Code of Federal Regulations, or successor regulations.

SA 1117. Ms. ROSEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. ___. TELEHEALTH CAPACITY OF VETERANS HEALTH ADMINISTRATION.

Of the amounts made available to the Department of Veterans Affairs for fiscal year 2024 by this Act or any other Act under the ''Veterans Health Administration – Medical Services'', ''Veterans Health Administration – Medical Community Care'', and ''Veterans Health Administration – Medical Support and Compliance'' accounts, $5,180,336,000 shall be made available to sustain and increase telehealth capacity, including in rural and highly rural areas, and associated programmatic efforts.

SA 1118. Ms. SMITH (for herself and Mr. RICKETTS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) Congress is concerned about staffing challenges faced by the Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resources Conservation Service at the county level; and

(2) Congress supports the Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resources Conservation Service in quickly filling hiring gaps, improving retention, and bringing pay for staff to competitive standards to improve public-facing customer service, particularly in rural areas.

(b) Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress a report describing a plan for improving staffing at the

Farm Service Agency and the Natural Resources Conservation Service at the county level, including recommendations for actions that Congress may take.

SA 1119. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Mr. LUJÁN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the amendment, add the following:

DIVISION D—RIO SAN JOSÉ AND RIO JEMEZ WATER SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2023

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This division may be cited as the ''Rio San José and Rio Jemez Water Settlements Act of 2023''.

TITLE I—PUEBLOS OF ACOMA AND LAGUNA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT

SEC. 111. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) to achieve a fair, equitable, and final settlement of all issues and controversies concerning claims to water rights in the general stream adjudication of the Rio San José Stream System captioned ''State of New Mexico, ex rel. State Engineer v. Kerr-McGee, et al.'', No. D–1333–CV–1983–00190 and No. D–1333–CV1983–00220 (consolidated), pending in the Thirteenth Judicial District Court for the State of New Mexico, for—

(A) the Pueblo of Acoma;

(B) the Pueblo of Laguna; and

(C) the United States, acting as trustee for the Pueblos of Acoma and Laguna;

(2) to authorize, ratify, and confirm the agreement entered into by the Pueblos, the State, and various other parties to the Agreement, to the extent that the Agreement is consistent with this title;

(3) to authorize and direct the Secretary—

(A) to execute the Agreement; and

(B) to take any other actions necessary to carry out the Agreement in accordance with this title; and

(4) to authorize funds necessary for the implementation of the Agreement and this title.

SEC. 112. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ACEQUIA.—The term ''Acequia'' means each of the Bluewater Toltec Irrigation District, La Acequia Madre del Ojo del Gallo, Moquino Water Users Association II, Murray Acres Irrigation Association, San Mateo Irrigation Association, Seboyeta Community Irrigation Association, Cubero Acequia Association, Cebolletita Acequia Association, and Community Ditch of San José de la Cienega.

(2) ADJUDICATION.—The term ''Adjudication'' means the general adjudication of water rights entitled ''State of New Mexico, ex rel. State Engineer v. Kerr-McGee, et al.'', No. D–1333–CV–1983–00190 and No. D–1333–CV1983–00220 (consolidated) pending, as of the date of enactment of this Act, in the Decree Court.

(3) AGREEMENT.—The term ''Agreement'' means—

(A) the document entitled ''Rio San José Stream System Water Rights Local Settlement Agreement Among the Pueblo of Acoma, the Pueblo of Laguna, the Navajo Nation, the State of New Mexico, the City of Grants, the Village of Milan, the Association of Community Ditches of the Rio San José and Nine Individual Acequias and Community Ditches'' and dated May 13, 2022, and the attachments thereto; and

(B) any amendment to the document referred to in subparagraph (A) (including an amendment to an attachment thereto) that is executed to ensure that the Agreement is consistent with this title.

(4) ALLOTMENT.—The term ''Allotment'' means a parcel of land that is—

(A) located within—

(i) the Rio Puerco Basin;

(ii) the Rio San José Stream System; or

(iii) the Rio Salado Basin; and

(B) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of 1 or more individual Indians.

(5) ALLOTTEE.—The term ''Allottee'' means an individual with a beneficial interest in an Allotment.

(6) DECREE COURT.—The term ''Decree Court'' means the Thirteenth Judicial District Court of the State of New Mexico.

(7) ENFORCEABILITY DATE.—The term ''Enforceability Date'' means the date described in section 117.

(8) PARTIAL FINAL JUDGMENT AND DECREE.—The term ''Partial Final Judgment and Decree'' means a final or interlocutory partial final judgment and decree entered by the Decree Court with respect to the water rights of the Pueblos—

(A) that is substantially in the form described in article 14.7.2 of the Agreement, as amended to ensure consistency with this title; and

(B) from which no further appeal may be taken.

(9) PUEBLO.—The term ''Pueblo'' means either of—

(A) the Pueblo of Acoma; or

(B) the Pueblo of Laguna.

(10) PUEBLO LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''Pueblo Land'' means any real property—

(i) in the Rio San José Stream System that is held by the United States in trust for either Pueblo, or owned by either Pueblo, as of the Enforceability Date;

(ii) in the Rio Salado Basin that is held by the United States in trust for the Pueblo of Acoma, or owned by the Pueblo of Acoma, as of the Enforceability Date; or

(iii) in the Rio Puerco Basin that is held by the United States in trust for the Pueblo of Laguna, or owned by the Pueblo of Laguna, as of the Enforceability Date.

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ''Pueblo Land'' includes land placed in trust with the United States subsequent to the Enforceability Date for either Pueblo in the Rio San José Stream System, for the Pueblo of Acoma in the Rio Salado Basin, or for the Pueblo of Laguna in the Rio Puerco Basin.

(11) PUEBLO TRUST FUND.—The term ''Pueblo Trust Fund'' means—

(A) the Pueblo of Acoma Settlement Trust Fund established by section 115(a);

(B) the Pueblo of Laguna Settlement Trust Fund established by that section; and

(C) the Acomita Reservoir Works Trust Fund established by that section.

(12) PUEBLO WATER RIGHTS.—The term ''Pueblo Water Rights'' means—

(A) the respective water rights of the Pueblos in the Rio San José Stream System—

(i) as identified in the Agreement and section 114; and

(ii) as confirmed in the Partial Final Judgment and Decree;

(B) the water rights of the Pueblo of Acoma in the Rio Salado Basin; and

(C) the water rights of the Pueblo of Laguna in the Rio Puerco Basin, as identified in the Agreement and section 114.

(13) PUEBLOS.—The term ''Pueblos'' means—

(A) the Pueblo of Acoma; and

(B) the Pueblo of Laguna.

(14) RIO PUERCO BASIN.—The term ''Rio Puerco Basin'' means the area defined by the United States Geological Survey Hydrologic Unit Codes (HUC) 13020204 (Rio Puerco subbasin) and 13020205 (Arroyo Chico subbasin), including the hydrologically connected groundwater.

(15) RIO SAN JOSÉ STREAM SYSTEM.—The term ''Rio San José Stream System'' means the geographic extent of the area involved in the Adjudication pursuant to the description filed in the Decree Court on November 21, 1986.

(16) RIO SALADO BASIN.—The term ''Rio Salado Basin'' means the area defined by the United States Geological Survey Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 13020209 (Rio Salado subbasin), including the hydrologically connected groundwater.

(17) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(18) SIGNATORY ACEQUIA.—The term ''Signatory Acequia'' means an acequia that is a signatory to the Agreement.

(19) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of New Mexico and all officers, agents, departments, and political subdivisions of the State of New Mexico.

SEC. 113. RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENT.

(a) RATIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as modified by this title and to the extent the Agreement does not conflict with this title, the Agreement is authorized, ratified, and confirmed.

(2) AMENDMENTS.—If an amendment to the Agreement or any attachment to the Agreement requiring the signature of the Secretary is executed in accordance with this title to make the Agreement consistent with this title, the amendment is authorized, ratified, and confirmed.

(b) EXECUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent the Agreement does not conflict with this title, the Secretary shall execute the Agreement, including all attachments to or parts of the Agreement requiring the signature of the Secretary.

(2) MODIFICATIONS.—Nothing in this title prohibits the Secretary, after execution of the Agreement, from approving any modification to the Agreement, including an attachment to the Agreement, that is consistent with this title, to the extent that the modification does not otherwise require congressional approval under section 2116 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 177) or any other applicable provision of Federal law.

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In implementing the Agreement and this title, the Secretary shall comply with—

(A) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(B) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), including the implementing regulations of that Act; and

(C) all other applicable Federal environmental laws and regulations.

(2) COMPLIANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In implementing the Agreement and this title, the Pueblos shall prepare any necessary environmental documents consistent with—

(i) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(ii) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), including the implementing regulations of that Act; and

(iii) all other applicable Federal environmental laws and regulations.

(B) AUTHORIZATIONS.—The Secretary shall—

(i) independently evaluate the documentation required under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) be responsible for the accuracy, scope, and contents of that documentation.

(3) EFFECT OF EXECUTION.—The execution of the Agreement by the Secretary under this section shall not constitute a major Federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(4) COSTS.—Any costs associated with the performance of the compliance activities under subsection (c) shall be paid from funds deposited in the Pueblo Trust Funds, subject to the condition that any costs associated with the performance of Federal approval or other review of such compliance work or costs associated with inherently Federal functions shall remain the responsibility of the Secretary.

SEC. 114. PUEBLO WATER RIGHTS.

(a) TRUST STATUS OF THE PUEBLO WATER RIGHTS.—The Pueblo Water Rights shall be held in trust by the United States on behalf of the Pueblos in accordance with the Agreement and this title.

(b) FORFEITURE AND ABANDONMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Pueblo Water Rights shall not be subject to loss through non-use, forfeiture, abandonment, or other operation of law.

(2) STATE-LAW BASED WATER RIGHTS.—Pursuant to the Agreement, State-law based water rights acquired by a Pueblo, or by the United States on behalf of a Pueblo, after the date for inclusion in the Partial Final Judgment and Decree, shall not be subject to forfeiture, abandonment, or permanent alienation from the time they are acquired.

(c) USE.—Any use of the Pueblo Water Rights shall be subject to the terms and conditions of the Agreement and this title.

(d) ALLOTMENT RIGHTS NOT INCLUDED.—The Pueblo Water Rights shall not include any water uses or water rights claims on an Allotment.

(e) AUTHORITY OF THE PUEBLOS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Pueblos shall have the authority to allocate, distribute, and lease the Pueblo Water Rights for use on Pueblo Land in accordance with the Agreement, this title, and applicable Federal law.

(2) USE OFF PUEBLO LAND.—The Pueblos may allocate, distribute, and lease the Pueblo Water Rights for use off Pueblo Land in accordance with the Agreement, this title, and applicable Federal law, subject to the approval of the Secretary.

(3) ALLOTTEE WATER RIGHTS.—The Pueblos shall not object in any general stream adjudication, including the Adjudication, or any other appropriate forum, to the quantification of reasonable domestic, stock, and irrigation water uses on an Allotment, and shall administer any water use in accordance with applicable Federal law, including recognition of—

(A) any water use existing on an Allotment as of the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) reasonable domestic, stock, and irrigation water uses on an Allotment; and

(C) any Allotment water right decreed in a general stream adjudication, including the Adjudication, or other appropriate forum, for an Allotment.

(f) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) NO ALIENATION.—The Pueblos shall not permanently alienate any portion of the Pueblo Water Rights.

(2) PURCHASES OR GRANTS OF LAND FROM INDIANS.—An authorization provided by this title for the allocation, distribution, leasing, or other arrangement entered into pursuant to this title shall be considered to satisfy any requirement for authorization of the action required by Federal law.

(3) PROHIBITION ON FORFEITURE.—The nonuse of all or any portion of the Pueblo Water Rights by any water user shall not result in the forfeiture, abandonment, relinquishment, or other loss of all or any portion of the Pueblo Water Rights.

SEC. 115. SETTLEMENT TRUST FUNDS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish 2 trust funds, to be known as the ''Pueblo of Acoma Settlement Trust Fund'' and the ''Pueblo of Laguna Settlement Trust Fund'', and a trust fund for the benefit of both Pueblos to be known as the ''Acomita Reservoir Works Trust Fund'', to be managed, invested, and distributed by the Secretary and to remain available until expended, withdrawn, or reverted to the general fund of the Treasury, consisting of the amounts deposited in the Pueblo Trust Funds under subsection (c), together with any investment earnings, including interest, earned on those amounts, for the purpose of carrying out this title.

(b) ACCOUNTS.—

(1) PUEBLO OF ACOMA SETTLEMENT TRUST FUND.—The Secretary shall establish in the Pueblo of Acoma Settlement Trust Fund the following accounts:

(A) The Water Rights Settlement Account.

(B) The Water Infrastructure Operations and Maintenance Account.

(C) The Feasibility Studies Settlement Account.

(2) PUEBLO OF LAGUNA SETTLEMENT TRUST FUND.—The Secretary shall establish in the Pueblo of Laguna Settlement Trust Fund the following accounts:

(A) The Water Rights Settlement Account.

(B) The Water Infrastructure Operations and Maintenance Account.

(C) The Feasibility Studies Settlement Account.

(c) DEPOSITS.—The Secretary shall deposit in each Pueblo Trust Fund the amounts made available pursuant to section 116(a).

(d) MANAGEMENT AND INTEREST.—

(1) MANAGEMENT.—On receipt and deposit of funds into the Pueblo Trust Funds under subsection (c), the Secretary shall manage, invest, and distribute all amounts in the Pueblo Trust Funds in a manner that is consistent with the investment authority of the Secretary under—

(A) the first section of the Act of June 24, 1938 (25 U.S.C. 162a);

(B) the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.); and

(C) this subsection.

(2) INVESTMENT EARNINGS.—In addition to the deposits made to each Pueblo Trust Fund under subsection (c), any investment earnings, including interest, earned on those amounts held in each Pueblo Trust Fund are authorized to be used in accordance with subsections (f) and (h).

(e) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated to, and deposited in, each Pueblo Trust Fund, including any investment earnings (including interest) earned on those amounts, shall be made available to the Pueblo or Pueblos by the Secretary beginning on the Enforceability Date, subject to the requirements of this section, except for those funds to be made available to the Pueblos pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1)—

(A) amounts deposited in the Feasibility Studies Settlement Account of each Pueblo Trust Fund, including any investment earnings, including interest, earned on those amounts shall be available to the Pueblo on the date on which the amounts are deposited for uses described in subsection (h)(3), and in accordance with the Agreement;

(B) amounts deposited in the Acomita Reservoir Works Trust Fund, including any investment earnings, including interest, earned on those amounts shall be available to the Pueblos on the date on which the amounts are deposited for uses described in subsection (h)(4), and in accordance with the Agreement; and

(C) up to $15,000,000 from the Water Rights Settlement Account for each Pueblo shall be available on the date on which the amounts are deposited for installing, on Pueblo Lands, groundwater wells to meet immediate domestic, commercial, municipal and industrial water needs, and associated environmental, cultural, and historical compliance.

(f) WITHDRAWALS.—

(1) WITHDRAWALS UNDER THE AMERICAN INDIAN TRUST FUND MANAGEMENT REFORM ACT OF 1994.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Pueblo may withdraw any portion of the amounts in its respective Settlement Trust Fund on approval by the Secretary of a Tribal management plan submitted by each Pueblo in accordance with the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—In addition to the requirements under the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Tribal management plan under this paragraph shall require that the appropriate Pueblo shall spend all amounts withdrawn from each Pueblo Trust Fund, and any investment earnings (including interest) earned on those amounts through the investments under the Tribal management plan, in accordance with this title.

(C) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary may carry out such judicial and administrative actions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to enforce the Tribal management plan under this paragraph to ensure that amounts withdrawn by each Pueblo from the Pueblo Trust Funds under subparagraph (A) are used in accordance with this title.

(2) WITHDRAWALS UNDER EXPENDITURE PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Pueblo may submit to the Secretary a request to withdraw funds from the Pueblo Trust Fund of the Pueblo pursuant to an approved expenditure plan.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to withdraw amounts under an expenditure plan under subparagraph (A), the appropriate Pueblo shall submit to the Secretary an expenditure plan for any portion of the Pueblo Trust Fund that the Pueblo elects to withdraw pursuant to that subparagraph, subject to the condition that the amounts shall be used for the purposes described in this title.

(C) INCLUSIONS.—An expenditure plan under this paragraph shall include a description of the manner and purpose for which the amounts proposed to be withdrawn from the Pueblo Trust Fund will be used by the Pueblo, in accordance with this subsection and subsection (h).

(D) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall approve an expenditure plan submitted under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines that the plan—

(i) is reasonable; and

(ii) is consistent with, and will be used for, the purposes of this title.

(E) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary may carry out such judicial and administrative actions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to enforce an expenditure plan to ensure that amounts disbursed under this paragraph are used in accordance with this title.

(3) WITHDRAWALS FROM ACOMITA RESERVOIR WORKS TRUST FUND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A Pueblo may submit to the Secretary a request to withdraw funds from the Acomita Reservoir Works Trust Fund pursuant to an approved joint expenditure plan.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—To be eligible to withdraw amounts under a joint expenditure plan under subparagraph (A), the Pueblos shall submit to the Secretary a joint expenditure

plan for any portion of the Acomita Reservoir Works Trust Fund that the Pueblos elect to withdraw pursuant to this subparagraph, subject to the condition that the amounts shall be used for the purposes described in subsection (h)(4).

(ii) WRITTEN RESOLUTION.—Each request to withdraw amounts under a joint expenditure plan submitted under clause (i) shall be accompanied by a written resolution from the Tribal councils of both Pueblos approving the requested use and disbursement of funds.

(C) INCLUSIONS.—A joint expenditure plan under this paragraph shall include a description of the manner and purpose for which the amounts proposed to be withdrawn from the Acomita Reservoir Works Trust Fund will be used by the Pueblo or Pueblos to whom the funds will be disbursed, in accordance with subsection (h)(4).

(D) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall approve a joint expenditure plan submitted under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines that the plan—

(i) is reasonable; and

(ii) is consistent with, and will be used for, the purposes of this title.

(E) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary may carry out such judicial and administrative actions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to enforce a joint expenditure plan to ensure that amounts disbursed under this paragraph are used in accordance with this title.

(g) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section gives the Pueblos the right to judicial review of a determination of the Secretary relating to whether to approve a Tribal management plan under paragraph (1) of subsection (f) or an expenditure plan under paragraph (2) or (3) of that subsection, except under subchapter II of chapter 5, of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act'').

(h) USES.—

(1) WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACCOUNT.—The Water Rights Settlement Account for each Pueblo may only be used for the following purposes:

(A) Acquiring water rights or water supply.

(B) Planning, permitting, designing, engineering, constructing, reconstructing, replacing, rehabilitating, operating, or repairing water production, treatment, or delivery infrastructure, including for domestic and municipal use, on-farm improvements, or wastewater infrastructure.

(C) Pueblo Water Rights management and administration.

(D) Watershed protection and enhancement, support of agriculture, water-related Pueblo community welfare and economic development, and costs relating to implementation of the Agreement.

(E) Environmental compliance in the development and construction of infrastructure under this title.

(2) WATER INFRASTRUCTURE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE TRUST ACCOUNT.—The Water Infrastructure Operations and Maintenance Account for each Pueblo may only be used to pay costs for operation and maintenance of water infrastructure to serve Pueblo domestic, commercial, municipal, and industrial water uses from any water source.

(3) FEASIBILITY STUDIES SETTLEMENT ACCOUNT.—The Feasibility Studies Settlement Account for each Pueblo may only be used to pay costs for feasibility studies of water supply infrastructure to serve Pueblo domestic, commercial, municipal, and industrial water uses from any water source.

(4) ACOMITA RESERVOIR WORKS TRUST FUND.—The Acomita Reservoir Works Trust Fund may only be used for planning, permitting, designing, engineering, constructing, reconstructing, replacing, rehabilitating, maintaining, or repairing Acomita reservoir, its dam, inlet works, outlet works, and the North Acomita Ditch from the Acomita Reservoir outlet on the Pueblo of Acoma through its terminus on the Pueblo of Laguna.

(i) LIABILITY.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury shall not be liable for the expenditure or investment of any amounts withdrawn from the Pueblo Trust Funds by a Pueblo under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (f).

(j) EXPENDITURE REPORTS.—Each Pueblo shall annually submit to the Secretary an expenditure report describing accomplishments and amounts spent from use of withdrawals under a Tribal management plan or an expenditure plan under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (f), as applicable.

(k) NO PER CAPITA DISTRIBUTIONS.—No portion of the Pueblo Trust Funds shall be distributed on a per capita basis to any member of a Pueblo.

(l) TITLE TO INFRASTRUCTURE.—Title to, control over, and operation of any project constructed using funds from the Pueblo Trust Funds shall remain in the appropriate Pueblo or Pueblos.

(m) OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPLACEMENT.—All operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of any project constructed using funds from the Pueblo Trust Funds shall be the responsibility of the appropriate Pueblo or Pueblos.

SEC. 116. FUNDING.

(a) MANDATORY APPROPRIATIONS.—Out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary the following amounts for the following accounts:

(1) PUEBLO OF ACOMA SETTLEMENT TRUST FUND.—

(A) THE WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACCOUNT.—$296,000,000, to remain available until expended, withdrawn, or reverted to the general fund of the Treasury.

(B) THE WATER INFRASTRUCTURE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT.—$14,000,000, to remain available until expended, withdrawn, or reverted to the general fund of the Treasury.

(C) THE FEASIBILITY STUDIES SETTLEMENT ACCOUNT.—$1,750,000, to remain available until expended, withdrawn, or reverted to the general fund of the Treasury.

(2) PUEBLO OF LAGUNA SETTLEMENT TRUST FUND.—

(A) THE WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT ACCOUNT.—$464,000,000, to remain available until expended, withdrawn, or reverted to the general fund of the Treasury.

(B) THE WATER INFRASTRUCTURE OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE ACCOUNT.—$26,000,000, to remain available until expended, withdrawn, or reverted to the general fund of the Treasury.

(C) THE FEASIBILITY STUDIES SETTLEMENT ACCOUNT.—$3,250,000, to remain available until expended, withdrawn, or reverted to the general fund of the Treasury.

(3) ACOMITA RESERVOIR WORKS TRUST FUND.—$45,000,000, to remain available until expended, withdrawn, or reverted to the general fund of the Treasury.

(b) FLUCTUATIONS IN COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts appropriated under subsection (a) shall be increased or decreased, as appropriate, by such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in costs, as indicated by the Bureau of Reclamation Construction Cost Index–Composite Trend.

(2) CONSTRUCTION COSTS ADJUSTMENT.—The amounts appropriated under subsection (a) shall be adjusted to address construction cost changes necessary to account for unforeseen market volatility that may not otherwise be captured by engineering cost indices, as determined by the Secretary, including repricing applicable to the types of construction and current industry standards involved.

(3) REPETITION.—The adjustment process under this subsection shall be repeated for each subsequent amount appropriated until the applicable amount, as adjusted, has been appropriated.

(4) PERIOD OF INDEXING.—The period of indexing and adjustment under this subsection for any increment of funding shall start on October 1, 2021, and shall end on the date on which funds are deposited in the applicable Pueblo Trust Fund.

(c) STATE COST SHARE.—Pursuant to the Agreement, the State shall contribute—

(1) $23,500,000, as adjusted for inflation pursuant to the Agreement, for the Joint Grants-Milan Project for Water Re-Use, Water Conservation and Augmentation of the Rio San José, the Village of Milan Projects Fund, and the City of Grants Projects Fund;

(2) $12,000,000, as adjusted for the inflation pursuant to the Agreement, for Signatory Acequias Projects and Offset Projects Fund for the Association of Community Ditches of the Rio San José; and

(3) $500,000, as adjusted for inflation pursuant to the Agreement, to mitigate impairment to non-Pueblo domestic and livestock groundwater rights as a result of new Pueblo water use.

SEC. 117. ENFORCEABILITY DATE.

The Enforceability Date shall be the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a statement of findings that—

(1) to the extent that the Agreement conflicts with this title, the Agreement has been amended to conform with this title;

(2) the Agreement, as amended, has been executed by all parties to the Agreement, including the United States;

(3) all of the amounts appropriated under section 116 have been appropriated and deposited in the designated accounts of the Pueblo Trust Fund;

(4) the State has—

(A) provided the funding under section 116(c)(3) into appropriate funding accounts;

(B) provided the funding under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 116(c) into appropriate funding accounts or entered into funding agreements with the intended beneficiaries for funding under those paragraphs of that section; and

(C) enacted legislation to amend State law to provide that a Pueblo Water Right may be leased for a term not to exceed 99 years, including renewals;

(5) the Decree Court has approved the Agreement and has entered a Partial Final Judgment and Decree; and

(6) the waivers and releases under section 118 have been executed by the Pueblos and the Secretary.

SEC. 118. WAIVERS AND RELEASES OF CLAIMS.

(a) WAIVERS AND RELEASES OF CLAIMS BY PUEBLOS AND THE UNITED STATES AS TRUSTEE FOR PUEBLOS.—Subject to the reservation of rights and retention of claims under subsection (d), as consideration for recognition of the Pueblo Water Rights and other benefits described in the Agreement and this title, the Pueblos and the United States, acting as trustee for the Pueblos, shall execute a waiver and release of all claims for—

(1) water rights within the Rio San José Stream System that the Pueblos, or the United States acting as trustee for the Pueblos, asserted or could have asserted in any proceeding, including the Adjudication, on or before the Enforceability Date, except to the extent that such rights are recognized in the Agreement and this title; and

(2) damages, losses, or injuries to water rights or claims of interference with, diversion of, or taking of water rights (including claims for injury to land resulting from such damages, losses, injuries, interference with, diversion, or taking of water rights) in waters in the Rio San José Stream System against any party to the Agreement, including the members and parciantes of Signatory Acequias, that accrued at any time up to and including the Enforceability Date.

(b) WAIVERS AND RELEASES OF CLAIMS BY PUEBLOS AGAINST UNITED STATES.—Subject to the reservation of rights and retention of claims under subsection (d), the Pueblos shall execute a waiver and release of all claims against the United States (including any agency or employee of the United States) first arising before the Enforceability Date relating to—

(1) water rights within the Rio San José Stream System that the United States, acting as trustee for the Pueblos, asserted or could have asserted in any proceeding, including the Adjudication, except to the extent that such rights are recognized as part of the Pueblo Water Rights under this title;

(2) foregone benefits from non-Pueblo use of water, on and off Pueblo Land (including water from all sources and for all uses), within the Rio San José Stream System;

(3) damage, loss, or injury to water, water rights, land, or natural resources due to loss of water or water rights (including damages, losses, or injuries to hunting, fishing, gathering, or cultural rights due to loss of water or water rights, claims relating to interference with, diversion of, or taking of water, or claims relating to a failure to protect, acquire, replace, or develop water, water rights, or water infrastructure) within the Rio San José Stream System;

(4) a failure to provide operation, maintenance, or deferred maintenance for any irrigation system or irrigation project within the Rio San José Stream System;

(5) a failure to establish or provide a municipal, rural, or industrial water delivery system on Pueblo Land within the Rio San José Stream System;

(6) damage, loss, or injury to water, water rights, land, or natural resources due to construction, operation, and management of irrigation projects on Pueblo Land (including damages, losses, or injuries to fish habitat, wildlife, and wildlife habitat) within the Rio San José Stream System;

(7) a failure to provide a dam safety improvement to a dam on Pueblo Land within the Rio San José Stream System;

(8) the litigation of claims relating to any water right of the Pueblos within the Rio San José Stream System; and

(9) the negotiation, execution, or adoption of the Agreement (including attachments) and this title.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The waivers and releases described in subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the Enforceability Date.

(d) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS AND RETENTION OF CLAIMS.—Notwithstanding the waivers and releases under subsections (a) and (b), the Pueblos and the United States, acting as trustee for the Pueblos, shall retain all claims relating to—

(1) the enforcement of, or claims accruing after the Enforceability Date relating to, water rights recognized under the Agreement, this title, or the Partial Final Judgment and Decree entered in the Adjudication;

(2) activities affecting the quality of water and the environment, including claims under—

(A) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), including claims for damages to natural resources;

(B) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(C) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) (commonly referred to as the ''Clean Water Act''); and

(D) any regulations implementing the Acts described in subparagraphs (A) through (C);

(3) the right to use and protect water rights acquired after the date of enactment of this Act;

(4) damage, loss, or injury to land or natural resources that is not due to loss of water or water rights, including hunting, fishing, gathering, or cultural rights;

(5) all claims for water rights, and claims for injury to water rights, in basins other than the Rio San José Stream System, subject to article 8.5 of the Agreement with respect to the claims of the Pueblo of Laguna for water rights in the Rio Puerco Basin and the claims of the Pueblo of Acoma for water rights in the Rio Salado Basin;

(6) all claims relating to the Jackpile-Paguate Uranium Mine in the State that are not due to loss of water or water rights; and

(7) all rights, remedies, privileges, immunities, powers, and claims not specifically waived and released pursuant to this title or the Agreement.

(e) EFFECT OF AGREEMENT AND TITLE.—Nothing in the Agreement or this title—

(1) reduces or extends the sovereignty (including civil and criminal jurisdiction) of any government entity, except as provided in section 120;

(2) affects the ability of the United States, as a sovereign, to carry out any activity authorized by law, including—

(A) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.);

(B) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(C) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) (commonly referred to as the ''Clean Water Act'');

(D) the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.); and

(E) any regulations implementing the Acts described in subparagraphs (A) through (D);

(3) affects the ability of the United States to act as trustee for the Pueblos (consistent with this title), any other pueblo or Indian Tribe, or an Allottee of any Indian Tribe;

(4) confers jurisdiction on any State court—

(A) to interpret Federal law relating to health, safety, or the environment;

(B) to determine the duties of the United States or any other party under Federal law regarding health, safety, or the environment; or

(C) to conduct judicial review of any Federal agency action; or

(5) waives any claim of a member of a Pueblo in an individual capacity that does not derive from a right of the Pueblos.

(f) TOLLING OF CLAIMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each applicable period of limitation and time-based equitable defense relating to a claim described in this section shall be tolled for the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the Enforceability Date.

(2) EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.—Nothing in this subsection revives any claim or tolls any period of limitation or time-based equitable defense that expired before the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section precludes the tolling of any period of limitation or any time-based equitable defense under any other applicable law.

(g) EXPIRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This title shall expire in any case in which the Secretary fails to publish a statement of findings under section 117 by not later than—

(A) July 1, 2030; or

(B) such alternative later date as is agreed to by the Pueblos and the Secretary, after providing reasonable notice to the State.

(2) CONSEQUENCES.—If this title expires under paragraph (1)—

(A) the waivers and releases under subsections (a) and (b) shall—

(i) expire; and

(ii) have no further force or effect;

(B) the authorization, ratification, confirmation, and execution of the Agreement under section 113 shall no longer be effective;

(C) any action carried out by the Secretary, and any contract or agreement entered into, pursuant to this title shall be void;

(D) any unexpended Federal funds appropriated or made available to carry out the activities authorized by this title, together with any interest earned on those funds, and any water rights or contracts to use water and title to other property acquired or constructed with Federal funds appropriated or made available to carry out the activities authorized by this title, shall be returned to the Federal Government, unless otherwise agreed to by the Pueblos and the United States and approved by Congress; and

(E) except for Federal funds used to acquire or construct property that is returned to the Federal Government under subparagraph (D), the United States shall be entitled to offset any Federal funds made available to carry out this title that were expended or withdrawn, or any funds made available to carry out this title from other Federal authorized sources, together with any interest accrued on those funds, against any claims against the United States—

(i) relating to—

(I) water rights in the State asserted by—

(aa) the Pueblos; or

(bb) any user of the Pueblo Water Rights; or

(II) any other matter covered by subsection (b); or

(ii) in any future settlement of water rights of the Pueblos.

SEC. 119. SATISFACTION OF CLAIMS.

The benefits provided under this title shall be in complete replacement of, complete substitution for, and full satisfaction of any claim of the Pueblos against the United States that are waived and released by the Pueblos pursuant to section 118(b).

SEC. 120. CONSENT OF UNITED STATES TO JURISDICTION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW OF A PUEBLO WATER RIGHT PERMIT DECISION.

(a) CONSENT.—On the Enforceability Date, the consent of the United States is hereby given, with the consent of each Pueblo under article 11.5 of the Agreement, to jurisdiction in the District Court for the Thirteenth Judicial District of the State of New Mexico, and in the New Mexico Court of Appeals and the New Mexico Supreme Court on appeal therefrom in the same manner as provided under New Mexico law, over an action filed in such District Court by any party to a Pueblo Water Rights Permit administrative proceeding under article 11.4 of the Agreement for the limited and sole purpose of judicial review of a Pueblo Water Right Permit decision under article 11.5 of the Agreement.

(b) LIMITATION.—The consent of the United States under this title is limited to judicial review, based on the record developed through the administrative process of the Pueblo, under a standard of judicial review limited to determining whether the Pueblo decision on the application for Pueblo Water Right Permit—

(1) is supported by substantial evidence;

(2) is not arbitrary, capricious, or contrary to law;

(3) is not in accordance with this Agreement or the Partial Final Judgment and Decree; or

(4) shows that the Pueblo acted fraudulently or outside the scope of its authority.

(c) PUEBLO WATER CODE AND INTERPRETATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pueblo Water Code or Pueblo Water Law provisions that meet the requirements of article 11 of the Agreement shall be given full faith and credit in any proceeding described in this section.

(2) PROVISIONS OF THE PUEBLO WATER CODE.—To the extent that a State court conducting judicial review under this section must interpret provisions of Pueblo law that are not express provisions of the Pueblo Water Code, the State court shall certify the question of interpretation to the Pueblo court.

(3) NO CERTIFICATION.—Any issues of interpretation of standards in article 11.6 of the Agreement are not subject to certification.

(4) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section limits the jurisdiction of the Decree Court to interpret and enforce the Agreement.

SEC. 121. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) NO WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY BY THE UNITED STATES.—Nothing in this title waives the sovereign immunity of the United States.

(b) OTHER TRIBES NOT ADVERSELY AFFECTED.—Nothing in this title quantifies or diminishes any land or water right, or any claim or entitlement to land or water, of an Indian Tribe, band, or community other than the Pueblos.

(c) ALLOTTEES NOT ADVERSELY AFFECTED.—Nothing in this title quantifies or diminishes any water right, or any claim or entitlement to water, of an Allottee.

(d) EFFECT ON CURRENT LAW.—Nothing in this title affects any provision of law (including regulations) in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act with respect to pre-enforcement review of any Federal environmental enforcement action.

(e) CONFLICT.—In the event of a conflict between the Agreement and this title, this title shall control.

SEC. 122. ANTIDEFICIENCY.

The United States shall not be liable for any failure to carry out any obligation or activity authorized by this title, including any obligation or activity under the Agreement, if adequate appropriations are not provided expressly by Congress to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE II—PUEBLOS OF JEMEZ AND ZIA WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT

SEC. 201. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) to achieve a fair, equitable, and final settlement of all claims to water rights in the Jemez River Stream System in the State of New Mexico for—

(A) the Pueblo of Jemez;

(B) the Pueblo of Zia; and

(C) the United States, acting as trustee for the Pueblos of Jemez and Zia;

(2) to authorize, ratify, and confirm the Agreement entered into by the Pueblos, the State, and various other parties to the extent that the Agreement is consistent with this title;

(3) to authorize and direct the Secretary—

(A) to execute the Agreement; and

(B) to take any other actions necessary to carry out the Agreement in accordance with this title; and

(4) to authorize funds necessary for the implementation of the Agreement and this title.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) ADJUDICATION.—The term ''Adjudication'' means the adjudication of water rights pending before the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico: United States of America, on its own behalf, and on behalf of the Pueblos of Jemez, Santa Ana, and Zia, State of New Mexico, ex rel. State Engineer, Plaintiffs, and Pueblos of Jemez, Santa Ana, and Zia, Plaintiffs-in-Intervention v. Tom Abousleman, et al., Defendants, Civil No. 83–cv–01041 (KR).

(2) AGREEMENT.—The term ''Agreement'' means—

(A) the document entitled ''Pueblos of Jemez and Zia Water Rights Settlement Agreement'' and dated May 11, 2022, and the appendices and exhibits attached thereto; and

(B) any amendment to the document referred to in subparagraph (A) (including an amendment to an appendix or exhibit) that is executed to ensure that the Agreement is consistent with this title.

(3) ENFORCEABILITY DATE.—The term ''Enforceability Date'' means the date described in section 207.

(4) JEMEZ RIVER STREAM SYSTEM.—The term ''Jemez River Stream System'' means the geographic extent of the area involved in the Adjudication.

(5) PARTIAL FINAL JUDGMENT AND DECREE.—The term ''Partial Final Judgment and Decree'' means a final or interlocutory partial final judgment and decree entered by the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico with respect to the water rights of the Pueblos—

(A) that is substantially in the form described in the Agreement, as amended to ensure consistency with this title; and

(B) from which no further appeal may be taken.

(6) PUEBLO.—The term ''Pueblo'' means either of—

(A) the Pueblo of Jemez; or

(B) the Pueblo of Zia.

(7) PUEBLO LAND.—The term ''Pueblo Land'' means any real property that is—

(A) held by the United States in trust for a Pueblo within the Jemez River Stream System;

(B) owned by a Pueblo within the Jemez River Stream System before the date on which a court approves the Agreement; or

(C) acquired by a Pueblo on or after the date on which a court approves the Agreement if the real property—

(i) is located within the exterior boundaries of the Pueblo, as recognized and confirmed by a patent issued under the Act of December 22, 1858 (11 Stat. 374, chapter V);

(ii) is located within the exterior boundaries of any territory set aside for a Pueblo by law, executive order, or court decree;

(iii) is owned by a Pueblo or held by the United States in trust for the benefit of a Pueblo outside the Jemez River Stream System that is located within the exterior boundaries of the Pueblo, as recognized and confirmed by a patent issued under the Act of December 22, 1858 (11 Stat. 374, chapter V); or

(iv) is located within the exterior boundaries of any real property located outside the Jemez River Stream System set aside for a Pueblo by law, executive order, or court decree if the land is within or contiguous to land held by the United States in trust for the Pueblo as of June 1, 2022.

(8) PUEBLO TRUST FUND.—The term ''Pueblo Trust Fund'' means—

(A) the Pueblo of Jemez Settlement Trust Fund established under section 205(a); and

(B) the Pueblo of Zia Settlement Trust Fund established under that section.

(9) PUEBLO WATER RIGHTS.—The term ''Pueblo Water Rights'' means the respective water rights of the Pueblos—

(A) as identified in the Agreement and section 204; and

(B) as confirmed in the Partial Final Judgment and Decree.

(10) PUEBLOS.—The term ''Pueblos'' means—

(A) the Pueblo of Jemez; and

(B) the Pueblo of Zia.

(11) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(12) STATE.—The term ''State'' means the State of New Mexico and all officers, agents, departments, and political subdivisions of the State of New Mexico.

SEC. 203. RATIFICATION OF AGREEMENT.

(a) RATIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as modified by this title and to the extent that the Agreement does not conflict with this title, the Agreement is authorized, ratified, and confirmed.

(2) AMENDMENTS.—If an amendment to the Agreement, or to any appendix or exhibit attached to the Agreement requiring the signature of the Secretary, is executed in accordance with this title to make the Agreement consistent with this title, the amendment is authorized, ratified, and confirmed.

(b) EXECUTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—To the extent the Agreement does not conflict with this title, the Secretary shall execute the Agreement, including all appendices or exhibits to, or parts of, the Agreement requiring the signature of the Secretary.

(2) MODIFICATIONS.—Nothing in this title prohibits the Secretary, after execution of the Agreement, from approving any modification to the Agreement, including an appendix or exhibit to the Agreement, that is consistent with this title, to the extent that the modification does not otherwise require congressional approval under section 2116 of the Revised Statutes (25 U.S.C. 177) or any other applicable provision of Federal law.

(c) ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In implementing the Agreement and this title, the Secretary shall comply with—

(A) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(B) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), including the implementing regulations of that Act; and

(C) all other applicable Federal environmental laws and regulations.

(2) COMPLIANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—In implementing the Agreement and this title, the Pueblos shall prepare any necessary environmental documents, consistent with—

(i) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);

(ii) the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), including the implementing regulations of that Act; and

(iii) all other applicable Federal environmental laws and regulations.

(B) AUTHORIZATIONS.—The Secretary shall—

(i) independently evaluate the documentation required under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) be responsible for the accuracy, scope, and contents of that documentation.

(3) EFFECT OF EXECUTION.—The execution of the Agreement by the Secretary under this section shall not constitute a major Federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).

(4) COSTS.—Any costs associated with the performance of the compliance activities under this subsection shall be paid from funds deposited in the Pueblo Trust Funds, subject to the condition that any costs associated with the performance of Federal approval or other review of such compliance work or costs associated with inherently Federal functions shall remain the responsibility of the Secretary.

SEC. 204. PUEBLO WATER RIGHTS.

(a) TRUST STATUS OF THE PUEBLO WATER RIGHTS.—The Pueblo Water Rights shall be held in trust by the United States on behalf of the Pueblos in accordance with the Agreement and this title.

(b) FORFEITURE AND ABANDONMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Pueblo Water Rights shall not be subject to loss through non-use, forfeiture, abandonment, or other operation of law.

(2) STATE-LAW BASED WATER RIGHTS.—State-law based water rights acquired by a Pueblo, or by the United States on behalf of a Pueblo, after the date for inclusion in the Partial Final Judgment and Decree, shall not be subject to forfeiture, abandonment, or permanent alienation from the time they are acquired.

(c) USE.—Any use of the Pueblo Water Rights shall be subject to the terms and conditions of the Agreement and this title.

(d) AUTHORITY OF THE PUEBLOS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Pueblos shall have the authority to allocate, distribute, and lease the Pueblo Water Rights for use on Pueblo Land in accordance with the Agreement, this title, and applicable Federal law.

(2) USE OFF PUEBLO LAND.—The Pueblos may allocate, distribute, and lease the Pueblo Water Rights for use off Pueblo Land in accordance with the Agreement, this title, and applicable Federal law, subject to the approval of the Secretary.

(e) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) NO ALIENATION.—The Pueblos shall not permanently alienate any portion of the Pueblo Water Rights.

(2) PURCHASES OR GRANTS OF LAND FROM INDIANS.—An authorization provided by this title for the allocation, distribution, leasing, or other arrangement entered into pursuant to this title shall be considered to satisfy any requirement for authorization of the action required by Federal law.

(3) PROHIBITION ON FORFEITURE.—The nonuse of all or any portion of the Pueblo Water Rights by any water user shall not result in the forfeiture, abandonment, relinquishment, or other loss of all or any portion of the Pueblo Water Rights.

SEC. 205. SETTLEMENT TRUST FUNDS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish 2 trust funds, to be known as the ''Pueblo of Jemez Settlement Trust Fund'' and the ''Pueblo of Zia Settlement Trust Fund'', to be managed, invested, and distributed by the Secretary and to remain available until expended, withdrawn, or reverted to the general fund of the Treasury, consisting of the amounts deposited in the Pueblo Trust Funds under subsection (b), together with any investment earnings, including interest, earned on those amounts for the purpose of carrying out this title.

(b) DEPOSITS.—The Secretary shall deposit in each Pueblo Trust Fund the amounts made available pursuant to section 206(a).

(c) MANAGEMENT AND INTEREST.—

(1) MANAGEMENT.—On receipt and deposit of funds into the Pueblo Trust Funds under subsection (b), the Secretary shall manage, invest, and distribute all amounts in the Pueblo Trust Funds in a manner that is consistent with the investment authority of the Secretary under—

(A) the first section of the Act of June 24, 1938 (25 U.S.C. 162a);

(B) the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.); and

(C) this subsection.

(2) INVESTMENT EARNINGS.—In addition to the deposits made to each Pueblo Trust Fund under subsection (b), any investment earnings, including interest, earned on those amounts held in each Pueblo Trust Fund are authorized to be used in accordance with subsections (e) and (g).

(d) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts appropriated to, and deposited in, each Pueblo Trust Fund, including any investment earnings (including interest) earned on those amounts, shall be made available to each Pueblo by the Secretary beginning on the Enforceability Date, subject to the requirements of this section, except for funds to be made available to the Pueblos pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), $25,000,000 of the amounts deposited in each Pueblo Trust Fund shall be available to the appropriate Pueblo for—

(A) developing economic water development plans;

(B) preparing environmental compliance documents;

(C) preparing water project engineering designs;

(D) establishing and operating a water resource department;

(E) installing supplemental irrigation groundwater wells; and

(F) developing water measurement and reporting water use plans.

(e) WITHDRAWALS.—

(1) WITHDRAWALS UNDER THE AMERICAN INDIAN TRUST FUND MANAGEMENT REFORM ACT OF 1994.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Pueblo may withdraw any portion of the amounts in the Pueblo Trust Fund on approval by the Secretary of a Tribal management plan submitted by the Pueblo in accordance with the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—In addition to the requirements under the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.), the Tribal management plan under this paragraph shall require that the appropriate Pueblo shall spend all amounts withdrawn from each Pueblo Trust Fund, and any investment earnings (including interest) earned on those amounts through the investments under the Tribal management plan, in accordance with this title.

(C) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary may carry out such judicial and administrative actions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to enforce the Tribal management plan under this paragraph to ensure that amounts withdrawn by each Pueblo from the Pueblo Trust Fund of the Pueblo under subparagraph (A) are used in accordance with this title.

(2) WITHDRAWALS UNDER EXPENDITURE PLAN.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Each Pueblo may submit to the Secretary a request to withdraw funds from the Pueblo Trust Fund of the Pueblo pursuant to an approved expenditure plan.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—To be eligible to withdraw amounts under an expenditure plan under subparagraph (A), each Pueblo shall submit to the Secretary an expenditure plan for any portion of the Pueblo Trust Fund that the Pueblo elects to withdraw pursuant to that subparagraph, subject to the condition that the amounts shall be used for the purposes described in this title.

(C) INCLUSIONS.—An expenditure plan under this paragraph shall include a description of the manner and purpose for which the amounts proposed to be withdrawn from the Pueblo Trust Fund will be used by the Pueblo, in accordance with this subsection and subsection (g).

(D) APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall approve an expenditure plan submitted under subparagraph (A) if the Secretary determines that the plan—

(i) is reasonable; and

(ii) is consistent with, and will be used for, the purposes of this title.

(E) ENFORCEMENT.—The Secretary may carry out such judicial and administrative actions as the Secretary determines to be necessary to enforce an expenditure plan to ensure that amounts disbursed under this paragraph are used in accordance with this title.

(f) EFFECT OF SECTION.—Nothing in this section gives the Pueblos the right to judicial review of a determination of the Secretary relating to whether to approve a Tribal management plan under paragraph (1) of subsection (e) or an expenditure plan under paragraph (2) of that subsection except under subchapter II of chapter 5, and chapter 7, of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the ''Administrative Procedure Act'').

(g) USES.—Amounts from a Pueblo Trust Fund may only be used by the appropriate Pueblo for the following purposes:

(1) Planning, permitting, designing, engineering, constructing, reconstructing, replacing, rehabilitating, operating, or repairing water production, treatment, or delivery infrastructure, including for domestic and municipal use, on-farm improvements, or wastewater infrastructure.

(2) Watershed protection and enhancement, support of agriculture, water-related Pueblo community welfare and economic development, and costs related to implementation of the Agreement.

(3) Planning, permitting, designing, engineering, construction, reconstructing, replacing, rehabilitating, operating, or repairing water production of delivery infrastructure of the Augmentation Project, as set forth in the Agreement.

(4) Ensuring environmental compliance in the development and construction of projects under this title.

(5) The management and administration of the Pueblo Water Rights.

(h) LIABILITY.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the Treasury shall not be liable for the expenditure or investment of any amounts withdrawn from a Pueblo Trust Fund by a Pueblo under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (e).

(i) EXPENDITURE REPORTS.—Each Pueblo shall annually submit to the Secretary an expenditure report describing accomplishments and amounts spent from use of withdrawals under a Tribal management plan or an expenditure plan under paragraph (1) or (2) of subsection (e), as applicable.

(j) NO PER CAPITA DISTRIBUTIONS.—No portion of a Pueblo Trust Fund shall be distributed on a per capita basis to any member of a Pueblo.

(k) TITLE TO INFRASTRUCTURE.—Title to, control over, and operation of any project constructed using funds from a Pueblo Trust Fund shall remain in the appropriate Pueblo.

(l) OPERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPLACEMENT.—All operation, maintenance, and replacement costs of any project constructed using funds from a Pueblo Trust Fund shall be the responsibility of the appropriate Pueblo.

SEC. 206. FUNDING.

(a) MANDATORY APPROPRIATION.—Out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary—

(1) for deposit in the Pueblo of Jemez Settlement Trust Fund established under section 205(a) $290,000,000, to remain available until expended, withdrawn, or reverted to the general fund of the Treasury; and

(2) for deposit in the Pueblo of Zia Settlement Trust Fund established under that section $200,000,000, to remain available until expended, withdrawn, or reverted to the general fund of the Treasury.

(b) FLUCTUATION IN COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount appropriated under subsection (a) shall be increased or decreased, as appropriate, by such amounts as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in costs, as indicated by the Bureau of Reclamation Construction Cost Index–Composite Trend.

(2) CONSTRUCTION COSTS ADJUSTMENT.—The amount appropriated under subsection (a) shall be adjusted to address construction cost changes necessary to account for unforeseen market volatility that may not otherwise be captured by engineering cost indices, as determined by the Secretary, including repricing applicable to the types of construction and current industry standards involved.

(3) REPETITION.—The adjustment process under this subsection shall be repeated for each subsequent amount appropriated until the applicable amount, as adjusted, has been appropriated.

(4) PERIOD OF INDEXING.—The period of indexing adjustment under this subsection for any increment of funding shall start on October 1, 2021, and end on the date on which the funds are deposited in the applicable Pueblo Trust Fund.

(c) STATE COST SHARE.—The State shall contribute—

(1) $3,400,000, as adjusted for inflation pursuant to the Agreement, to the San Ysidro Community Ditch Association for capital and operating expenses of the mutual benefit Augmentation Project;

(2) $16,159,000, as adjusted for inflation pursuant to the Agreement, for Jemez River Basin Water Users Coalition acequia ditch improvements; and

(3) $500,000, as adjusted for inflation, to mitigate impairment to non-Pueblo domestic and livestock groundwater rights as a result of new Pueblo water use.

SEC. 207. ENFORCEABILITY DATE.

The Enforceability Date shall be the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a statement of findings that—

(1) to the extent that the Agreement conflicts with this title, the Agreement has been amended to conform with this title;

(2) the Agreement, as amended, has been executed by all parties to the Agreement, including the United States;

(3) the United States District Court for the District of New Mexico has approved the Agreement and has entered a Partial Final Judgment and Decree;

(4) all of the amounts appropriated under section 206 have been appropriated and deposited in the designated accounts of the applicable Pueblo Trust Fund;

(5) the State has—

(A) provided the funding under section 206(c)(2) into appropriate funding accounts;

(B) provided the funding under section 206(c)(1) or entered into a funding agreement with the intended beneficiaries for that funding; and

(C) enacted legislation to amend State law to provide that a Pueblo Water Right may be leased for a term of not to exceed 99 years, including renewals;

(6) the waivers and releases under section subsections (a) and (b) of section 208 have been executed by the Pueblos and the Secretary; and

(7) the waivers and releases under section 208 have been executed by the Pueblos and the Secretary.

SEC. 208. WAIVERS AND RELEASES OF CLAIMS.

(a) WAIVERS AND RELEASES OF CLAIMS BY PUEBLOS AND UNITED STATES AS TRUSTEE FOR PUEBLOS.—Subject to the reservation of rights and retention of claims under subsection (d), as consideration for recognition of the Pueblo Water Rights and other benefits described in the Agreement and this title, the Pueblos and the United States, acting as trustee for the Pueblos, shall execute a waiver and release of all claims for—

(1) water rights within the Jemez River Stream System that the Pueblos, or the United States acting as trustee for the Pueblos, asserted or could have asserted in any proceeding, including the Adjudication, on or before the Enforceability Date, except to the extent that such a right is recognized in the Agreement and this title; and

(2) damages, losses, or injuries to water rights or claims of interference with, diversion of, or taking of water rights (including claims for injury to land resulting from such damages, losses, injuries, interference, diversion, or taking of water rights) in the Jemez River Stream System against any party to a settlement, including the members and parciantes of signatory acequias, that accrued at any time up to and including the Enforceability Date.

(b) WAIVERS AND RELEASES OF CLAIMS BY PUEBLOS AGAINST UNITED STATES.—Subject to the reservation of rights and retention of claims under subsection (d), each Pueblo shall execute a waiver and release of all claims against the United States (including any agency or employee of the United States) for water rights within the Jemez River Stream System first arising before the Enforceability Date relating to—

(1) water rights within the Jemez River Stream System that the United States, acting as trustee for the Pueblos, asserted or could have asserted in any proceeding, including the Adjudication, except to the extent that such rights are recognized as part of the Pueblo Water Rights under this title;

(2) foregone benefits from non-Pueblo use of water, on and off Pueblo Land (including water from all sources and for all uses), within the Jemez River Stream System;

(3) damage, loss, or injury to water, water rights, land, or natural resources due to loss of water or water rights (including damages, losses, or injuries to hunting, fishing, gathering, or cultural rights due to loss of water or water rights, claims relating to interference with, diversion of, or taking of water, or claims relating to a failure to protect, acquire, replace, or develop water, water rights, or water infrastructure) within the Jemez River Stream System;

(4) a failure to establish or provide a municipal, rural, or industrial water delivery system on Pueblo Land within the Jemez River Stream System;

(5) damage, loss, or injury to water, water rights, land, or natural resources due to construction, operation, and management of irrigation projects on Pueblo Land or Federal land (including damages, losses, or injuries to fish habitat, wildlife, and wildlife habitat) within the Jemez River Stream System;

(6) a failure to provide for operation, maintenance, or deferred maintenance for any irrigation system or irrigation project within the Jemez River Stream System;

(7) a failure to provide a dam safety improvement to a dam on Pueblo Land within the Jemez River Stream System;

(8) the litigation of claims relating to any water right of a Pueblo within the Jemez River Stream System; and

(9) the negotiation, execution, or adoption of the Agreement (including exhibits or appendices) and this title.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The waivers and releases described in subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the Enforceability Date.

(d) RESERVATION OF RIGHTS AND RETENTION OF CLAIMS.—Notwithstanding the waivers and releases under subsections (a) and (b), the Pueblos and the United States, acting as trustee for the Pueblos, shall retain all claims relating to—

(1) the enforcement of, or claims accruing after the Enforceability Date relating to, water rights recognized under the Agreement, this title, or the Partial Final Judgement and Decree entered into in the Adjudication;

(2) activities affecting the quality of water, including claims under—

(A) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), including claims for damages to natural resources;

(B) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(C) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) (commonly referred to as the ''Clean Water Act''); and

(D) any regulations implementing the Acts described in subparagraphs (A) through (C);

(3) the right to use and protect water rights acquired after the date of enactment of this Act;

(4) damage, loss, or injury to land or natural resources that is not due to loss of water or water rights, including hunting, fishing, gathering, or cultural rights;

(5) all rights, remedies, privileges, immunities, and powers not specifically waived and released pursuant to this title or the Agreement; and

(6) loss of water or water rights in locations outside of the Jemez River Stream System.

(e) EFFECT OF AGREEMENT AND TITLE.—Nothing in the Agreement or this title—

(1) reduces or extends the sovereignty (including civil and criminal jurisdiction) of any government entity;

(2) affects the ability of the United States, as sovereign, to carry out any activity authorized by law, including—

(A) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.);

(B) the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300f et seq.);

(C) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) (commonly referred to as the ''Clean Water Act'');

(D) the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.); and

(E) any regulations implementing the Acts described in subparagraphs (A) though (D);

(3) affects the ability of the United States to act as trustee for the Pueblos (consistent with this title), any other pueblo or Indian Tribe, or an allottee of any Indian Tribe;

(4) confers jurisdiction on any State court—

(A) to interpret Federal law relating to health, safety, or the environment;

(B) to determine the duties of the United States or any other party under Federal law regarding health, safety, or the environment;

(C) to conduct judicial review of any Federal agency action; or

(D) to interpret Pueblo or Tribal law; or

(5) waives any claim of a member of a Pueblo in an individual capacity that does not derive from a right of the Pueblos.

(f) TOLLING OF CLAIMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each applicable period of limitation and time-based equitable defense relating to a claim described in this section shall be tolled for the period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act and ending on the Enforceability Date.

(2) EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.—Nothing in this subsection revives any claim or tolls any period of limitation or time-based equitable defense that expired before the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this section precludes the tolling of any period of limitation or any time-based equitable defense under any other applicable law.

(g) EXPIRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—This title shall expire in any case in which the Secretary fails to publish a statement of findings under section 207 by not later than—

(A) July 1, 2030; or

(B) such alternative later date as is agreed to by the Pueblos and the Secretary, after providing reasonable notice to the State.

(2) CONSEQUENCES.—If this title expires under paragraph (1)—

(A) the waivers and releases under subsections (a) and (b) shall—

(i) expire; and

(ii) have no further force or effect;

(B) the authorization, ratification, confirmation, and execution of the Agreement under section 203 shall no longer be effective;

(C) any action carried out by the Secretary, and any contract or agreement entered into, pursuant to this title shall be void;

(D) any unexpended Federal funds appropriated or made available to carry out the activities authorized by this title, together with any interest earned on those funds, and any water rights or contracts to use water and title to other property acquired or constructed with Federal funds appropriated or made available to carry out the activities authorized by this title shall be returned to the Federal Government, unless otherwise agreed to by the Pueblos and the United States and approved by Congress; and

(E) except for Federal funds used to acquire or construct property that is returned to the Federal Government under subparagraph (D), the United States shall be entitled to offset any Federal funds made available to carry out this title that were expended or withdrawn, or any funds made available to carry out this title from other Federal authorized sources, together with any interest accrued on those funds, against any claims against the United States—

(i) relating to—

(I) water rights in the State asserted by—

(aa) the Pueblos; or

(bb) any user of the Pueblo Water Rights; or

(II) any other matter covered by subsection (b); or

(ii) in any future settlement of water rights of the Pueblos.

SEC. 209. SATISFACTION OF CLAIMS.

The benefits provided under this title shall be in complete replacement of, complete substitution for, and full satisfaction of any claim of the Pueblos against the United States that are waived and released by the Pueblos pursuant to section 208(b).

SEC. 210. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) NO WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY BY THE UNITED STATES.—Nothing in this title waives the sovereign immunity of the United States.

(b) OTHER TRIBES NOT ADVERSELY AFFECTED.—Nothing in this title quantifies or diminishes any land or water right, or any claim or entitlement to land or water, of an Indian Tribe, band, or community other than the Pueblos.

(c) EFFECT ON CURRENT LAW.—Nothing in this title affects any provision of law (including regulations) in effect on the day before the date of enactment of this Act with respect to pre-enforcement review of any Federal environmental enforcement action.

(d) CONFLICT.—In the event of a conflict between the Agreement and this title, this title shall control.

SEC. 211. ANTIDEFICIENCY.

The United States shall not be liable for any failure to carry out any obligation or activity authorized by this title, including any obligation or activity under the Agreement, if adequate appropriations are not provided expressly by Congress to carry out the purposes of this title.

SA 1120. Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title I of division C, insert the following:

SEC. 110. The remaining unobligated balances, as of September 30, 2024, from amounts made available for the ''Department of Transportation—Office of the Secretary—National Infrastructure Investments'' in division L of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2021 (Public Law 116–260) are hereby permanently rescinded, and an amount of additional new budget authority equivalent to the amount rescinded is hereby appropriated on September 30, 2024, to remain available until September 30, 2027, and shall be available, without additional competition, for completing the funding of awards made pursuant to the fiscal year 2021 national infrastructure investments program, in addition to other funds as may be available for such purposes: *Provided*, That no amounts may be rescinded from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget or the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SA 1121. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

DIVISION D

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF AGENCY RULEMAKING

SEC. 101. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW. (a)(1)(A) Before a rule may take effect, the Federal agency promulgating such rule shall publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

(i) a copy of the rule;

(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 104(2);

(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Federal agency shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs;

(ii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of title 5, United States Code;

(iii) the agency's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995;

(iv) an estimate of the effect on inflation of the rule; and

(v) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

(D) If requested in writing by a member of Congress—

(i) the Comptroller General shall make a determination whether an agency action qualifies as a rule for purposes of this chapter, and shall submit to Congress this determination not later than 60 days after the date of the request; and

(ii) the Comptroller General, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, shall make a determination whether a rule is considered a major rule under the provisions of this act, and shall submit to Congress this determination not later than 90 days after the date of the request.

For purposes of this section, a determination under this subparagraph shall be deemed to be a report under subparagraph (A).

(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the agency's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 102 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 102, whichever is later.

(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 103 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this division in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 102.

(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in subsection (a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either

House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

(C) necessary for national security; or

(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 102.

(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this division, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days; or

(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 102 and 103 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

(2)(A) In applying sections 102 and 103 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day; or

(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

SEC. 102. CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL PROCEDURE FOR MAJOR RULES. (a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term "joint resolution" means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 101(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

(A) bears no preamble;

(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): ''Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.'';

(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): ''That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.''; and

(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 101(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 101(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

(h) This section and section 103 are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 103. CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL PROCEDURE FOR NONMAJOR RULES. (a) For purposes of this section, the term "joint resolution" means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 101(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect." (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

(e) In the Senate, the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date; or

(2) if the report under section 101(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 101(c)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

SEC. 104. DEFINITIONS. For purposes of this division:

(1) The term ''Federal agency'' means any agency as that term is defined in section 551(1) of title 5, United States Code, that receives funding under any division of this Act.

(2) The term ''major rule'' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions;

(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; or

(D) an increase in mandatory vaccinations.

(3) The term ''nonmajor rule'' means any rule that is not a major rule.

(4) The term ''rule'' means a rule, as defined in section 551 of title 5, United States Code, except that such ter has the meaning given such term in section 551 of title 5, United States Code, except that such term—

(A) includes interpretive rules, general statements of policy, and all other agency guidance documents; and

(B) does not include—

(i) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

(ii) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

(iii) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of nonagency parties.

(5) The term ''submission or publication date'', except as otherwise provided in this division, means—

(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 101(a)(1); and

(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 101(a)(1); and

(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

SEC. 105. JUDICIAL REVIEW. (a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this division shall be subject to judicial review.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether a Federal agency has completed the necessary requirements under this division for a rule to take effect.

(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 102 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

SEC. 106. EXEMPTION FOR MONETARY POLICY. Nothing in this division shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

SEC. 107. EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN RULES. Notwithstanding section 101—

(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

(2) any rule other than a major rule which the Federal agency for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Federal agency determines.

SEC. 108. REVIEW OF RULES CURRENTLY IN EFFECT. (a) Beginning on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this section and annually thereafter for the 4 years following, each agency shall designate not less than 20 percent of eligible rules made by that agency for review, and shall submit a report including each such eligible rule in the same manner as a report under section 1(a)(1). Section 1, section 2, and section 3 shall apply to each such rule, subject to subsection (c) of this section. No eligible rule previously designated may be designated again.

(b) Beginning after the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this section, if Congress has not enacted a joint resolution of approval for that eligible rule, that eligible rule shall not continue in effect.

(c)(1) Unless Congress approves all eligible rules designated by executive agencies for review within 90 days of designation, they shall have no effect.

(2) A single joint resolution of approval shall apply to all eligible rules in a report designated for a year as follows: ''That Congress approves the rules submitted by the_____ for the year _____.'' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

(3) A member of either House may move that a separate joint resolution be required for a specified rule.

(d) In this section, the term ''eligible rule'' means a rule that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this section.

SEC. 109. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE. Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 2 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rule subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 2 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

SEC. 110. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES. (a) The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report (and publish the report on the website of the Comptroller General) to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SA 1122. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in title VII of division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. (a) There is appropriated $3,000,000, to remain available until expended, for the emergency and transitional pet shelter and housing assistance grant program established under section 12502(b) of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (34 U.S.C. 20127).

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total amount rescinded in section 745 is increased by $3,000,000.

SA 1123. Ms. ERNST submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. 4. REPORTING REGARDING TELEWORK.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section, the terms ''employee'', ''locality pay area'', ''locality rate'', and ''official worksite'' have the meanings given those terms in section 531.602 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) REPORTING REQUIREMENT.—Not later than 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency or department funded under division A, division B, or division C of this Act shall submit to Congress a report containing—

(1) the number of employees of the agency or department who, based upon information technology login information, office swipeins, and other measurable and observable factors, perform the majority of their working hours in a locality pay area with a lower locality rate than the locality rate for the locality pay area in which the official worksite of the employee is located, but continue to receive the higher locality rate associated with the official worksite of the employee;

(2) the cost savings that would be achieved by adjusting the locality rate for employees described in paragraph (1) to be the locality rate for the locality pay area in which the employees perform the majority of their working hours;

(3) the actions the agency or department has taken to audit and adjust the locality rates for employees with a telework agreement to account for the location from which the employees perform the majority of their working hours;

(4) as of the date of enactment of this Act, the actions the agency or department has taken to ensure oversight and quality control of remote work;

(5) any additional steps the agency or department is considering taking to improve oversight and quality control of remote work;

(6) the typical daily onsite attendance in the office buildings of the agency or department, as a proportion of the total workforce of the agency or department;

(7) any guidance, initiatives, or other incentives in effect to entice the employees of the agency or department to return to working from the office buildings of the agency or department;

(8) a description of the instances in which the agency or department has exercised the authority under paragraph (2) of section 531.605(d) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations to waive the twice-in-a-pay-period standard under paragraph (1) of such section;

(9) the number of exceptions to the exercises of authority described in paragraph (8) that have been revoked during each month beginning on or after July 1, 2021;

(10) as of the date of enactment of this Act, the number of employees for whom an exception described in paragraph (8) remains in effect;

(11) a discussion of the monetary and environmental cost of maintaining underutilized space for the agency or department, in terms of energy use and carbon emissions;

(12) any steps the agency or department is taking or planning to take on or before the date that is 30 days after the date of enactment of this Act to reduce underutilization of building and office space; and

(13) an analysis of the impacts of telework on the delivery of services and response times, including any increase or decrease in backlogs relative to the backlog as of March 1, 2020.

SA 1124. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. Of the funds made available by this division or otherwise made available for fiscal year 2024 for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization Security Investment Program, not more than two percent may be obligated or expended.

SA 1125. Mr. VANCE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division C, insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or made available by this division may be used to enforce a mask mandate in response to the COVID–19 virus.

SA 1126. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division A, insert the following:

TITLE IV

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF RULEMAKING BY THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

SEC. 401. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW. (a)(1)(A) Before a rule of the Department may take effect, the Department shall publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

(i) a copy of the rule;

(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 404(2);

(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Department shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs;

(ii) the Department's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of title 5, United States Code;

(iii) the Department's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995;

(iv) an estimate of the effect on inflation of the rule; and

(v) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

(D) If requested in writing by a member of Congress—

(i) the Comptroller General shall make a determination whether an agency action qualifies as a rule for purposes of this chapter, and shall submit to Congress this determination not later than 60 days after the date of the request; and

(ii) the Comptroller General, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, shall make a determination whether a rule is considered a major rule under the provisions of this act, and shall submit to Congress this determination not later than 90 days after the date of the request.

For purposes of this section, a determination under this subparagraph shall be deemed to be a report under subparagraph (A).

(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the Department's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes

any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 402 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 402, whichever is later.

(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 403 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this title in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 402.

(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in subsection (a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

(C) necessary for national security; or

(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 402.

(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this title, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days; or

(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 402 and 403 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

(2)(A) In applying sections 402 and 403 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day; or

(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

SEC. 402. CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL PROCEDURE FOR MAJOR RULES. (a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term "joint resolution" means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 401(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

(A) bears no preamble;

(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): ''Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.'';

(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): ''That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.''; and

(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 401(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 401(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

(h) This section and section 403 are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 403. CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL PROCEDURE FOR NONMAJOR RULES. (a) For purposes of this section, the term "joint resolution" means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 401(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect." (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

(e) In the Senate, the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date; or

(2) if the report under section 401(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 401(c)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

SEC. 404. DEFINITIONS. For purposes of this title:

(1) The term ''Department'' means the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(2) The term ''major rule'' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions;

(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; or

(D) in increase in mandatory vaccinations.

(3) The term ''nonmajor rule'' means any rule that is not a major rule.

(4) The term ''rule'' means a rule, as defined in section 551 of title 5, United States, issued by the Department under title II of this division, except that such term—

(A) includes interpretive rules, general statements of policy, and all other agency guidance documents; and

(B) does not include—

(i) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

(ii) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

(iii) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of non-agency parties.

(5) The term ''submission or publication date'', except as otherwise provided in this title, means—

(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 401(a)(1); and

(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 401(a)(1); and

(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

SEC. 405. JUDICIAL REVIEW. (a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this title shall be subject to judicial review.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether the Department has completed the necessary requirements under this title for a rule to take effect.

(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 402 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

SEC. 406. EXEMPTION FOR MONETARY POLICY. Nothing in this title shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

SEC. 407. EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN RULES. Notwithstanding section 401—

(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

(2) any rule other than a major rule which the Department for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Department determines.

SEC. 408. REVIEW OF RULES CURRENTLY IN EFFECT. (a) Beginning on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this section and annually thereafter for the 4 years following, the Department shall designate not less than 20 percent of eligible rules made by the Department for review, and shall submit a report including each such eligible rule in the same manner as a report under section 401(a)(1). Section 401, section 402, and section 403 shall apply to each such rule, subject to subsection (c) of this section. No eligible rule previously designated may be designated again.

(b) Beginning after the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this section, if Congress has not enacted a joint resolution of approval for that eligible rule, that eligible rule shall not continue in effect.

(c)(1) Unless Congress approves all eligible rules designated by the Department for review within 90 days of designation, they shall have no effect.

(2) A single joint resolution of approval shall apply to all eligible rules in a report designated for a year as follows: ''That Congress approves the rules submitted by the_____ for the year _____.'' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

(3) A member of either House may move that a separate joint resolution be required for a specified rule.

(d) In this section, the term ''eligible rule'' means a rule that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this section.

SEC. 409. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE. Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 2 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rule subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 2 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

SEC. 410. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES. (a) The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report (and publish the report on the website of the Comptroller General) to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SA 1127. Mr. BARRASSO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 106 of the amendment, line 9, strike ''40 percent'' and insert ''30 percent''.

SA 1128. Mr. LEE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of division A, insert the following:

TITLE IV

CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF RULEMAKING BY THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

SEC. 401. CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW. (a)(1)(A) Before a rule of the Department may take effect, the Department shall publish in the Federal Register a list of information on which the rule is based, including data, scientific and economic studies, and cost-benefit analyses, and identify how the public can access such information online, and shall submit to each House of the Congress and to the Comptroller General a report containing—

(i) a copy of the rule;

(ii) a concise general statement relating to the rule;

(iii) a classification of the rule as a major or nonmajor rule, including an explanation of the classification specifically addressing each criteria for a major rule contained within subparagraphs (A) through (C) of section 404(2);

(iv) a list of any other related regulatory actions intended to implement the same statutory provision or regulatory objective as well as the individual and aggregate economic effects of those actions; and

(v) the proposed effective date of the rule.

(B) On the date of the submission of the report under subparagraph (A), the Department shall submit to the Comptroller General and make available to each House of Congress—

(i) a complete copy of the cost-benefit analysis of the rule, if any, including an analysis of any jobs added or lost, differentiating between public and private sector jobs;

(ii) the Department's actions pursuant to sections 603, 604, 605, 607, and 609 of title 5, United States Code;

(iii) the Department's actions pursuant to sections 202, 203, 204, and 205 of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995;

(iv) an estimate of the effect on inflation of the rule; and

(v) any other relevant information or requirements under any other Act and any relevant Executive orders.

(C) Upon receipt of a report submitted under subparagraph (A), each House shall provide copies of the report to the chairman and ranking member of each standing committee with jurisdiction under the rules of the House of Representatives or the Senate to report a bill to amend the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

(D) If requested in writing by a member of Congress—

(i) the Comptroller General shall make a determination whether an agency action qualifies as a rule for purposes of this chapter, and shall submit to Congress this determination not later than 60 days after the date of the request; and

(ii) the Comptroller General, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, shall make a determination whether a rule is considered a major rule under the provisions of this act, and shall submit to Congress this determination not later than 90 days after the date of the request.

For purposes of this section, a determination under this subparagraph shall be deemed to be a report under subparagraph (A).

(2)(A) The Comptroller General shall provide a report on each major rule to the committees of jurisdiction by the end of 15 calendar days after the submission or publication date. The report of the Comptroller General shall include an assessment of the Department's compliance with procedural steps required by paragraph (1)(B) and an assessment of whether the major rule imposes any new limits or mandates on private-sector activity.

(B) Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Comptroller General by providing information relevant to the Comptroller General's report under subparagraph (A).

(3) A major rule relating to a report submitted under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 402 or as provided for in the rule following enactment of a joint resolution of approval described in section 402, whichever is later.

(4) A nonmajor rule shall take effect as provided by section 403 after submission to Congress under paragraph (1).

(5) If a joint resolution of approval relating to a major rule is not enacted within the period provided in subsection (b)(2), then a joint resolution of approval relating to the same rule may not be considered under this title in the same Congress by either the House of Representatives or the Senate.

(b)(1) A major rule shall not take effect unless the Congress enacts a joint resolution of approval described under section 402.

(2) If a joint resolution described in subsection (a) is not enacted into law by the end of 70 session days or legislative days, as applicable, beginning on the date on which the report referred to in subsection (a)(1)(A) is received by Congress (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), then the rule described in that resolution shall be deemed not to be approved and such rule shall not take effect.

(c)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section (except subject to paragraph (3)), a major rule may take effect for one 90-calendar-day period if the President makes a determination under paragraph (2) and submits written notice of such determination to the Congress.

(2) Paragraph (1) applies to a determination made by the President by Executive order that the major rule should take effect because such rule is—

(A) necessary because of an imminent threat to health or safety or other emergency;

(B) necessary for the enforcement of criminal laws;

(C) necessary for national security; or

(D) issued pursuant to any statute implementing an international trade agreement.

(3) An exercise by the President of the authority under this subsection shall have no effect on the procedures under section 402.

(d)(1) In addition to the opportunity for review otherwise provided under this title, in the case of any rule for which a report was submitted in accordance with subsection (a)(1)(A) during the period beginning on the date occurring—

(A) in the case of the Senate, 60 session days; or

(B) in the case of the House of Representatives, 60 legislative days,

before the date the Congress is scheduled to adjourn a session of Congress through the date on which the same or succeeding Congress first convenes its next session, sections 402 and 403 shall apply to such rule in the succeeding session of Congress.

(2)(A) In applying sections 402 and 403 for purposes of such additional review, a rule described under paragraph (1) shall be treated as though—

(i) such rule were published in the Federal Register on—

(I) in the case of the Senate, the 15th session day; or

(II) in the case of the House of Representatives, the 15th legislative day,

after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes; and

(ii) a report on such rule were submitted to Congress under subsection (a)(1) on such date.

(B) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect the requirement under subsection (a)(1) that a report shall be submitted to Congress before a rule can take effect.

(3) A rule described under paragraph (1) shall take effect as otherwise provided by law (including other subsections of this section).

SEC. 402. CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL PROCEDURE FOR MAJOR RULES. (a)(1) For purposes of this section, the term "joint resolution" means only a joint resolution addressing a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 401(a)(1)(A)(iii) that—

(A) bears no preamble;

(B) bears the following title (with blanks filled as appropriate): ''Approving the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.'';

(C) includes after its resolving clause only the following (with blanks filled as appropriate): ''That Congress approves the rule submitted by _____ relating to _____.''; and

(D) is introduced pursuant to paragraph (2).

(2) After a House of Congress receives a report classifying a rule as major pursuant to section 401(a)(1)(A)(iii), the majority leader of that House (or his or her respective designee) shall introduce (by request, if appropriate) a joint resolution described in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the case of the House of Representatives, within 3 legislative days; and

(B) in the case of the Senate, within 3 session days.

(3) A joint resolution described in paragraph (1) shall not be subject to amendment at any stage of proceeding.

(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred in each House of

Congress to the committees having jurisdiction over the provision of law under which the rule is issued.

(c) In the Senate, if the committee or committees to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred have not reported it at the end of 15 session days after its introduction, such committee or committees shall be automatically discharged from further consideration of the resolution and it shall be placed on the calendar. A vote on final passage of the resolution shall be taken on or before the close of the 15th session day after the resolution is reported by the committee or committees to which it was referred, or after such committee or committees have been discharged from further consideration of the resolution.

(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee or committees to which a joint resolution is referred have reported, or when a committee or committees are discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 2 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

(e) In the House of Representatives, if any committee to which a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has been referred has not reported it to the House at the end of 15 legislative days after its introduction, such committee shall be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution, and it shall be placed on the appropriate calendar. On the second and fourth Thursdays of each month it shall be in order at any time for the Speaker to recognize a Member who favors passage of a joint resolution that has appeared on the calendar for at least 5 legislative days to call up that joint resolution for immediate consideration in the House without intervention of any point of order. When so called up a joint resolution shall be considered as read and shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered to its passage without intervening motion. It shall not be in order to reconsider the vote on passage. If a vote on final passage of the joint resolution has not been taken by the third Thursday on which the Speaker may recognize a Member under this subsection, such vote shall be taken on that day.

(f)(1) If, before passing a joint resolution described in subsection (a), one House receives from the other a joint resolution having the same text, then—

(A) the joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee; and

(B) the procedure in the receiving House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House until the vote on passage, when the joint resolution received from the other House shall supplant the joint resolution of the receiving House.

(2) This subsection shall not apply to the House of Representatives if the joint resolution received from the Senate is a revenue measure.

(g) If either House has not taken a vote on final passage of the joint resolution by the last day of the period described in section 401(b)(2), then such vote shall be taken on that day.

(h) This section and section 403 are enacted by Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and House of Representatives, respectively, and as such are deemed to be part of the rules of each House, respectively, but applicable only with respect to the procedure to be followed in that House in the case of a joint resolution described in subsection (a) and superseding other rules only where explicitly so; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change the rules (so far as they relate to the procedure of that House) at any time, in the same manner and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 403. CONGRESSIONAL DISAPPROVAL PROCEDURE FOR NONMAJOR RULES. (a) For purposes of this section, the term "joint resolution" means only a joint resolution introduced in the period beginning on the date on which the report referred to in section 401(a)(1)(A) is received by Congress and ending 60 days thereafter (excluding days either House of Congress is adjourned for more than 3 days during a session of Congress), the matter after the resolving clause of which is as follows: "That Congress disapproves the nonmajor rule submitted by the _____ relating to _____, and such rule shall have no force or effect." (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

(b) A joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be referred to the committees in each House of Congress with jurisdiction.

(c) In the Senate, if the committee to which is referred a joint resolution described in subsection (a) has not reported such joint resolution (or an identical joint resolution) at the end of 15 session days after the date of introduction of the joint resolution, such committee may be discharged from further consideration of such joint resolution upon a petition supported in writing by 30 Members of the Senate, and such joint resolution shall be placed on the calendar.

(d)(1) In the Senate, when the committee to which a joint resolution is referred has reported, or when a committee is discharged (under subsection (c)) from further consideration of a joint resolution described in subsection (a), it is at any time thereafter in order (even though a previous motion to the same effect has been disagreed to) for a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution, and all points of order against the joint resolution (and against consideration of the joint resolution) are waived. The motion is not subject to amendment, or to a motion to postpone, or to a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business. A motion to reconsider the vote by which the motion is agreed to or disagreed to shall not be in order. If a motion to proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution is agreed to, the joint resolution shall remain the unfinished business of the Senate until disposed of.

(2) In the Senate, debate on the joint resolution, and on all debatable motions and appeals in connection therewith, shall be limited to not more than 10 hours, which shall be divided equally between those favoring and those opposing the joint resolution. A motion to further limit debate is in order and not debatable. An amendment to, or a motion to postpone, or a motion to proceed to the consideration of other business, or a motion to recommit the joint resolution is not in order.

(3) In the Senate, immediately following the conclusion of the debate on a joint resolution described in subsection (a), and a single quorum call at the conclusion of the debate if requested in accordance with the rules of the Senate, the vote on final passage of the joint resolution shall occur.

(4) Appeals from the decisions of the Chair relating to the application of the rules of the Senate to the procedure relating to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) shall be decided without debate.

(e) In the Senate, the procedure specified in subsection (c) or (d) shall not apply to the consideration of a joint resolution respecting a nonmajor rule—

(1) after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning with the applicable submission or publication date; or

(2) if the report under section 401(a)(1)(A) was submitted during the period referred to in section 401(c)(1), after the expiration of the 60 session days beginning on the 15th session day after the succeeding session of Congress first convenes.

(f) If, before the passage by one House of a joint resolution of that House described in subsection (a), that House receives from the other House a joint resolution described in subsection (a), then the following procedures shall apply:

(1) The joint resolution of the other House shall not be referred to a committee.

(2) With respect to a joint resolution described in subsection (a) of the House receiving the joint resolution—

(A) the procedure in that House shall be the same as if no joint resolution had been received from the other House; but

(B) the vote on final passage shall be on the joint resolution of the other House.

SEC. 404. DEFINITIONS. For purposes of this title:

(1) The term ''Department'' means the Department of Defense.

(2) The term ''major rule'' means any rule, including an interim final rule, that the Administrator of the Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs of the Office of Management and Budget finds has resulted in or is likely to result in—

(A) an annual effect on the economy of $100,000,000 or more;

(B) a major increase in costs or prices for consumers, individual industries, Federal, State, or local government agencies, or geographic regions;

(C) significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets; or

(D) in increase in mandatory vaccinations.

(3) The term ''nonmajor rule'' means any rule that is not a major rule.

(4) The term ''rule'' means a rule, as defined in section 551 of title 5, United States,

issued by the Department under title I of this division, except that such term—

(A) includes interpretive rules, general statements of policy, and all other agency guidance documents; and

(B) does not include—

(i) any rule of particular applicability, including a rule that approves or prescribes for the future rates, wages, prices, services, or allowances therefore, corporate or financial structures, reorganizations, mergers, or acquisitions thereof, or accounting practices or disclosures bearing on any of the foregoing;

(ii) any rule relating to agency management or personnel; or

(iii) any rule of agency organization, procedure, or practice that does not substantially affect the rights or obligations of nonagency parties.

(5) The term ''submission or publication date'', except as otherwise provided in this title, means—

(A) in the case of a major rule, the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 401(a)(1); and

(B) in the case of a nonmajor rule, the later of—

(i) the date on which the Congress receives the report submitted under section 401(a)(1); and

(ii) the date on which the nonmajor rule is published in the Federal Register, if so published.

SEC. 405. JUDICIAL REVIEW. (a) No determination, finding, action, or omission under this title shall be subject to judicial review.

(b) Notwithstanding subsection (a), a court may determine whether the Department has completed the necessary requirements under this title for a rule to take effect.

(c) The enactment of a joint resolution of approval under section 402 shall not be interpreted to serve as a grant or modification of statutory authority by Congress for the promulgation of a rule, shall not extinguish or affect any claim, whether substantive or procedural, against any alleged defect in a rule, and shall not form part of the record before the court in any judicial proceeding concerning a rule except for purposes of determining whether or not the rule is in effect.

SEC. 406. EXEMPTION FOR MONETARY POLICY. Nothing in this title shall apply to rules that concern monetary policy proposed or implemented by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or the Federal Open Market Committee.

SEC. 407. EFFECTIVE DATE OF CERTAIN RULES. Notwithstanding section 401—

(1) any rule that establishes, modifies, opens, closes, or conducts a regulatory program for a commercial, recreational, or subsistence activity related to hunting, fishing, or camping; or

(2) any rule other than a major rule which the Department for good cause finds (and incorporates the finding and a brief statement of reasons therefore in the rule issued) that notice and public procedure thereon are impracticable, unnecessary, or contrary to the public interest,

shall take effect at such time as the Department determines.

SEC. 408. REVIEW OF RULES CURRENTLY IN EFFECT. (a) Beginning on the date that is 6 months after the date of enactment of this section and annually thereafter for the 4 years following, the Department shall designate not less than 20 percent of eligible rules made by the Department for review, and shall submit a report including each such eligible rule in the same manner as a report under section 401(a)(1). Section 401, section 402, and section 403 shall apply to each such rule, subject to subsection (c) of this section. No eligible rule previously designated may be designated again.

(b) Beginning after the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this section, if Congress has not enacted a joint resolution of approval for that eligible rule, that eligible rule shall not continue in effect.

(c)(1) Unless Congress approves all eligible rules designated by the Department for review within 90 days of designation, they shall have no effect.

(2) A single joint resolution of approval shall apply to all eligible rules in a report designated for a year as follows: ''That Congress approves the rules submitted by the_____ for the year _____.'' (The blank spaces being appropriately filled in).

(3) A member of either House may move that a separate joint resolution be required for a specified rule.

(d) In this section, the term ''eligible rule'' means a rule that is in effect as of the date of enactment of this section.

SEC. 409. BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 802 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE. Section 257(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 907(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

''(E) BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF RULES SUBJECT TO SECTION 2 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—Any rule subject to the congressional approval procedure set forth in section 2 of chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, affecting budget authority, outlays, or receipts shall be assumed to be effective unless it is not approved in accordance with such section.''.

SEC. 410. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STUDY OF RULES. (a) The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study to determine, as of the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) how many rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect;

(2) how many major rules (as such term is defined in section 804 of title 5, United States Code) were in effect; and

(3) the total estimated economic cost imposed by all such rules.

(b) Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit a report (and publish the report on the website of the Comptroller General) to Congress that contains the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

SA 1129. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division B, insert the following:

SEC. _____. The Secretary of Agriculture, in coordination with the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency, shall coordinate food benefit allotments under section 412 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5179) and section 5(h) of the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 (7 U.S.C. 2014(h)) with respect to individuals and households adversely affected by a major disaster to minimize delays in receiving temporary food assistance, improve information sharing, and prevent redundancy of assistance.

SA 1130. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of title II of division A, add the following:

SEC. 261. REPORT ON RIDESHARING PROGRAM OF THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report containing the following:

(1) An analysis of available data on the impact on homeless veterans from ending the expanded use of the ridesharing program of the Department of Veterans Affairs that took place during the COVID–19 pandemic.

(2) An estimate of the cost to reinstate the expanded use of the program described in paragraph (1) and an identification of any logistical issues associated with doing so.

(b) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SA 1131. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 1092 submitted by Mrs. MURRAY (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) and intended to be proposed to the bill H.R. 4366, making appropriations for military construction, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place in division A, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REPORT ON USE OF THIRD-PARTY CONTRACTORS TO CONDUCT MEDICAL DISABILITY EXAMINATIONS.

(a) REPORT REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a report on the use of third-party contractors to conduct medical disability examinations of veterans for purposes of obtaining compensation under laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(b) CONTENTS.—The report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) The number of contractors described in subsection (a) in each State who are used as described in such subsection.

(2) The requirements for performance and quality in the contracts governing the use described in subsection (a), including qualifications contractors described in such subsection are required meet for such uses.

(3) The average milage veterans described in subsection (a) are required to travel to attend a contract medical disability examination described in such subsection, disaggregated by state;

(4) The number of veterans described in paragraph (3) who are required to travel beyond the mileage requirement in a contract described in paragraph (2).

(5) A description of the process at the Department for handling complaints of veterans about the use of contractors as described in subsection (a).

(c) DEFINITION OF APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this section, the term ''appropriate committees of Congress'' means—

(1) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I have eight requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority Leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 12, 2023, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on a nomination.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 12, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 12, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a subcommittee 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 Tuesday, September 12, 2023, at 10:45 a.m., to conduct a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on The Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 12, 2023, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing .

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on The Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 12, 2023, at 2:30 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 Tuesday, September 12, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, TRANSPORTATION, AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The Subcommittee on Housing, Transportation, and Community Development of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, September 12, 2023, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hybrid hearing.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Executive Calendar No. 298, Michael Colin Casey, to be Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center; that the Senate vote on the nomination without any intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the Record; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate resume legislative session.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Colin Casey, of Kentucky, to be Director of the National Counterintelligence and Security Center.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Casey nomination?

The nomination was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions: S. Res. 337, National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week; S. Res. 338, Patriot Week; and S. Res. 339, Blood Donation Drive.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles, where applicable, be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, all en bloc.

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

The resolutions (S. Res. 337 and S. Res. 338) were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

The resolution (S. Res. 339) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today's RECORD under ''Submitted Resolutions.'')

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2023

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 12 noon on Wednesday, September 13; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; that upon the conclusion of morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 198, H.R. 4366, postcloture; further, that all time during adjournment, recess, morning business, and leader remarks count against the postcloture time.

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

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.R. 4366

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator MURRAY, I ask unanimous consent that the following report from the Committee on Appropriations be printed in the RECORD.

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

FURTHER REVISED ALLOCATION TO SUBCOMMITTEES OF BUDGET TOTALS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report revising the allocations to its subcommittees for fiscal year 2024 set forth in Senate Report 118–45 (June 22, 2023) and revised in Senate Report 118–57 (July 12, 2023), Senate Report 118–69 (July 19, 2023), and Senate Report 118–78 (July 26, 2023).

Section 302(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, provides that at any time after a committee reports its allocations, such committee may report to its House an alteration of such allocations. This report is submitted pursuant to this section.

Under the provisions of section 301(a) of the Congressional Budget Act, the Congress shall complete action on a concurrent resolution on the budget no later than April 15 of each year. The Congressional Budget Act requires that, as soon as practicable after a concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to, the Committee on Appropriations shall submit to the Senate a report subdividing among its subcommittees the new budget authority and total outlays allocated to the Committee in the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on such a resolution.

On June 3, 2023, the President approved the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023. Section 121 of that act provides for the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget to file an allocation, consistent with the terms of the Fiscal

Responsibility Act, to serve as a section 302(a) allocation for purposes of budget enforcement in the Senate. The allocation was filed by the Chairman of the Budget Committee on June 21, 2023 (Congressional Record pp. S2180–S2181).

The Committee notes that, under the terms of section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the 302(a) allocation of the Committee on Appropriations if certain conditions relating to funding of specific programs are met. These provisions address such programs as the costs of emergencies (sec. 251(b)(2)(A)(i)), continuing disability reviews and redeterminations (sec. 251(b)(2)(B)), healthcare fraud and abuse control (sec. 251(b)(2)(C)), disaster funding (sec. 251(b)(2)(D)), reemployment services and eligibility assessments (sec. 251(b)(2)(E)), and wildfire suppression (sec. 251(b)(2)(F)).

On September 12, 2023, the Committee on the Budget filed a revised 302(a) allocation for the Committee on Appropriations reflecting permissible increases in the fiscal year 2024 discretionary allocation. These reflect an increase of $8,000,000,000 in budget authority in the revised security category for emergencies and $54,198,000,000 in budget authority in the revised nonsecurity category for emergencies, continuing disability reviews and redeterminations, healthcare fraud and abuse control, disaster funding, reemployment services and eligibility assessments, and wildfire suppression, as well as their associated outlays.

The revised allocations to subcommittees for fiscal year 2024 are set forth below:

FURTHER REVISED SUBCOMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024

[In millions of dollars]

Subcommittee	Discretionary				Mandatory		Total	
	Budget authority			Outlays Total	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
	Security	Nonsecurity	Total					
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	.....	25,993	25,993	27,894	174,241	169,505	200,234	197,399
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	6,674	65,060	71,734	87,588	385	441	72,119	88,029
Defense	831,080	187	831,267	821,922	514	514	831,781	822,436
Energy and Water Development	33,422	24,670	58,092	64,020	.....	.....	58,092	64,020
Financial Services and General Government	43	16,907	16,950	33,018	22,334	22,326	39,284	55,344
Homeland Security	3,612	78,025	81,637	83,400	1,147	1,147	82,784	84,547
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	.....	42,695	42,695	48,392	64	65	42,759	48,457
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies	.....	202,178	202,178	263,863	1,064,077	1,062,276	1,266,255	1,326,139
Legislative Branch	.....	6,761	6,761	6,657	137	137	6,898	6,794
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	19,070	135,282	154,352	150,863	209,944	195,630	364,296	346,493
State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	.....	61,608	61,608	67,235	159	159	61,767	67,394
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	448	98,483	98,931	182,360	.....	.....	98,931	182,360
Total	894,349	757,849	1,652,198	1,837,212	1,473,002	1,452,200	3,125,200	3,289,412

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. 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 6:47 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 13, 2023, at 12 noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 12, 2023:

THE JUDICIARY

JEFFREY IRVINE CUMMINGS, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS

TANYA J. BRADSHER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR OF NATIONAL INTELLIGENCE

MICHAEL COLIN CASEY, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL COUNTERINTELLIGENCE AND SECURITY CENTER.