



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 5, 2024

No. 96

Senate

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont.

PRAYER

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

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our gracious King, as we prepare to commemorate the 80th anniversary of D-Day, our eyes turn to You. Lord, our Nation and world are in pain, feeling overwhelmed by the multiple challenges that require Your love, wisdom, and power. We celebrate that You love us so much that You want what is best for us. You are so wise that You know what is best for us, and You are so powerful that You can accomplish what is best for us.

Today, give supernatural wisdom to our national leaders as they seek to do Your will. Guide and direct also the leaders of our world.

And, Lord, we thank You for the marvelous contributions of our spring 2024 Senate page class. As they prepare to graduate on Friday, bless and keep them in all of their tomorrows.

We pray in Your marvelous 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, June 5, 2024.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable PETER WELCH, a Senator from the State of Vermont, to perform the duties of the Chair.

PATTY MURRAY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. WELCH 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 Judith E. Pipe, 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.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, let me begin with a disturbing statistic. According to a recent poll by the Kaiser Family Foundation, one in five U.S.

adults worries that the right to contraception is under threat—one in five U.S. adults. That is more people than live in Florida or Texas or California. In the same poll, less than half of the adults said they felt the right to use birth control was secure.

Americans' uncertainty about using birth control is one of the many shameful consequences of overturning Roe v. Wade. This is the mess Donald Trump, the MAGA Supreme Court, and the Republican-led Senate has created.

Today, we live in a country where not only tens of millions of women have been robbed of their reproductive freedoms, we also live in a country where tens of millions more worry about something as basic as birth control. That is utterly medieval. It is sickening. It should never happen here in the United States. But because of Donald Trump and the hard right, it is reality.

Today, the Senate has the chance to protect reproductive rights by advancing the Right to Contraception Act. I thank my good friends Senators HIRONO and MARKEY for championing this bill. I thank every Senator and every advocate and every concerned citizen who has raised their voice supporting this bill.

In a perfect world, a bill saying you can access birth control without government interference should not be necessary, but given the erosion of reproductive rights in America, today, it is absolutely vital. So I will be proud to vote yes today. I urge all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Sometimes the right answer is the obvious one. If Republicans truly support protecting access to birth control, then they should vote yes on moving this bill forward.

Now, we have heard a number of very anxious arguments from the other side against moving forward on the Right to Contraception Act. We have heard that it radically expands access to

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3963

abortion. We have been told it stomps all over religious liberties. We have heard that this issue is much ado about nothing. At best, these retorts are feeble and predictable, and at worst, they are dangerous. So let's set the record straight.

To those who claim the Right to Contraception Act undermines religious liberties, if anything, the opposite is true. This bill absolutely protects religious liberties. There is nothing in the text forcing anyone to provide contraception if it contradicts their own beliefs. Should this bill pass, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act would remain the law of the land.

To those who say outlandishly that this bill expands abortion access, that is false, full stop. I invite Americans to read this bill for themselves. There is nothing—nothing—in this bill about abortion. To suggest this bill expands abortion is vulgar fearmongering, plain and simple.

The reason we hear these claims is because Republican colleagues don't want to say the quiet part out loud: The GOP, the Republican Party here in the Senate, has been totally captured by the radical MAGA right, which is totally opposed to protecting reproductive rights, even birth control, which, of course, 90 percent of Americans support.

Make no mistake, if Republicans get into power, the MAGA right will push for a national abortion ban and the total elimination of reproductive care.

Finally, of course, there is the more devious claim that the Right to Contraception Act is much ado about nothing, that it is unnecessary, that birth control could never possibly fall under risk. Well, remember, people said the same thing about Roe—that it could never be overturned—and then tragically, unfortunately, it was because Donald Trump and the Republican Senate filled the Supreme Court with MAGA radicals who followed through with the hard right's goal of eliminating freedom of choice.

And who knows how far the hard right will go. A few years ago, it was Roe. A few years from now, it could be something else. Justice Thomas himself opened the door to undoing protections for birth control in his dissenting opinion in *Dobbs*. We are kidding ourselves if we think the hard right is done with their attacks on reproductive rights.

Let's be perfectly clear: Attacks against birth control aren't theoretical bugaboos; it is already happening at the State level.

To those who argue Federal protections for birth controls are unnecessary, go ask the people of Virginia what they think after their Republican Governor vetoed—vetoed—a bill that would have protected contraceptives at the State level. Go ask the people of Nevada what they think after their Republican Governor also vetoed a bill to protect access to birth control.

To those who say birth control will never fall at risk, go ask the people of

Arizona or Florida or Idaho or Iowa or Missouri. In each of these States, Republican Governors or Republican State legislators are on record blocking protections for birth control access in one form or another.

So let there be no mistake: In the aftermath after Roe's demise, the threat to birth control is very, very real, and that is why it is so important for the Senate to act.

This is a simple bill and a simple vote. If you believe all women deserve to have contraception, then you should vote for this bill. That is all there is to it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Republican leader is recognized.

U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Supreme Court term is about to end, which means it is time for Democrats and their media allies to bully and harass the Justices. The most recent example of this is the risible attack leveled against Justice Alito for his wife's flags.

I have nothing to say about those attacks themselves because they are so profoundly unserious, but I do have an observation about how some of the attacks have been leveled.

Three of our colleagues have taken it upon themselves to write to the Chief Justice and demand Justice Alito's recusal in cases. One went so far as to tell the Chief that he should strip Justices Alito and Thomas of their ability to write majority opinions unless they recuse from the cases liberals don't want them hearing.

This goes beyond the standard disgraceful bullying my Democratic colleagues have perfected. Recusal is a judicial act.

These Senators are telling the Chief Justice, privately, to change the course of pending litigation. This is known as ex parte communication, and it is frowned upon by the ABA's Model Rules of Professional Conduct.

This matters because at least two of these colleagues of ours—the junior Senator from Rhode Island and the senior Senator from Connecticut—seem to be members of the Supreme Court Bar. If so, they are, therefore, potentially engaging in unethical professional conduct before the Court.

They may be under the mistaken impression that their persistent attempts to threaten the Federal courts are a permissible use of their legislative office, but they are officers of the Court and bound by a different set of rules than a mere Senator. These rules pro-

vide for discipline against those who engage in "conduct unbecoming" an officer of the Court.

I might suggest to our colleagues that unethical ex parte communications seeking to change the course of pending litigation is such conduct and that the Court should take any remedial action it feels to be appropriate.

The legal profession is in distress. Unethical behavior by attorneys serving political causes, unfortunately, knows no party or faction. It is up to the legal profession to police itself, and in the end, this means that courts, including the Supreme Court, must police their officers. We don't need to appeal to heaven to fix this problem, just to the Supreme Court's power to police the ethical practice of law among the members of its bar.

INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL FOR THE LAW OF THE SEA

Mr. President, on another matter, unaccountable international judicial juntas have made headlines in recent weeks.

First, it was the self-aggrandizing International Criminal Court, whose rogue prosecutor sought preposterous arrest warrants for Israeli leaders in a grotesque attempt to draw moral equivalence with Hamas terrorists.

Not to be outdone, the unelected and unaccountable International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea has issued an advisory opinion that seeks to establish an international law requirement to regulate greenhouse gases, including a right of action against wealthy, industrialized nations.

The New York Times reports that such an opinion is unsurprisingly expected to lead to "wide-ranging claims for damages against polluting nations." The paper of record also tells us the U.N.'s International Court of Justice is also seized of the matter.

Climate justice warriors are swooning as they contemplate the largesse they might receive from this redistributive lawfare. This is a money grab and a power grab, pure and simple.

All of this unaccountable globalist socialism is just another reason President Reagan refused to sign the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea and why the Senate has rightly refused to ratify it. At this point, it should be called the "ICC of the Sea."

I know some of my colleagues believe we should ratify this treaty, and they mean well, but I would urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to ask themselves if they are willing to put U.S. sovereignty into the hands of the "ICC of the Sea."

No country or entity has done more to protect the freedom of navigation than the United States. The U.S. and allied navies are the ones who protect commercial shipping lanes the global economy relies on, and self-important jurists of the "ICC of the Sea" would do well to remember this fact the next time they consider biting the hand that feeds.

ENERGY

Now, Mr. President, on one final matter, since President Biden took office, the cost of energy has risen 41.65 percent. Fuel oil prices are up 56.8 percent. Gasoline is up 55.5 percent, and natural gas is up 22 percent.

This, of course, is not news to working families who have been struggling to keep up for the past 3½ years, but Washington Democrats are just now waking up.

Suddenly, right before an election, Democrats are concerned about the high prices Americans are paying to fill up their gas tanks, but they still can't seem to correctly assign the blame. Just last month, the Democratic leader berated "big oil companies" for "continuing to rake in the cash at the expense of the American people."

But I thought high energy prices were a primary feature of the leftwing climate agenda. As a report from Columbia University's Center on Global Energy Policy put it, "a price on carbon makes those responsible for the damages caused by greenhouse gas emissions pay for those damages. . . . A carbon price makes carbon-intensive goods and services more expensive."

Well, there you have it. High prices for hard-working Americans are a feature, not a bug.

If Washington Democrats are looking for a scapegoat for soaring energy prices, it is about time they looked in the mirror.

And, as our colleague from West Virginia, Senator CAPITO, reminded us recently, the very law Washington Democrats claimed was designed to lower prices is, instead, sending taxpayer dollars to support inflationary climate programs and other radical causes. The EPA sent \$50 million from the so-called Inflation Reduction Act to support the Climate Justice Alliance.

Now, we already know that "climate justice" means higher gas prices for working Americans and electric vehicle subsidies for high-earning elites.

But what about the organization's plan to "break the rules that need to be broken" and "shut down extractive facilities and extractive economic structures" and place "race, gender and class at the center" of the economy?

What about its contention that "the path to climate justice travels through a free Palestine"?

Once again, this is a beneficiary of the so-called Inflation Reduction Act.

Suffice it to say, the so-called Climate Justice Alliance is not comprised of America's allies, and, while they claim to advocate for justice, they are burying working families in higher costs.

I can assure our colleagues that the American people won't take kindly to being treated like suckers.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. 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.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Mr. THUNE. Well, Mr. President, it is about time for Democrats' weekly exercise in election-year politics.

Later today, we will take up another bill intended to provide a talking point for Democrat candidates, and the Democrat leader hopes to put Republicans in a tight spot. But if he thinks to see Republicans quaking in their boots over being asked to take these votes, he should think again, because we welcome the chance to talk about the Democrat agenda.

Take this afternoon's exercise. Under the guise of protecting access to contraception—something that is not under threat—the Democrat leader is bringing up legislation that would not only funnel money to Democrats' allies at Planned Parenthood but would wipe out—wipe out—conscience protections for healthcare providers. The bill specifically targets the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, which was bipartisan legislation passed in 1993—back, I might add, when Democrats actually believed in protecting our First Amendment freedoms.

And this is not the first time Democrats have attempted to carve out sweeping exceptions to this once widely supported legislation. Apparently, Americans are free to live out their deeply held moral and religious beliefs when they don't conflict with Democrats' policy positions.

It is deeply disturbing that the Democrat leader has gone from sponsoring—sponsoring—the Religious Freedom Restoration Act to attempting to decide when and how Americans can exercise one of their fundamental First Amendment rights. If the Democrat leader thinks that Republicans are intimidated to cast a vote against legislation that would seriously imperil Americans' ability to live according to their consciences, well, as I said, he should think again.

I suspect there are few Americans who don't recognize the Democrat leader's politicking for exactly what it is, just as I suspect there are few Americans who bought Democrats' border legislation ploy 2 weeks ago.

The Democrat leader apparently thought that he could erase Americans' memories of 3-plus years of chaos at the southern border under President Biden by bringing up a vote on a border bill that he knew would not be able to pass the Senate, but I think he will find that Americans' memories are more retentive than that.

Three years of national security crisis were not wiped out by a show vote intended to provide electoral cover for Democrats, just as they won't be wiped out by President Biden's latest election-year ploy—an Executive order to implement border restrictions the likes

of which he should have implemented years ago. If anything, any improvements at the border stemming from the President's latest measure will only serve to highlight the President's failure to address this crisis earlier and the needless danger to which he has subjected Americans.

I mentioned that the Democrat leader knew his border show vote would fail, just as he knows his Planned Parenthood subsidy, anti-religious freedom legislation will fail this afternoon. That, of course, points to the fundamental unseriousness of what the Democrat leader is doing.

If the Democrat leader had any real interest in legislating on these issues, he would be working with Republicans to bring up legislation that actually has a chance of receiving the support from both Democrats and Republicans.

Senator JONI ERNST, for example, has legislation to promote access to contraception, but that is not the legislation Senator SCHUMER is bringing up because these votes have nothing to do with legislating and everything to do with boosting Democrats' electoral chances—he hopes—in this fall's elections.

I suspect the exercises in election politics will continue. Look for this to be the summer of show votes here in the U.S. Senate.

As I said, Republicans are ready for it. We are happy to talk about the Democrat agenda, whether that is the President's disastrous border policies—or lack thereof—or Democrats' never-ending inflation crisis, or another attempt by the Democrat leader to force through legislation to legalize abortion up until the moment of birth.

All the show votes in the world won't erase Democrats' record, as Democrats may discover, to their cost.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

IMMIGRATION

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, the President of the United States is, today, using clips of my speech on the floor of the Senate in his campaign ads talking about border security and immigration. Well, I would encourage him to use clips of this speech today instead, because President Biden created the problem at the border right now.

That is not some theory. That is not some political statement. That is fact. And I can compare that to the two previous Presidents, who operated under the exact same law as President Biden is operating under now. We have 2½ million people—plus—illegally crossing our southern border this year. Under

President Obama, we had half a million.

There is no difference in the law between President Obama, President Trump, and President Biden. The only difference is the Executive who is actually overseeing that law's prosecution. That is the only difference.

So why would we have half a million people illegally crossing the border under President Obama and 2½ million people under President Biden? It is the Executive and how they are carrying out the law.

Now, I have been very clear: That last half a million is Congress's responsibility. We have a responsibility to change the definition of "asylum," to change how the enforcement is done, increase the number of agents that are there, take away a lot of the appeals that are frivolous—and we all know it—to be able to allow people who qualify for asylum to get into the country and people who do not get turned around so they can go through a legal pathway, not through an illegal pathway.

That is Congress's responsibility, that last half a million. Those are changes in the law we have to get done, and I have been very outspoken on that and will continue to be outspoken on that because we have not done our job here.

But the other 2 million people who are illegally crossing this year, last year, the year before that, that is not on Congress; that is on the President of the United States because he created this.

Why would I say that? Day one of his Presidency, he walked in with an Executive order day one and announced to the world: We are no longer going to do a border wall construction. We are going to stop border wall construction. Day one, this President announced that he is no longer going to do the Executive order that had been put in place under President Trump to ensure that there was a meaningful application of Border Patrol laws and immigration regulations. Literally, he took those regs and set them aside and said: We are not going to do that.

Day one, he announced a 100-day moratorium on deportations and on enforcement and then continued to be able to extend it out from there.

This wasn't day one, but it was a week and a half later: DHS implemented a new policy saying that we are going to change the way we do removals of people who are illegally present in the country. The next day after that, he changed the way asylum processing is done at the border and removed what was called the "Remain in Mexico" program.

That is something the Supreme Court actually came back and said: You can't just remove that; you have to re-implement that. So the Supreme Court actually required that to be implemented. This President put in the mechanics to do it but is not actually doing it.

So, as Americans, we are paying hundreds of millions of dollars to have the facility and the personnel actually there to fulfill what the Court has required them to do, but they are not actually doing what is called the "MPP," the "Remain in Mexico" program. That is a decision that they made.

A week after that, in February of 2021, Antony Blinken announced that he was terminating the agreements with Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador so that they would then enforce their borders more readily. That agreement that we had made with them with the State Department, the State Department terminated that to be able to open up the pathways for more folks to go.

I could keep going on and on and on. You see, what is happening now is not happenstance; it was a deliberate decision made in 2021 to open our borders to "not look so mean." But what has actually occurred is more than 10 million people have crossed our border illegally, and the administration has announced just in the last couple of weeks that 55,000 people have crossed just this year that they designated as a special-interest migrant—their definition—55,000 people. Those individuals are coming from areas that they define as a terror risk. Those 55,000 individuals have all been labeled by this administration as a potential risk to national security—55,000 in just the last year. You know what has happened to those? The vast majority of them are in the United States right now because they were released by this administration.

This is a border crisis of this administration's creation. They created this crisis. While Congress has the responsibility to do the things that we need to do, this administration created this crisis with the decisions that they made in Homeland Security, that they made in the State Department, and they made at the Department of Justice.

Individuals who cross the border multiple times, that is a felony in American law. Ask the Department of Justice how many of those folks have been prosecuted as a felony in the last 3 years—I dare you; ask them—and you will find out it is zero. They have just stopped prosecutions.

They have announced to the world: We are no longer enforcing American law. The world has taken the message, and they are coming because we are the United States of America. We are the greatest country in the world. But we are also the top terrorism threat in the world because people come here to do us harm because they hate our freedom and who we are.

We are not doing the most basic security that every nation does, and that is protect our border. So the President announced an Executive action this week, an Executive action that he literally pulled from a section of the bipartisan bill that we worked on, but it was literally the bolt-on section on the end of it.

The heart of the bill was not what you do after thousands of people are crossing the border; the heart of the bill is what do you do for the first person that illegally crosses. The bill was set up to say that the very first person that illegally crosses—they are picked up at the border, they are screened quickly, and then they are deported quickly. We changed the screening process, we changed the appeals process, and we changed all the standards. We rapidly affected the first person.

This administration has announced a new initiative that they are going to do not for the first person that illegally crosses but for somewhere around the 4,000th.

Why do I say 4,000 when they have announced 2,500? Well, you have to read the fine print. They said: After 2,500 people come, then we are going to add some new authorities. But the fine print is pretty important.

They exclude the about 1,600 people a day that they are currently letting in at ports of entry using what they call the CBP One app. They are giving those folks parole. They have not gone through any legal process. They are declaring them as legal when they come through. So they are not including those folks that are illegally coming across the border under a parole program they have created. That program could end tomorrow. Illegal immigration would drop by 1,600 people tomorrow if they turned off the program they turned on.

They are also not including what is called the Cuba, Haiti, Venezuela, Nicaragua program. There are 1,000 people a day coming in under that program. They have just excluded them as well from their 2,500 number.

They are excluding anyone who is an unaccompanied minor. They are excluding them.

They have also listed a whole bunch of others—if they have a health issue, others.

So this 2,500 number—I have had several folks say: Well, that is half of what you all had proposed in your bill. It is not. You have to read the fine print of what is actually in the Executive order.

What could this administration do? It is pretty straightforward. Here a few things they could do right now.

Right now, they could actually start putting pressure on recalcitrant countries, through the State Department, to take individuals back into their own country. The State Department has stopped putting pressure on recalcitrant countries. They could do that today.

The law today allows the administration to start doing direct hire for Border Patrol and for ICE. They are not using that authority. They are just saying: We can't hire enough agents. They have direct hire authority they are choosing not to use.

Right now, this administration could speed up the way they handle the appeals process through all these frivolous regulations and some of the Executive orders. They had to literally take

away those things and make it more difficult to actually fight through the appeals. They could put those back in today.

Today, they could end the Cuba, Haiti, Nicaragua, Venezuela program that they created to allow folks to be able to come in in greater numbers from those four countries. They started that program. They could end that today.

They could end the catch-and-release that they have created at the southern border. They could end that today. They started it. They could turn that off.

They could restart the cooperative agreements with Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador to stop the flow of migrants coming from Central America up as they are coming through those areas. They could do that today.

They could reinstate the "Remain in Mexico" program. All the structure is there. The court required them to have it. They could actually use it, and that would make a huge difference today.

They could actually start prosecuting border crossing cases from start to finish. What do I mean by that? This administration is starting the process of prosecuting individuals, but halfway through, they are just dropping the case. Well, it doesn't take long for the word to get out to people who illegally cross that even if you start the prosecution, this administration will drop it and will not finish it. They text family members back home and say "come," and the next group actually comes from there.

This administration is currently finding new ways to allow people to come in. In States like Oklahoma—my State is currently being prosecuted by the Department of Justice because we passed laws in our State to put greater requirements on people that are illegally present in the State and have committed criminal acts. It used to be, under the previous administration, if someone was illegally present and they committed a criminal act, they were more active to remove those. Right now, the Department of Justice is actually putting pressure on my State of Oklahoma for pressuring people that are illegally present and also have committed a criminal act.

The Department of Justice could actually enforce our southern border rather than actually go after States that are trying to actually enforce the law in our own States.

Quite frankly, one of the things this administration could do today is to vet people coming across our border better, because they are currently not coordinating all of the data points we have for foreign individuals. They are not checking against all of those systems when people are crossing our border illegally.

This administration and this President need to stop saying there is nothing he can do until Congress acts. Congress does need to act, but there is a lot he could do that would make a huge

difference. And it is not just my opinion; I can prove it with fact. Just compare this Democrat President and his number of illegal crossings against the last Democrat President and his number of illegal crossings: Biden, 2.5 million a year; Obama, half a million a year.

I understand this President doesn't want to enforce what President Trump did, although that was more effective than what President Obama did, but he should do at least what President Obama did.

Stop playing politics with this on all sides. Stop running a speech that I have given on this floor for his campaign purposes unless he wants to run this speech and to say this President needs to step up and do his job.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President and my colleagues, for too long, political leaders have shied away from being honest and having a difficult conversation with the American people about our national security. Elected officials have kicked the can down the road, failing to tell the country just how dangerous the world has become. It is past time to confront this issue.

Many Americans do not know that the safety we enjoy has been secured by a global network of U.S. military bases, diplomatic efforts, and international coalitions, as well as massive amounts of equipment and ammunition. We have taken our security for granted, not knowing that much of it has been enabled by a previous once-in-a-generation investment made decades ago.

President Ronald Reagan led Congress to rebuild the U.S. military in the 1980s. I will hasten to add that it was a bipartisan Congress who joined President Reagan in this effort. Americans have been living off that investment ever since.

Because of those efforts, we have rested easy under the umbrella of overwhelming military superiority. Today, though, our military streak is diminishing to dangerous lows—dangerous lows. That umbrella of security has become a false sense of security. The U.S. Navy is the smallest and oldest it has been in over eight decades—80 years. Our Air Force is shrinking. Much of our military infrastructure is out of date.

This is a fact, and it is no secret. Time and again, U.S. military leadership comes before Congress and tells us we are facing the most dangerous security environment since at least the Cold War, if not since World War II.

Most Americans don't know that we are long overdue for a generational replenishment of our weaponry. We have delayed updating our military even as China has gotten closer and closer to matching our military might. The news gets even worse: China is actually multiplying its strength by spear-

heading a new axis of aggression, joined by Russia, Iran, and North Korea. So far, China has not moved against us because its dictator, Xi Jinping, knew he would lose, but just over the horizon, he might have reason to feel differently.

We in Congress must tell the American people what is at stake. Failing to deter China would immediately trigger a global economic depression. Losing to Beijing would extend the hardship, darkening the course of the entire 21st century. I am not trying to be alarmist, but we need to be honest.

This bleak future is possible but not inevitable. I recently introduced a detailed plan to rebuild American military might and restore our ability to deter threats. It would be a downpayment for our future. It would be expensive—many worthwhile things are expensive—but it would be far less costly than war.

Political neglect has put us in this vulnerable position. It does not have to be this way. My goal is to launch a much needed conversation about how we can turn the page on that complacency and to get started right away with corrective action. I have been inviting my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join in this discussion. I will continue to extend that invitation. But there is really no time to waste. We need to get started this year. We can do so next week when the Armed Services Committee in the Senate begins the NDAA markup, the National Defense Authorization Act. During our meetings, I will introduce an amendment to raise the level of this year's defense investment significantly. My amendment will be an opportunity for the kind of debate for which this Chamber is renowned.

In considering national spending priorities, we have thought of ourselves as hamstrung by spending caps, but we simply have to dream bigger when it comes to our vital national security. I hope this debate will lead to a defense topline number that meets the moment.

President Reagan's buildup kept the peace and won the Cold War, and it did so without firing a shot. The future can be just as peaceful and secure for our children and our grandchildren, but it is time we made that investment in the future.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, before he leaves the floor, I want to say to the Senator from Mississippi how proud I am to stand here beside him as he delivers an inconvenient truth, which is, our national security is not something we can take for granted. You pay for it with your treasure or your blood. That is an inconvenient truth.

In the course of our Nation's history, we remain the beacon of freedom, opportunity, liberty, and prosperity for the world, but we cannot take that for granted because we see everywhere we look rising threats and challenges to

America's leadership role in the world. Whether it is in Europe, whether it is in Asia, whether it is in the Middle East, the threats and the challenges go on and on.

What emboldens our adversaries is when they believe that we lack the resolve and commitment to do what is necessary to preserve the peace. The way you preserve the peace is to make sure none of your adversaries want to take a chance to engage with you militarily because they know they will lose. That is what deterrence is all about.

I think the Senator from Mississippi has hopefully started a really critical discussion at a critical time when we sort of lurch back and forth between continuing resolutions and an appropriations process that is fundamentally broken; when, in fact, the money we appropriate through that process is only about one-third of the money the Federal Government spends. The Federal Government spends trillions of dollars more on mandatory programs and through the Tax Code. We need to look at all of that spending, and we need to rightsize our commitment to what should be our No. 1 priority, which is the safety and security of the American people and our way of life, and to figure out what that means in terms of where the Federal Government spends money elsewhere.

And it is a very, very important debate. We shouldn't be afraid of it. Nobody is talking about touching Social Security or Medicare.

Both President Biden and President Trump has said no matter what the outcome of the election is, neither one of them want to touch it. We could argue the merits of that. Certainly, those debates won't occur without bipartisan leadership, like Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan, but in the absence of our addressing those challenges, certainly there are other mandatory spending programs, which are essentially on autopilot, that grow at 7 or 8 percent a year that we can look at and say: Does this still make sense?

Maybe it made sense 10 or 20 years ago when that program was created, but maybe we ought to look at indexing the amount of money that we spend to inflation, rather than just have an open-ended entitlement.

And then there is the Tax Code. I know next year we are going to be looking at the expiration of the individual tax rates of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

President Biden has said that he is happy to have those expire, which would result in a tax increase for 62 percent of American taxpayers and a \$3 trillion tax increase. I know his staff came back later and said: No, no, no. He is not for raising taxes on anybody who makes less than \$400,000 a year, but that is not what would happen if you let these tax rates expire next year.

So we are on the precipice, I hope, of having a fundamental debate and deci-

sion about the future of our country, and it starts with a discussion about America's leadership role in maintaining the peace because there is no other country in the world that can fill that gap. And we know that if that gap is created, that it will be filled likely by the Vladimir Putins, the President Xis in China, or the mullahs in Tehran, and people like Kim Jong Un in North Korea.

So I will just conclude now by saying I am really profoundly grateful to our friend from Mississippi for having the courage and demonstrating the leadership to initiate this discussion. It could not be more important, and it could not be more urgent.

BORDER SECURITY

Mr. President, let me turn to another crisis, and that is the one on our southern border. Since President Biden took office, U.S. Customs and Border Protection has recorded 7.8 million illegal crossings at the southern border—7.8 million souls.

Now, just to provide some context, in over 3 years, we have logged twice as many illegal border crossings as we did during the full 8 years of the Obama administration. President Biden has been there about 3½ years; President Obama was there 8 years, but President Biden has racked up double the number of illegal crossings in 3½ years that occurred during President Obama's term in office.

President Biden has neglected the border for so long, it is now much more than just a question about our immigration system; it is a serious national security threat. The southern border has become an open gateway for drug traffickers, terrorists, and criminals of all stripes to enter the United States and disperse through our communities, all across this great land.

And there is no question that this crisis was able to grow and expand because of the conscious policies of the Biden administration. In other words, this isn't an accident. This is not the result of negligence. This is intentional.

In his first 100 days in office, President Biden issued more than 94 Executive actions related to immigration, many of which were designed to overturn each one of President Trump's effective border policies, and we all see how that turned out.

In the 3 years since, the Biden administration has taken hundreds of other Executive actions that have made it easier—not harder—easier for people to cross the border illegally and remain in the United States.

Now, with election day 5 months away, President Biden has taken a look at the polls and realized that the American people aren't happy with his open border policies. His poll numbers are in the tank.

So the President did what I presume any politician would do is launch a last-ditch effort to show that, no, that is not where I am; that is not what I believe; that is not what we should do.

But the fact is, nobody is going to be fooled by the actions the President took yesterday. It is a ploy. It is an election-year stunt. It is a shell game. You pick your metaphor.

Yesterday, President Biden issued a proclamation that would shut off access to the asylum system if the daily number of illegal border crossings reaches an average of 2,500. Well, if that makes sense, why wouldn't you do it with the first person coming across the border? Why would you say 2,500 a day are welcome to come into the country no questions asked?

But there are a few points the American people need to understand: One, as I said, the President is effectively saying it is OK for 2,499 border crossings per day. That is OK; you got the green light on that. The green light is not just to the migrants; it is also to the criminal organizations that smuggle these people for millions and millions or rather billions and billions of dollars.

And that 2,499 that are being waved across the border, that amounts to more than 900,000 per year. Now, 2,499 may not seem like a big number, but 900,000 per year seems like a lot, and it is. For some reason, the 2,500th person to cross the border is a bridge too far for this administration now, 5 months before the general election.

In my view, one illegal border crossing is one too many. Now, don't get me wrong. I believe legal immigration has been essential to America and remains so—legal, humane, and orderly immigration policy. Very few of us and our forebearers were born here. Most came from somewhere else in hope of a better life and became Americans and embraced our values and our way of life. But President Biden has outsourced his immigration policy to criminal cartels. It is madness.

Secondly, the Biden administration won't likely be able to enforce these caps anyway. In other words, they are just artificial. In order to waive migrants back to Mexico or return them to their home countries, those countries have to be willing to accept them. That is what President Trump negotiated with his "Remain in Mexico" policy. What did President Biden do? He basically wiped it off the books.

Now, it is no guarantee Mexico is going to be willing to accept these folks. What happens if Mexico says, "We are at capacity"?

My guess is, those individuals will be released into the United States, which is what has happened to this point, and many will never be heard from again, unless they have the bad judgment and misfortune to commit some crime and happen to be encountering U.S. law enforcement.

The final point I want to make is this: The administration had been claiming for years that it doesn't have the authority to restrict illegal border crossings. Well, apparently President Biden woke up yesterday and realized he did.

In fact, the President has consistently blamed Republicans or anybody else, for that fact, for lack of progress on the border issue. But by issuing this Executive action, President Biden has acknowledged that he does have authority to address this crisis on its own, even though this proclamation looks like a piece of Swiss cheese.

So he could have taken action at any point in the last 3½ years with no further action required by the Congress. There has not been a single month during the Biden administration where we saw an average of less than 2,500 illegal crossings per day. We have seen some, as many as 13,000 a day. And where I come from in Texas, we are the front door through which these migrants enter, 1,200 miles of border with Mexico. Some go to Arizona, some go to California, but most of them come through Texas.

During the slowest month, which was the President's first full month in office, we saw an average of 3,500 illegal crossings a day. President Biden could have stopped the wave of illegal immigration at any point in the last 3½ years, but he simply ignored the crisis until 5 months before an election. It sounds like an election-eve conversion to me.

The President's latest proclamation is not an honest or serious attempt to address the border crisis. It is nothing more than a last-ditch effort to deceive voters into thinking he has gotten religion; that he is serious about it this time. It is just not credible.

The American people have seen how President Biden has handled the crisis for more than 3 years, and they won't be fooled by this eleventh-hour gambit.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. President, finally, let me say a word about how we are conducting business here in the U.S. Senate. When our colleagues on the other side of the aisle took the majority 3 years ago, the majority leader, the Senator from New York promised a new way of legislating.

In his maiden speech as majority leader, he stood here on the Senate floor and he said, "As the majority in the Senate changes hands, the Senate will do business differently."

Well, he was absolutely right about that, but I don't think it is exactly what any of us envisioned. Under Democratic control, the Senate has turned into an unproductive body that follows a schedule that most American workers would envy.

Look at the calendar this month as an example. Under the leadership of Senator SCHUMER, the Senate will be in session 2½ days a week, not 40 hours, not a 40-hour workweek but 2½ days a week: 2½ days next week and 2½ days the week after that and that is it. Then we wrap up the Senate's work for the month of June.

July is just as bad when it comes to the Senate's lack of work ethic. When the Senate returns after the Fourth of July, we will be in session 1 week. We

will then take a break for a week—I guess we will be exhausted from that 1 full week back—and then we will come back for a 2-week work period. Then, yes, you guessed it, the Senate will gavel out until after Labor Day.

We will be exhausted by those 2½-day workweeks and then the sprint to the August recess. Including this week, which is almost finished, the Senate is only scheduled to be in session for 9 weeks before the election. That is 5 months off. We will be in session 9 weeks. Election day is exactly 5 months away, and the Senate is not breaking any records for our productivity or our willingness to take on hard problems that seem to surround us everywhere.

Given the fact that we are only working a maximum of 4 weeks—that is on the rare occasion where we actually are not working 4 days a week, on the rare occasion we are not working 2½ days—we now—my staff calls these "miracle Mondays" where we don't actually come back and start voting until Tuesday evening, and then we are out of here Thursday afternoon. But on the rare occasion we are working 4 days a week, that doesn't leave much time to get the American people's work done. And trust me, we have a lot of work to do.

One of the things that I think is an insult to the American people is, given the lack of productivity or the lack of willingness to deal with the challenges that face us, Senator SCHUMER schedules a vote on contraception this afternoon, as if this were somehow controversial. Contraception is legal, to my knowledge. It is not in any jeopardy. And yet Senator SCHUMER wants to schedule a show vote that suggests that somehow it is, maybe striking fear or anxiety in the minds of some people that that is in jeopardy? It is just absurd; and it is a waste of time; and it is a distraction from doing the other things that we should be doing that are so important.

We need to pass all 12 government funding bills before the end of September. We need to pass the defense authorization bills—something we have done more than 60 years in a row—and then the farm bill. That is 14 separate bills that need to pass in the next 9 weeks. So will we do it? No.

So with this lengthy to-do list, why is the Senate wasting its time, the time we are actually in session? Well, like most weeks, we spent the majority of this time voting on more of President Biden's nominees.

Before the Senate gavels out this evening, we will take another partisan show vote, as I said, that was teed up by the majority leader. This is just the latest example of a show vote. Last month, the majority leader teed up a vote on a border bill that was already rejected by the Senate. When it came up for a second vote, it received even fewer votes. Democrats who voted for the bill, now voted against it. What was that all about? The majority lead-

er knew the bill would fail a second time but wasted the Senate's valuable and limited time voting on it anyway.

So here we go again, having another useless, nonproductive show vote, this time on contraception, which is not in doubt. As the American people know, the right to contraception is not in jeopardy. I don't think that is breaking news. Apparently, it is to the majority leader. Contraception is available in every State in America, and there is no legitimate effort to change that. Democrats are using their power as the majority party to engage in fearmongering—that is a mouthful—fearmongering to further their own political agenda.

The bill before the Senate goes far beyond protecting access to contraception, and this is where there will be some bona fide differences of opinion. It would force healthcare providers to provide abortion drugs, regardless of any religious objections.

The Supreme Court has made very clear that as a matter of conscience or religious beliefs, people who do not believe they should participate in this, they cannot be required to do so.

Well, this bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing. It is actually a pro-abortion bill designed as a pro-women's health bill, and it is designed to keep the issue of reproductive rights top of mind so you forget about the crisis at the border, so you forget about the threats to our national security around the world.

Given the Senate's long to-do list, I think there is a better way to spend the Chamber's time. Two and-a-half day work weeks, truncated work periods, the time we have wasted here on nominees and political show votes—this is no way to run the Senate, and it is certainly not the way Republicans will do things if we regain control of the Chamber next year.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

REMEMBERING ALICE STEWART

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today to honor the life of a dear friend, Alice Stewart. Her sudden passing last month was a profound loss to all who knew her. Alice was far too young with so much more to give in the world.

Alice began her career as a reporter in Georgia and eventually moved to Little Rock, AR, where she was an anchor for the NBC affiliate there. In 2008, she served as Mike Huckabee's communications director during his Presidential run. Then she later advised Michelle Bachmann and Rick Santorum during their Presidential runs. In 2016, Alice came to work for me during my run for President. I was very lucky to have her on my team.

Alice fought passionately for me on the campaign trail. She was a joy to be around, always smiling, both personally and professionally. Politics can be a harsh arena, but Alice engaged with a light touch. She never lost her southern charm, her class, or her respect for others. She was one of the last few old-

school political operators who believed you can get along with anyone, regardless of political differences.

It is telling that many, many former colleagues and friends of Alice's have echoed the very same sentiment about her, that she was unfailingly kind and a rare gem in the tumultuous world of politics.

Alice and I remained friends after the Presidential run. This is a photo of the two of us when she came to my second swearing in here in the Senate in 2019.

Not only was Alice a talented communicator, she also served as Deputy Secretary of State in Arkansas and became a resident fellow at Harvard's Institute of Politics, where she became a mentor for many students.

In 2016, Alice became a CNN commentator. Now, CNN isn't always known as a friendly place for conservatives, to put it mildly. But Alice never backed down from what she believed in. Instead, she navigated disagreements with kindness, whether it was at CNN or in her role as a political contributor on NPR.

If you knew Alice, you knew she was an avid runner. Another former communications director of mine and good friend, Cat Frazier, remembers the day that she met Alice on my Presidential campaign. Alice and my friend David Polyansky pulled her out into the freezing Iowa snow to go on a run with the two of them. That is how Cat got to know Alice, on a run in the bitter Iowa cold and snow. They also asked me to come on a run with them that morning. But it will not surprise you, Mr. President, I turned down that invitation. Alice and I had a lot in common, but running marathons was not one of them.

As a runner, it was fitting that Alice also loved Hebrews 12, especially the verse:

Let us run with perseverance the race marked out for us, fixing our eyes on Jesus, the pioneer and perfecter of faith.

Alice showed what it means to run the race well as a good and faithful servant. She has now finished her race, and she is today in the loving arms of her Creator.

I was immensely proud to have Alice on my team. She was wonderful and talented and a good friend. She loved America fiercely. She lived every day to the fullest, and she will be deeply, deeply missed.

Her absence is deeply felt by me, by Heidi, and by the entire Cruz team. I pray for God's comfort and His peace on her loved ones. May God bless the memory of Alice Stewart. She will be missed. I will miss her. God bless you, Alice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes and Senator CARDIN be permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes prior to the scheduled rollcall vote.

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

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, the Supreme Court overturning *Roe v. Wade*, it was a wake-up call for all Americans. It demonstrated that a fundamental right, the right of women to make decisions over their own bodies, could be taken away in the blink of an eye—the blink of an eye—by anti-choice extremists.

And since that decision nearly 2 years ago, we have seen countless attacks on women's reproductive freedoms across our Nation. We are seeing anti-choice States enact rigid abortion bans without exceptions for rape or incest. States that are forcing—forcing—emergency room doctors to call their lawyers before treating women who are going through a miscarriage, one of the most awful days of their lives. States like Alabama, they have even threatened IVF.

These restrictive attacks are meant to control what women can and can't do with their bodies. I am going to repeat that. These restrictive attacks are meant to control women, what they can and can't do with their bodies. They are meant to dictate to women their family planning decisions, and they want to put extreme politicians between women and their doctors.

The last 2 years have made it crystal clear: We cannot—we cannot—rely on the Supreme Court alone to protect our access to care. We know overturning *Roe* was just the beginning. If extreme anti-choice politicians and activists, well, if they have their way, access to birth control is next.

Contraception has been safely used by millions of women for decades. It has allowed women to take control over their own bodies, to decide when they want to start a family, how many kids they want to have, who they want to start a family with. And for these very same reasons, the right to contraception has been a target of anti-choice extremists for years.

So let me be clear: Overturning the right to contraception would be catastrophic in a post-*Roe* world. It would mean that women in States with the most restrictive abortions bans would have zero ability—zero ability—at all to make any decisions over their own bodies. They would have no ability to prevent an unplanned pregnancy or get the care they need. Women would have zero ability to get the care they need or prevent a pregnancy.

And this isn't just hypothetical. The Supreme Court has clearly demonstrated that it will not hesitate—they will not hesitate—to reverse landmark decisions and take away women's reproductive freedoms.

That is why my colleagues and I introduced the Right to Contraception Act, to codify women's constitutional right to make family planning decisions.

And this bill will do exactly what is in the name. It will just guarantee the

right for women to access and to use birth control. It will guarantee the right for women to have access to contraception.

Later today, we are going to have an opportunity to pass this important legislation. And I urge everyone in this Chamber to allow this bill to move forward and prevent extreme politicians from getting in the way of women's reproductive choices, to prevent extreme politicians from taking control over women's bodies, to prevent extreme politicians from being in your doctor's office.

And if we fail to act, the Supreme Court could roll our rights back once again, and every woman across this country will suffer from our inaction today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

NOMINATION OF STEPHANIE SANDERS SULLIVAN

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, we shortly will be voting on the nomination of Stephanie Sanders Sullivan to be the U.S. Representative to the African Union, and I take this time, as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to urge my colleagues to support that nomination.

The African Union is the only continent-wide multilateral organization for diplomatic engagement and the advancement of peace and security in Africa. The U.S. Ambassador to the African Union plays a key role in representing the United States and advancing our national interests within this international body.

The AU is critically important to helping find a diplomatic solution to conflicts on the continent, such as the ongoing war in Sudan. That conflict has led to the impending famine and what credible organizations have called genocide. It will not be resolved without AU participation. We should be there to support the AU's vital efforts, but we have been absent.

The AU is also an essential voice in articulating continent-wide values related to democracy, good governance, respect for human rights, and gender equality—all values that we share.

The alarming trend of democratic backsliding in the Sahel cannot be reversed without AU involvement. We should be there to support its efforts in this area, but we have not been.

No, Mr. President, we have not been there, while the Chinese have been very active.

It is critically important that we have confirmed representatives to represent our national security interests. When we don't have Senate-confirmed representatives, it gives openings for our adversaries.

China is there. We are not because we have not confirmed this Ambassador position. It is against our national security interest to leave these positions unfilled because of a lack of Senate action.

This nomination has languished since February of 2023. For nearly a year and

a half, the United States has been a no-show, allowing others to engage in our absence. During this time, the United States has missed opportunities to add its voice and engagement to essential conversations on economic integration, the promotion of justice and the rule of law, durable solutions to crisis, and citizen engagement that impact the entire African continent.

China has been active. We have been missing.

We must get ourselves back into the game in the continent, and the nominee under consideration is well positioned to do this. Ambassador Sullivan has held numerous positions focusing on advancing U.S. interests in Africa. She has served as Ambassador to the Republic of Ghana and the Republic of Congo and as Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for the State Department's Bureau of African Affairs. Ambassador Sullivan is an experienced diplomat who knows and understands the continent and has demonstrated leadership skills that will serve us well at the AU headquarters.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on cloture and yes on the confirmation of Ambassador Stephanie Sullivan to be the next U.S. Ambassador to the African Union. Let's get this done, and let's get this done today.

With that, I yield the floor.

VOTE ON PIPE NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Pipe nomination?

Mrs. MURRAY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a 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 New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 188 Ex.]

YEAS—55

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Bennet	Hassan	Ossoff
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Padilla
Booker	Hickenlooper	Peters
Brown	Hirono	Reed
Butler	Kaine	Romney
Cantwell	Kelly	Rosen
Cardin	King	Sanders
Carper	Klobuchar	Schatz
Casey	Lankford	Schumer
Collins	Lujan	Shaheen
Coons	Manchin	Sinema
Cortez Masto	Markey	Smith
Duckworth	Merkley	Stabenow
Durbin	Murkowski	Tester
Fetterman	Murphy	Tillis

Van Hollen	Warren	Wyden
Warner	Welch	
Warnock	Whitehouse	

NAYS—38

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

NOT VOTING—7

Braun	Hagerty	Vance
Britt	Johnson	
Graham	Menendez	

The nomination was confirmed. The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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. 590, Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Charles E. Schumer, Benjamin L. Cardin, Jack Reed, Ben Ray Lujan, Tammy Baldwin, John W. Hickenlooper, Brian Schatz, Christopher Murphy, Richard J. Durbin, Jeanne Shaheen, Margaret Wood Hassan, Alex Padilla, Mazie Hirono, Sherrod Brown, Tina Smith, Catherine Cortez Masto, Jeff Merkley.

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 Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Sen-

ator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 189 Ex.]

YEAS—53

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

NAYS—40

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

NOT VOTING—7

Booker	Graham	Vance
Braun	Hagerty	
Britt	Menendez	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO). On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 40, and the motion is agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephanie Sanders Sullivan, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Representative of the United States of America to the African Union, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume legislative session and resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 4381, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 400, S. 4381, a bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I rise today in proud support of the Right to Contraception Act, straightforward legislation that would protect individuals' right to access contraception and providers' right to provide it.

Our bill wouldn't force anyone to take or provide contraception if they don't want to, but it would help ensure that those who do can without the government getting in their way.

As Republicans continue their assault on our fundamental reproductive rights, this bill is critical to safeguard the right of all Americans to access contraception.

I look forward to saying more about this important legislation later on, but first I am glad to be joined by many of my Democratic colleagues who will come to the floor to speak on this bill. They know how vital it is that we protect the right to contraception, starting with my colleague from Massachusetts, my partner on this bill, Senator MARKEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Madam President, thank you to my partner Senator HIRONO from Hawaii and to all of the Senators who today are going to lead on this issue of ensuring that people in the United States have access to contraception. I am joined by Senator SMITH from Minnesota. But we will be joined by so many others out here on the floor because this Friday, June 7, will be 49 years since there was a decision made in the Roe v. Wade question before it got repealed in 2022—49 years, from 1973 to 2022.

And the Supreme Court, 59 years ago to this day, June 7—the Supreme Court recognized in Griswold v. Connecticut the right of Americans to use contraception. Just a few years later, in 1972, the Supreme Court expanded on that holding and wrote:

If the right of privacy means anything, it is the right of the individual, married or single, to be free from unwarranted governmental intrusion into matters so fundamentally affecting a person as the decision whether to bear or beget a child.

That was the Supreme Court in 1972.

In recognizing the fundamental right to contraception, the Supreme Court affirmed what we know: The right to contraception is essential to Americans' health and freedom. This decision was a step toward freedom and away from decades of reproductive coercion rooted in this Nation's history.

In 1927, the Supreme Court in Buck v. Bell approved forced sterilization in a decision steeped in ableism. Federal funds were used to sterilize 100,000 to 150,000 women, half of whom were Black. Teaching hospitals in New York and Boston experimented on Black and Puerto Rican women as practice for medical students. In recent history, immigrant women in detention faced forced sterilization, and Black, Brown,

immigrant, disabled, LGBTQ, low-income and rural Americans still face significant—and sometimes insurmountable—barriers to getting reproductive care.

Left up to the extremism of the far right, they would let this injustice grow deeper into the American soul. Just 2 years ago, the Supreme Court majority did so when they took settled precedent and placed it on shaky ground.

In Dobbs, the Supreme Court majority overturned decades of settled precedent to strip away the constitutional right to abortion. On June 24, 2022, Americans had one less right than they did on January 23, 2022.

In his concurring opinion in Dobbs, Justice Clarence Thomas distilled the threat to American freedom. He outlined a long-held rightwing reactionary belief that Americans had too many privacy rights under the Constitution, that the Supreme Court erred in recognizing those rights, and that the Court should take them away. The rights he was talking about? The right to marry whom you love and the right to contraception.

Justice Thomas put that in his concurring opinion, a preview of what he wanted the Supreme Court to take up in future years.

Emboldened by the Supreme Court, States across the country have limited or prohibited access to contraception. Texas Republicans gutted Medicaid coverage of emergency contraception. Idaho Republicans blocked health clinics in public schools from providing contraception. And Republican Governors are vetoing State efforts to protect the right to contraception.

The threat to contraception is not hypothetical; it is a real threat that requires a real response here on the Senate floor. We must guard against efforts to oppress, suppress, and repress reproductive freedom for people and their healthcare providers.

That is why I proudly introduced the Right to Contraception Act with my colleagues MAZIE HIRONO and TAMMY DUCKWORTH.

The Right to Contraception Act guarantees Americans have the freedom to get contraception and for health providers to give it; the right to contraception free from Federal and State government threats; and the dignity to choose what contraception works best for them and for their families.

Passing the Right to Contraception Act would provide clear and unequivocal safeguards for a right that Americans have relied upon for nearly 60 years. It would keep government intrusion out of the deeply personal decisions people make about their health and their families. It would mean moving toward reproductive justice and freedom for everyone in our country.

Now, my colleagues across the aisle are trying to argue that this legislation restricts parental rights and religious liberties. That is completely un-

true. The only restrictions that are being debated today are the ones that Republicans and MAGA extremists want to place on access to contraception.

Democrats are here today to defend reproductive freedom. This bill is about ensuring liberty, the liberty that comes with having full access to healthcare options.

Today, we have an opportunity to pass the historic piece of legislation, the Right to Contraception Act. This vote asks a simple question of each Senator and each American: Do you support Americans' freedom to make their own decisions about their health and social and economic freedom or not? Which side of that question are you on in our Nation?

For many of my colleagues and for the vast majority of the American people, that answer is easy, and it should be easy. At its best, this institution has affirmed the rights of every American. On this floor, we have expanded access to healthcare, battled against racial segregation, and protected same-sex marriage.

And today, we have the opportunity to protect the right to contraception. We have the opportunity to show the American people that we will fight with them and for them for reproductive freedom.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes to pass the Right to Contraception Act. Vote yes to ensuring that reproductive health freedom and justice is the law of our land.

We cannot allow our country to go into the "Wayback Machine," to go back to 1965, to go back to before Griswold was decided. That is what MAGA rightwing Republicans want to have happen in our country, and it is just absolutely unacceptable.

So today is the day of reckoning. Today is the day we will have the vote out here on the Senate floor to show which direction you believe our country should be headed.

I thank Senator SCHUMER for making it possible for us to have this debate today. I think it is going to be a very meaningful one that will ultimately help to clarify for the American people whose side each of the Senators are on in terms of their families, their family planning, the decisions they have to make for themselves.

So I thank you. I thank Senator HIRONO and Senator DUCKWORTH for their leadership and Senator MURRAY, of course, historic leader on all of these issues. And I am looking forward to the discussion—the debate—today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Ms. BUTLER. Madam President, I rise today to join my colleagues in calling for the passage of the Right to Contraception Act.

I would like to start, of course, by thanking Senators MARKEY, HIRONO, and DUCKWORTH for their work in championing legislation that preserves

women and families' right to plan a pregnancy on their own terms.

Now, basic reproductive and sexual healthcare tools like contraception, like STI prevention, and like fertility treatment are under immediate threat, further reducing patients' options when and whether to start or grow their families.

In Arizona, every Republican in both legislative Chambers blocked legislation to protect access to contraception.

In Oklahoma, we have seen the Republican legislature there advance legislation that could create a database of women who obtained an abortion and could make IUDs and emergency contraception inaccessible.

In Tennessee, House Republicans voted down a bill in committee that would have made clear that the State's abortion ban would not jeopardize access to contraceptive care or fertility treatment.

In short, at every opportunity, extreme MAGA Republicans haven't stopped their unconscionable campaign to chip away at a woman's access to basic healthcare.

According to 2022 data from the Kaiser Family Foundation, 90 percent of females aged 18 to 64 have used contraception at some point during their reproductive years—90 percent. If we were to let those extremists have their way, it would mean millions of women in our country being left without options and forced into unwanted pregnancy and other situations that we may not be prepared for.

Now, my State, California, has been a leader on the frontlines of reproductive freedom. Five months after the Dobbs decision, California voters overwhelmingly chose to amend the State constitution and unequivocally protect the right to abortion and contraception.

This week, I heard from Martin Orea and Emily Oh from Southern California, first-year students attending Santa Monica College and Irvine Valley College, respectively. Together, they serve as the Youth Health Equity and Safety Ambassadors for Essential Access Health, a nonprofit dedicated to championing quality sexual and reproductive healthcare for all.

They wrote to me saying:

Access to contraception is not just a health issue—it's a lifeline for our autonomy and future. Access to contraception is about giving us the power to shape our destinies.

When we have the tools to manage our health, we can stay in school, build stable families, and contribute positively to our communities. The ability to get contraception enables us to lead healthier, more productive lives and achieve our dreams.

It is about fostering personal responsibility, stability, and economic self-reliance.

When I came to this Chamber, I made a promise. I made a promise to be urgent in my efforts to protect the rights of young people like Martin, Emily, and others in their generation who are tired of being ignored and dismissed. We cannot fail them or let them down in this moment.

I close, urging my colleagues to join in and ensure that attacks on contra-

ceptives do not go unchecked. We must support this legislation and safeguard contraceptive care for the millions of young girls, women, and patients across the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ROSEN). The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, I rise today with my colleagues to urge all of my colleagues to vote in favor of the Right to Contraception Act.

At its core, this bill is based on a very simple value. The value is that every individual should have the right to make decisions about their lives, their medical care, their families, and their bodies.

Passing this bill would not only protect the right to get birth control free from government interference, but it would protect this core American value because if you don't control your reproductive life, you don't control anything about your life.

This is a bipartisan issue at least in the Nation, if not in this Chamber. Over 80 percent of Americans support access to birth control, including over 70 percent of Republicans, but despite this overwhelming level of support, many of my Republican colleagues seem set to block this bill today. You know, I wish I could say that I was shocked, but there is a direct through line we see between Senate Republicans and Donald Trump in confirming Trump's extremist, anti-choice Justices, overturning Roe, and bringing us to this day. So this is not an accident; this is a plan.

In the era of chaos ushered in by the Supreme Court's Dobbs decision, the Republicans' refusal to protect access to birth control is just another example of this cruel and reckless approach to women's health, and every day, we are confronted with the grave consequences that overturning Roe has had for Americans.

Today, one in three women of child-bearing age lives in States with a Trump Republican abortion ban, and from those States, we hear the stories of the impact of that on people's lives—women trying to get reproductive health care and being turned away, sometimes until their conditions become life-threatening; doctors trying to provide healthcare that they feel is best for their patients but they can't because of the fear of prosecution. It is clear that the people responsible for this either don't understand women's health and bodies or they just don't care.

Now, people access contraceptive care—birth control—for a whole host of reasons, including to treat conditions like ovarian cancer, endometriosis, and migraines. Laws and regulations that restrict access to birth control harm people. They harm people, and they harm their families. That is why this is so important.

The Right to Contraception Act protects more than just your right to make your own decisions about wheth-

er and when and how to become a parent; it protects your right to chart the course of your life and to make decisions without politicians and judges interfering. So when Republicans vote no, what they are saying is that they want to be in charge of your freedom, your autonomy, and your personal dignity.

You know, you may be thinking as you are listening to this debate: I mean, why is this law necessary? I mean, what is out there? Who is out there who is actually trying to restrict access to contraceptives?

Well, the reality, colleagues, is that this is happening. You can see it in Republican efforts to redefine some contraception, like IUDs or the morning-after pill, to redefine those kinds of contraception as abortion—based not on the science, not on the best medical expertise, but on their political views. You can see it in their relentless efforts to defund Planned Parenthood and to cut title X funding.

Now, colleagues, title X is the bipartisan law that was signed by President Nixon. It is the only Federal program dedicated to providing comprehensive family planning and preventive healthcare. Title X helps low-income people afford wellness exams, cervical and breast cancer screenings, testing for sexually transmitted diseases and HIV/AIDS. It also provides basic infertility services. It is a godsend for over 2.5 million Americans. Most of them are without any health insurance and are under the age of 30. We should be supporting title X and not tearing it down.

Many of you know that long before I came to this body, I worked at Planned Parenthood. When I was there, I saw every day what it means to get access to basic reproductive health care, how that frees people to be able to live the lives that they choose, and how much they depend on those services. Now Donald Trump and extreme Senate Republicans have created a healthcare crisis by banning abortion for one in three women of child-bearing age in this country.

If my Republican colleagues are really interested, truly interested in helping women and families, you would vote for this bill, this Right to Contraception Act. You would vote for it today. I am here to tell you that actions speak louder than words. A "no" vote means that you don't trust women to make our own decisions about our bodies, our health, and our lives. So I urge you to join us in voting yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Madam President, for years, people were accused of being hysterical for saying Republicans would actually take away people's reproductive freedoms. The prevailing Republican position to ban abortions in almost every instance, with no exceptions, was so outrageous, so cruel, so unpopular that people said: Well, they

would never actually go through with that.

But, 2 years ago, it finally happened. Roe fell, and tens of millions of women across America lost their right to reproductive freedom overnight.

Now, once again, people question whether Republicans will actually go through with the thing that they say they want to do: It is too morally extreme; it is too politically risky. But the fact is, Republicans have shown no restraint whatsoever when it comes to shredding people's reproductive rights.

Overturning Roe was never going to be enough. The project also includes banning birth control and IVF. It doesn't matter how outrageous it is. It doesn't matter how unpopular it is. It doesn't matter that 92 percent of Americans support birth control and that almost 90 percent of women have used it at some point. It doesn't matter that women and families would lose the ability to plan whether and when to have kids. Dismantling reproductive freedoms is central to the Republican agenda. Aside from tax cuts for billionaires, it is kind of their main thing.

No right or freedom, no matter how basic or popular, is off limits until Congress enshrines that right in Federal law. The Right to Contraception Act does exactly that. It enshrines in Federal law the right to birth control, and it protects doctors who are simply doing their jobs by providing it.

This should not be controversial. No matter where you stand politically—if you want several kids or if you want none at all, whether you are religious or an atheist or somewhere in between—this is about the basic principle that people ought to be able to decide what is best for themselves, their bodies, and their families. Yet, over the past 2 years since the fall of Roe, Republican lawmakers in at least 17 States—Nevada, Arizona, Virginia, Wisconsin, Louisiana—have repeatedly killed efforts to protect access to contraception, and Republican-led legislatures in States like Missouri and Idaho are pushing bills to block access to various forms of birth control, including Plan B and IUDs. All the while, you have Donald Trump openly toying with a national contraception ban.

So to say the future of birth control in the United States is in serious jeopardy is not partisan spin. Republicans continue to work at this goal. They want fewer rights, less autonomy, less freedom. The only way to counter their crusade against people's fundamental freedoms is to enshrine this right in Federal statute.

The really cool thing about the Senate floor is this: This is the place where you find out what people actually think. There was a memo from the NRSC—an interesting memo. A lot of people are talking to the media near the train about what they think about contraception, but in 2 hours, we get to know what you think about contraception. We get to know whether you actually want to enshrine this right in

Federal statute or you don't. That is the beauty of this place, and that is the beauty of this bill at this time. Everyone will go on the record.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I want to thank all of my colleagues who are here on the floor and thank Senator HIRONO, who has led this legislation, along with Senator MARKEY.

As you just heard, today, every Senator is going to be confronted with a very simple question: Should Americans have the right to contraception, the right to birth control—IUDs? Plan B?

Now, that really should not be a hard question. In fact, most Americans thought this matter was settled. After all, nearly 60 years ago, the Supreme Court decided *Griswold v. Connecticut* and affirmed Americans' right to privacy, including the right to contraception.

Today, the right to contraception is overwhelmingly popular. The vast majority of the American people, our constituents, supports this right. So this should be an easy vote. This bill should pass with flying colors. It almost shouldn't be necessary. Yet Republicans have been making clear that a bill like this is not only necessary but urgent.

Not only has Justice Thomas signaled an interest in reconsidering *Griswold* and not only have Senators said *Griswold* was unsound, but there are Republican bills right now with large GOP support that would severely undercut the right to birth control, like the Life at Conception Act, which is supported by more than half of the Republicans in the House, including the Speaker. That GOP bill would enshrine the truly extreme doctrine of fetal personhood nationwide. That would not just ban abortion, it would outlaw emergency contraception like Plan B, and it would outlaw IUDs.

You don't have to take my word for it. I chaired a HELP hearing yesterday on the damage of Republicans' anti-abortion attacks over the past 2 years, and I asked the Republicans' own witness directly: Do you view IUDs as abortion? The answer was yes.

Let's be crystal clear. IUDs and Plan B do not cause an abortion. That level of disinformation is chilling, and it cuts to the heart of the issue about what many Republicans really think about contraception.

So every time Republicans try to say no one is coming for your birth control, well, what about every Republican pushing for fetal personhood? Seriously. Let's say Republicans succeed in making fetal personhood the law of the land. I mean, they have already succeeded at overturning Roe. So if Republicans enact fetal personhood, what happens to all of the women with IUDs? Make no mistake, that isn't simply some provocative hypothetical. If Republicans actually pass the Life at

Conception Act, this is a question millions of women will have to grapple with.

Now, I don't expect an answer from Republicans, and I don't expect every Republican to be as forthcoming as their witness yesterday when it comes to where they stand on the right to birth control, but we are putting every single Senator on the record today when we vote on the Right to Contraception Act.

This bill is as exactly straightforward and as common sense as it sounds. It simply codifies Americans' right to birth control into law. That is it. And you don't have to take my word for it; read it. It is 11 pages.

To me, this is not just a messaging bill; it is a meaningful way to protect a really fundamental right. But it is absolutely right that how each of us votes will send a message. So what message do my Republican colleagues want to send to the American people? What message do we want to send to our constituents: that we support their right to birth control—that we support access to IUDs, to Plan B—or that we are OK with taking that right away and letting politicians make medical decisions for women in this country?

I know where I stand—with the overwhelming majority of people who support that right. Soon, we will know exactly where every Republican Senator stands as well.

Whatever happens with this vote, Democrats are going to keep pushing in full force to hold Republicans accountable for their extreme policies and the harm they are causing. We will work to restore abortion rights in this country and to protect women's reproductive rights across the board.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I am here today with the same concern that we heard from my colleagues—that this country is failing women in New Hampshire and across the country when it comes to protecting our fundamental freedoms—fundamental freedoms like the right to contraception, which we thought was safe just a few short years ago.

From the beginning, the right to full access to contraception was hard fought. Since that right was first recognized by the Supreme Court in *Griswold v. Connecticut* nearly 60 years ago to the Affordable Care Act's expansion of contraceptive coverage in 2010 requiring insurance companies to pay for it, there have been incremental yet vital steps forward for women to determine our own reproductive futures. It put us on a path to making sure our daughters and granddaughters had more fundamental rights, not fewer. But as with so many things, this progress has been met with resistance.

In the year since the Affordable Care Act, attacks on contraception have increased at both the State and Federal levels.

Like many Americans—like those of us here today—I was very alarmed when Justice Thomas wrote in his concurring opinion in the Supreme Court's Dobbs ruling that the Court should "reconsider" its ruling in *Griswold v. Connecticut*—should reconsider women's rights to access to contraception. That is my editorial analysis of what Justice Thomas was saying.

Then, of course, just last month, the former President, Donald Trump, implied that States should be allowed to decide access to contraception, potentially setting a dangerous precedent that would harm millions of women and families who rely on contraception. And we heard Senator MURRAY talk so eloquently about how the laws are being interpreted to raise concerns about access to contraception.

And as Senator SCHATZ said so well, we have heard people suggest that our concern about access to contraceptives is really a scare tactic. But for all of us who worked for years trying to protect *Roe v. Wade* and the right for women to make our own healthcare decisions, we heard that same argument for decades on the *Roe* decision: The Supreme Court is never going to overturn that; we have already heard the Justices say that is settled law. Well, we saw what happened in the Dobbs decision.

These threats against women are felt acutely in my home State of New Hampshire, where our critical family planning providers can't make ends meet because elected officials continue to block Federal and State funding vital to ensuring that Granite Staters have access to reproductive care.

That care doesn't just encompass contraceptive services—though that is critically important—but it also includes basic reproductive education. It includes things like breast cancer screening and sexually transmitted disease screenings and treatment.

By throwing up roadblock after roadblock, MAGA Republicans are showing that they don't really care about women's health or our personal freedoms. They are taking us backward when women want and deserve to go forward.

These efforts follow a concerning pattern—that women's rights are negotiable; that they can easily be taken away; and that women's lives and our freedoms to decide our own futures are not valued.

So to address the women and families who are on the frontlines of this partisan onslaught, let me just say that I understand the anxiety, the fear, and the hopelessness that comes from watching your rights be stripped away.

To Zoe, who is a recent University of New Hampshire graduate—she wrote so powerfully about the positive experience she had with a family planning provider in New Hampshire, saying:

Without access to birth control decisions about my future would always have an element of uncertainty lingering.

But because Zoe had access to a family planning provider, she was empowered to make her own decisions, to have control over her own future.

To the women in New Hampshire who have written me—to say, for example: I'm worried about which rights would be taken away, or: I feel that women don't have equal rights, and: How did it come to this?—to the women not ready to start a family, to those whose families are just the right size, and to all the young women, like my granddaughters, who have fewer freedoms now than their mothers did at their age, I say to you: I hear you, and I feel that pain.

As we vote today, history is watching us. We can't sit back and watch while reproductive freedoms backslide because access to contraception is a fundamental right, and no one—not a sitting Supreme Court Justice, not a Governor, not a Member of Congress—should be allowed to decide whether or not a woman chooses to use contraception and determine her own future. That highly important and deeply personal decision belongs to the woman and to the woman and her family—to the woman alone.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, we are living through a new era in a fight for reproductive freedom.

This month marks 2 years since the extreme conservative majority on the Supreme Court struck down *Roe v. Wade*. This decision, which was enabled by Donald Trump and my Republican colleagues, has been an absolute disaster for our country.

Republican lawmakers have stripped abortion access from millions of women. They have made clear that they won't stop until they get a national abortion ban. This is all part of an extreme agenda that will go even further—a mission to take away basic freedoms for women all across our country.

We have to step up and protect reproductive health now. Contraception could be the next frontier in that fight.

Republican Governors in Virginia and Nevada have vetoed bills to protect access to birth control. The Arizona legislature has blocked similar legislation. That is why I am proud to be a co-sponsor of the Right to Contraception Act.

This legislation is very simple. It guarantees every single American the right to access contraception and ensures that healthcare professionals can provide it without interference from extreme Republican politicians.

Birth control is a pillar of reproductive health care. It is safe. It is effective. It gives millions of women control over when they want to start a family. And some contraceptives have an array of other health benefits, like helping to prevent certain kinds of cancer.

Birth control also helps expand economic opportunity for women all across our country. Access to birth control is linked to better educational outcomes, more professional opportunities, and higher lifetime earnings.

For all those reasons, access to contraception is an issue with overwhelming bipartisan support. More than 90 percent—90 percent—of Americans believe that everyone should be able to access the contraceptives they need.

We must take every measure to prevent dangerous bans on birth control, especially because barriers and access disproportionately impact our most vulnerable communities. Black, Hispanic, low-income, and uninsured women are more likely to have issues accessing and affording contraception. Every person should be able to receive this essential care and have the freedom to plan for their future however they see fit.

I call on my colleagues to vote in favor of the Right to Contraception Act. Republicans are bent on taking away reproductive freedoms for women everywhere, and we need to stop them from turning back the clock.

We should also not stop at contraception. We must work to expand access to all sexual and reproductive health services. That means abortion, contraception, gender-affirming care, maternal healthcare, and so much more.

Starting a family is one of the most important—and, clearly, one of the most personal—decisions that a person can make. And politicians should be absolutely nowhere near it.

Let's guarantee women have the reproductive freedom that they deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, I rise at a very serious moment in our history. I want to thank Senator HIRONO, Senator MARKEY, all of our colleagues, for joining together in reality—not only speaking out but standing up for women across the country, for families, for everyone who wants the capacity to have their own freedom to make their own healthcare decision, their own personal decisions about their lives. That is really what this is all about.

Let me first back up in the big picture because we know for 50 years, *Roe v. Wade* protected our freedom to make our own healthcare decisions. Then 2 years ago, because of a new Supreme Court majority appointed by Donald Trump—gone.

I was a college student when *Roe v. Wade* was decided. I can't believe that women today—that my daughter; that my granddaughter, as she grows up—may have fewer freedoms than I did all those years ago.

Today, 21 States now have near-total bans or severe restrictions on abortions. That means one out of three women now live under extreme and dangerous abortion bans.

And we know who to blame because he said it. Donald Trump—MAGA Republicans—he said himself: I was proudly the person responsible for ending *Roe*, proud to put the lives of millions of women at risk, proud to take this freedom away.

And if you think Donald Trump and Republicans are going to stop there, then you haven't been listening to them.

First, their ultimate goal is to have a nationwide ban. Under a nationwide ban, all of Michigan's hard work—our election to protect our freedoms in the Michigan Constitution that we passed 2 years ago—will be gone. None of that will matter, and we can't let that happen.

But as we are here talking about today, Republicans have indicated they want to go even further in their assault on reproductive freedoms. Rightwing judges and Republicans across the country are attacking access to contraception.

I never thought, Madam President, in my wildest dreams that I would be standing on the floor of the U.S. Senate talking about efforts to take away my right, your right, any woman's right, any person's right to make their own decision on when to have a family, on contraception. But right now, in States like Virginia—not very far from here—Nevada, and Arizona, Republicans are working to block protections for birth control right now.

Justice Clarence Thomas, as has been quoted on this floor today, has called on the Supreme Court to reconsider the constitutional freedom to access contraception in America.

Let's be clear: Birth control is a key part of a woman's healthcare. It is important for reproductive decisions, for treating medical conditions, for decreasing the risk of cancer, and, most importantly, it is a personal decision.

This is a personal decision. Americans don't want politicians—anybody here—or judges and their doctor's office in their medicine cabinet or in their bedroom.

They want to make their own decisions. They have every right, in America, to make their own decisions about their healthcare, their life, and their future. That is as basic as it gets in America. We talk about the freedoms that we have in this country, and that is pretty basic: to make your own decisions on your own healthcare.

Well, we are here on the floor as Democrats to say: We couldn't agree more. We could not agree more. This is absolutely fundamental. And that is why we need to pass the Right to Contraception Act now. Everybody on this floor is going to have a chance to either vote to do that or not.

This critical legislation will guarantee the right—the freedom—to contraceptives, a right that was decided by the Supreme Court nearly 60 years ago. We can't let Republicans turn back the clock. We need to defend Americans' freedom to make decisions about our own healthcare, our own lives, our own futures. Protecting contraceptives is an essential part of that. It is a basic part of that for us, and that is why we are here. Reproductive freedom is something we should all embrace as a basic American freedom.

I hope colleagues will join us in moving forward on this essential legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise in support of the Right to Contraception Act.

I would like to thank Senators MARKEY, HIRONO, MURRAY, and DUCKWORTH for their leadership on this bill. Senator HIRONO is here. Senator CANTWELL is also with us, who has been such a strong supporter of this bill.

We are at a pivotal moment for women's rights in this country. This month marks 2 years since the Supreme Court issued the ruling shredding half a century of precedent protecting a woman's right to make her own healthcare decisions. This ruling was against the wishes of somewhere between 70 and 80 percent of Americans, who believe that a woman's most personal decisions about her healthcare should be made not by politicians but by a woman, her doctor, her family.

In the wake of this disastrous ruling, women have been at the mercy of a patchwork of State laws that are creating chaos when it comes to accessing reproductive health care. Since the Dobbs decision came out, extremist judges have attempted to ban mifepristone, undermine IVF, and even criminalize doctors. Legislatures have introduced bills to criminalize doctors for simply doing their jobs. Twenty-one States have fully or partially banned abortion, and the number of U.S. patients traveling to other States for abortion care has skyrocketed to one in five.

This is unacceptable. My daughter should not have fewer rights than her mother or her grandmother.

So what is next? Well, what we must do is to codify Roe v. Wade into law, but as we work to do that, we have something else we have to watch out for, and that is that some Republican political leaders have called for restrictions even on contraception.

In his concurring opinion in the Dobbs case, Justice Thomas actually laid out a roadmap for how the Court could overturn the right to contraception. He said that the Supreme Court "should reconsider" whether the Constitution protects the right to access contraception.

This Friday marks 59 years—59 years—since the Supreme Court recognized the right to access contraception, but the current Court has made it clear that it won't hesitate to overturn decades of precedent in other contexts.

This threat is not hypothetical. In the wake of the Dobbs decision, nearly 20 million American women live in what we call contraceptive deserts, where they struggle to access birth control. I am thinking about Delilah, who lives in northern Texas. There are no health centers in her county and the dozen surrounding counties. To talk to a doctor about birth control, she has to

travel more than 400 miles, nearly 7 hours. There is Maya, who lives in Arizona. The wait times at her nearby health centers are so long that she needs to request an appointment at least 3 weeks in advance. Then there is Leah, who lives in Ohio. She has access to a clinic but has to take time off work to go to appointments—something she can't always afford to do.

State-level efforts, including recent Governor vetoes of right-to-contraception bills, are making the problem worse. We saw this in Nevada and just 2 weeks ago in Virginia. In Wisconsin, we saw the Republican-controlled State legislature refuse to hold a vote on the Right to Contraception Act. We have seen Missouri and other State legislatures attempt to cut off public funding for widely used contraceptives like IUDs and Plan B.

While 14 States, including my home State of Minnesota, protect the right to contraception, that is simply not enough. We cannot settle for a situation where women in Minnesota have more rights than women in Missouri.

With so many extremists racing to the State capitols to see who can be the first to take women's rights away, it is clear that we must explicitly protect the right to contraception. The American people agree. Recent data shows that more than 90 percent of Americans support access to contraception. That is why we are calling on our colleagues to pass the Right to Contraception Act.

This legislation is hardly radical. It simply ensures that women will be in the driver's seat when it comes to their health by codifying the right to contraception outlined by the Supreme Court nearly six decades ago—the same right Justice Thomas and others want to strip away. Specifically, this bill safeguards a patient's ability to seek contraception and a healthcare provider's ability to provide these critical services. Because the right to contraception cannot be an empty promise, it gives the Justice Department, patients, and doctors the power to make clear that no one can infringe upon the right to contraception.

I will note that 2 years ago, the House passed this legislation on a bipartisan basis. It is time for this body to do the same.

For the last 2 years, women in this country have faced an unacceptably uncertain future. These attacks on reproductive freedoms—on freedom for healthcare—have no place in America. Women are not second-class citizens.

The bill we are considering today represents a better path forward, a better future. The question that we must all answer is, Will we take that path or are we going to turn this over to this Supreme Court which has created a patchwork of laws that have allowed some States to try to criminalize doctors; that have allowed some States, through their courts, to ban mifepristone, a drug that has been found safe in dozens and dozens and dozens of countries? We have to decide.

So we have an opportunity today to make clear where we stand as a nation. I call on my colleagues to do what the American people overwhelmingly support and pass this bill into law.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Madam President, I join my colleagues out here on the floor. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for her unbelievable advocacy on behalf of women and healthcare and for her constant leadership on this issue, and I am glad to be joined by my colleague from Hawaii, who also has been such a great leader—both of them serving on the Judiciary Committee, the frontline of making sure that women's rights are protected. I thank them so much.

Most Americans alive probably don't remember a time when they didn't have the freedom to use birth control. We hear a lot about family planning. Well, what is family planning if you don't have access to contraception? Most people don't remember a time when they didn't have the freedom to decide whether and when to have children.

In Idaho recently, they have banned abortion. Now several of the State's colleges have banned their staff from even speaking to students about contraception. Imagine keeping college students in the dark about something as basic as a healthcare service.

We heard from an OB/GYN doctor from Idaho who moved away from their State after their reproductive care law, like so many other physicians have done in other States, and one thing really stuck out about what she told us. She said that anti-choice activists really stood out to her because they told her that "they're not done."

After Texas banned abortion, the State's Governor said women should just use emergency contraception to avoid getting pregnant, but Texas had already stopped covering emergency contraception under their State-funded family planning programs.

Madam President, when they say they are not done, I believe them.

In Iowa, the abortion ban is blocked for now, but the State attorney general temporarily paused a public funding program that helped pay for emergency contraception for rape victims, and 362 reimbursements have been delayed.

Madam President, I believe them when they say they are not done.

In Arizona, where abortion rights have been in legal chaos due to a practically Civil War-era ban, Republicans there unanimously blocked a vote to protect the right to access contraception.

In Virginia, people still have abortion rights, but the Governor chose to veto a bill to protect and expand birth control access just hours before the deadline.

So, yes, they are not done.

In Florida, where a near-total abortion ban just went into effect, law-

makers granted so-called crisis pregnancy centers a fivefold funding increase. These centers pretend to be real clinics while spreading misinformation about reproductive care, including contraception.

Across the country, anti-choice organizations are pushing false claims about contraception, fighting access to contraception, and basically even saying that birth control should be illegal.

So they are not done, and that is why we are here today.

The Supreme Court took away our constitutional right to abortion, and according to one Justice, they said they are not done.

So the point is that a woman cannot even be sure she can depend on the miracle of IVF to start a family.

America needs to know where people in this institution today stand on the reproductive rights of women, on family planning, on giving us access to contraception.

Today in my State, the State of Washington, abortion and contraception are protected by law, but this bill is important to my State because healthcare laws in nearby States affect our delivery-of-care system.

The University of Washington just this week released a study that showed that our State's abortion providers have seen a 50-percent increase in out-of-State patients since the Dobbs decision. Now, if you think about it, if you have seen a 50-percent increase in out-of-State patients, it means you are seeing more patients. What is the effect of seeing more patients? The study also found that all patients are getting abortions about 1 week later than they were before the Dobbs decision, which is dangerous on the healthcare delivery side.

Washington saw the largest increase in patients from those States who had banned abortion, States like Texas and Idaho, Louisiana and Florida. Now imagine if they carry this further and ban contraception too.

Our State doesn't want to be impacted in the delivery of care. It wants people to be able to see a physician when they need to see a physician, get the care when they need to get the care.

If we want to keep the right to contraception, if we want to keep the freedom to choose when people want to start their families, if we want to keep OB/GYNs in our national network system, we need to codify this right here today. We have to protect this right so the Supreme Court can't take it away.

I am glad to be a cosponsor of the Right to Contraception Act. I certainly look forward to voting on this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

It seems not that long ago when our country recognized, in *Connecticut v. Griswold*, that we had this right. When we have been talking about it for the last many years now, really, as so many people came before Congress to be a nominee for a judicial branch,

they have all said: This is all settled law—oh, yeah—*Connecticut v. Griswold*.

We always ask that question. Why? Because *Griswold v. Connecticut* was a decision based on contraception that gave you this right to privacy.

Now, all of a sudden, not only was that ignored by the Supreme Court—it was amazing when you think about the time before that. People didn't have access to contraception. It became such a day-to-day part of our lives. If it is such a day-to-day part of our lives and the delivery of healthcare, then we should have the courage to say so and vote this way today. If people don't, it is because they aren't done, and they don't want to protect this. And I guarantee you, families deserve the privacy of knowing when and how they want to start their families.

I ask my colleagues to support this legislation and support our healthcare system that has been working very well with the support of contraception.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I want to thank all my colleagues who came to the floor of the Senate yesterday and today with the fierce urgency of now to urge passage of the Right to Contraception Act.

This month marks almost 2 years since the Supreme Court's disastrous Dobbs decision, resulting in women in half the country having fewer rights than women in the other half of the country. What kind of a country is that?

I thought this was a country founded on equal protection and equal rights—not according to this Supreme Court.

Dobbs wreaked chaos in its own right, overturning *Roe v. Wade* and eliminating a constitutional right that I had for almost 50 years. But it also foretold more chaos to come. In his concurrence in the Dobbs case, Justice Thomas specifically called for "reconsidering" *Griswold v. Connecticut*, the 1965 case protecting the right to contraception. When a Supreme Court Justice says he wants to "reconsider" a case, that is a signal that he wants to overturn it. It is bad enough that they overturned *Roe v. Wade*'s 50 years of a constitutional protection. Now they want to overturn *Griswold*. That is a 59-year precedent protecting our right to contraception.

We have what I have described as an out-of-control Supreme Court majority that has no problem overturning decades here, there, and just about everywhere based on their ideological agenda.

Justice Alito, meanwhile, respects his wife's right to make her own decisions, but he has no problem telling millions of women—the rest of us—what to do with our bodies. I mean, just think about it. Do you see the irony of it? Do you see the hypocrisy of it?

And just this year, both of those Justices—I am talking about Justices

Alito and Thomas—suggested that the Comstock Act, a Civil War-era law—Civil War, I mean how far back are they going to go—could be used to restrict access to reproductive care nationwide. This crusade against reproductive rights by these Justices and the rest of their cohorts, I have to say, really comports with the Republicans' obsession with power and control over women's bodies.

As they work toward a national abortion ban, Republicans and their allies on the Supreme Court have given us every reason to believe contraception is also on their hit list. Republican States across the country have already blocked or rolled back access to contraception.

You have heard from my colleagues. Virginia's Governor vetoed a right-to-contraception bill just last month. Earlier this year, Arizona Republicans blocked a similar bill in their State. Oklahoma's Legislature advanced a bill that could ban access to IUDs and emergency contraception.

The list goes on. They are very specific about the kinds of contraceptives that we should have access to.

So this whole desire that I really can't figure out on the part of the MAGA Republicans and their supporters on the Supreme Court really comes down to power and control over women's bodies. That is what it is.

Madam President, contraception is healthcare—essential healthcare—that millions of people across the country rely on, not only to decide if and when to become pregnant but also to treat medical conditions, regulate hormone levels, and more. And that is why the vast majority of Americans support the right to contraception.

The current assault on women's rights is horrifying, but it is not new. Our country has a long and dark history of exerting control over women. For much of our country's history, women were denied a fundamental right to vote. They didn't have a right to own property. They couldn't open bank accounts. The list goes on. Some women of color faced forced sterilization and coercive contraception testing. That is the dark history in our country of controlling women and our bodies.

These attacks on women and our freedoms were wrong then, and you would think, by now, we would have learned a thing or two to protect all of our rights—but not this MAGA-majority Supreme Court. The attacks we are facing today are a reality.

The right to control one's own body, free from government interference, is as fundamental as it gets. That is why it is critical that the Senate pass the Right to Contraception Act.

Our bill is simple. It would protect an individual's right to access contraception and a provider's right to provide it. It wouldn't force anyone to take or provide contraception if they don't want to, but it would ensure that those who do can, without the government

getting in their way. It would ensure people can access the healthcare they need, from IUDs and birth control pills to emergency contraception, like Plan B, and more, especially for women of color, women with disabilities, LGBTQ people, and those from rural communities who have difficulty accessing this kind of care. They already face increased barriers to accessing contraception.

This bill shouldn't be controversial, but Republicans have become so obsessed with controlling women's bodies that they refuse to protect even the most basic freedoms.

To my Republican colleagues, I ask: What is with this obsession with power and control over women's bodies?

Democrats know that women, not politicians, should be the ones making decisions about our bodies and our healthcare, and we are doing everything we can to protect and strengthen the reproductive rights of all Americans, including the right to contraception.

We are going to vote on this bill today, and I urge all of my colleagues, with the fierce urgency of now, to stop taking away ever more rights of women in this country—women and others in this country—and vote for this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I am thrilled to be joining Senators MARKEY, HIRONO, DUCKWORTH, and all of my colleagues today in support of the Right to Contraception Act.

This month marks the second anniversary of the Supreme Court decision overturning *Roe v. Wade*, which upended a woman's right to choose and paved the way for former President Trump and anti-choice politicians to further erode women's rights in this country.

We knew these anti-choice Republicans wouldn't stop attacking reproductive rights after *Roe* fell. We knew they would keep trying to diminish our freedom to make decisions about our own bodies, including the right to attain and use birth control.

You don't have to take my word for it. Look at what is happening in States across the country, as you heard from my colleagues. Even though the right to birth control has strong bipartisan support, anti-choice lawmakers are passing bills left and right to chip away at access to contraception.

And listen to the leader of the Republican Party. Just 2 weeks ago, former President Trump said he was open to restricting women's right to contraception if he wins another term. For the anti-choice right, this is about controlling women.

On the other hand, my fellow pro-choice colleagues and I believe in reproductive freedom. We are working every day to protect access to birth control and other basic forms of women's healthcare, and we are making real progress here.

Last year, the Food and Drug Administration approved Opill, the first-ever over-the-counter birth control pill. Once it was approved, Senators MURRAY, HIRONO, and I, along with others, pushed the manufacturers to make sure that Opill is widely accessible without a prescription. It is now available online and in stores across the country.

We are not alone in this fight. The Biden-Harris administration has worked hard to expand access to contraception and make it more affordable for American women. We have made important progress, and we have seen that the anti-choice movement won't stop coming after our reproductive rights. That is why we have to pass the Right to Contraception Act and protect access to birth control in every State across our country.

We know that, despite dishonest efforts from anti-choice politicians to label it as dangerous, birth control is an essential part of healthcare. And for me, contraception was about my healthcare, as it is for millions of women in America.

I will tell you what, to my female colleagues here, if a man were able to give birth, we would have universal healthcare by now. But we don't because they don't feel it; they don't see it. So they disregard it, and they disregard the impact to women and the essential care that we need when it comes to our bodily health.

That is why this legislation is so important. It would protect the fundamental right to access essential healthcare. It would empower women in Nevada and across the country to make decisions about their own lives on their own terms. And it would make it clear to anti-choice candidates, like Donald Trump and his anti-choice followers, that messing with the right to contraception is not on the table.

My colleagues here and I will never stop fighting to reinstate the rights anti-choice politicians have stripped away from millions of women, and we will fiercely—fiercely—defend the rights women still have, including access to birth control. That is why we are here today.

I get asked quite often: What are you doing about it?

This is it. There is a role for Congress to play, and we are doing it. But there is a role for everyone who cares about this issue—no matter your station in life—to do something about it, to advocate, to be a part of a solution or policy change in your State or in your local community. There is a role for everybody and a responsibility. This is about women's rights. This is about women's freedoms in this country, and that is worth fighting for.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The junior Senator from Iowa.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE
CALENDAR—S. 4447

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I understand there is a bill at the desk that is due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The clerk will read the bill by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4447) to allow women greater access to safe and effective oral contraceptive drugs intended for routine use, and to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on Federal funding of contraceptive methods.

Ms. ERNST. In order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I would object to further proceeding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill will be placed on the calendar.

The junior Senator from Iowa.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT—
MOTION TO PROCEED

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 4447

Ms. ERNST. The so-called Right to Contraception Act goes far beyond the scope of providing access to contraception. It is important the American people understand what the Democrats are peddling.

Senator MARKEY's bill creates a precedent to mandate access to abortion drugs for women and girls of all ages. It also allows taxpayer dollars to be funneled to organizations like Planned Parenthood.

The bill removes conscious freedom protections, which allow our doctors and nurses to maintain their religious and moral beliefs while practicing medicine, a right that we are all afforded in the workplace which should be upheld.

I would like to remind my Democrat colleagues of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act—or RFRA is what we call it here. It is a law that was championed by Senator CHUCK SCHUMER more than 30 years ago.

The majority leader has really come a long way, hasn't he? Just like President Biden who used to be pro-life. Religious professionals and organizations across the country rely on RFRA for protection from broad government overreach. Yet the Democrats are willing to upend that precedent for politics and, more importantly, for abortion.

Let's be clear what is going on here. From the Senate to the White House, Democrats do not have anything to run on—no agenda that resonates with the American people. So instead, they are fearmongering in the name of politics.

Fortunately, Republicans have a solution: the Allowing Greater Access to Safe and Effective Contraception Act.

Like 90 percent of Americans, I believe routine-use contraception should be safe and accessible. That is why I have long worked to increase access to safe and effective over-the-counter oral contraceptives.

With my bill, we are ensuring women 18 and over can walk into any pharmacy, whether in Red Oak, IA, or Washington, DC, and purchase a safe and effective birth control option.

This Republican bill creates a priority review designation for over-the-counter birth control options to encourage the FDA to act quickly.

I am encouraged that as of this year, the first, but the only, over-the-counter option on the market has been approved. But having just one over-the-counter product on the market is just a starting point.

We need more options that are truly effective for women—women in rural areas, women facing domestic violence.

In addition, my bill brings much needed transparency and accountability in Federal spending to better understand where gaps are occurring and also to ensure dollars are actually going to supporting women and families.

GAO will take a 15-year look back at total dollar amounts for contraception reimbursement, inventory stocking, provider training, and patient education efforts to help better inform us as lawmakers and you as taxpayers on where and how our money is being spent.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 418, S. 4447; further, that the bill be considered read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The junior Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. SMITH. Madam President, reserving the right to object, I have great respect for my colleague from Iowa, our neighbor to the south, but we just disagree on this issue.

I think that this is an attempt by Republicans to claim that they are increasing access to contraception when, in fact, this bill does not accomplish that goal at all. And I also think our Republican colleagues believe that they have a message problem when it comes to women's health when, in fact, they have a policy problem. And I regret to say this bill is not going to fix it.

One in three women in this country face barriers to accessing prescription contraception, and only half of women that are interested in over-the-counter birth control pills can afford them. But instead of addressing this very real and very well-understood challenge, this bill does nothing to improve access to contraception. It does not address the lack of insurance coverage for prescription and over-the-counter birth control—carve-outs that Republicans have repeatedly supported which make contraception more expensive for patients.

It does not protect patients from efforts to roll back the ability of providers to prescribe birth control. It

does not enable patients to know what is best for themselves to get birth control without unnecessary barriers.

Instead, the bill directs the FDA to prioritize review of applications to convert prescription contraception to over-the-counter; but, in fact, an over-the-counter birth control pill has been approved for almost a year and has been available in stores since March of this year. And this bill does nothing to get that product into patients' hands. In fact, it explicitly restricts access to this important product for young people.

This bill also directs a study, a Federal funding for contraception. We don't need a study to tell us that there are problems here. We know what the problem is. We know that President Trump's anti-abortion Justices at the Supreme Court and Republicans' years of policies here in Congress and in State legislatures around the country have restricted access to birth control.

In addition, this bill reinforces the misguided view that emergency contraception causes abortion. That is not what the science says, and it is not what doctors say.

If Republicans truly support increased access and fewer barriers to contraception, then they should vote for the Right to Contraception Act. Our bill would actually guarantee the right for people to obtain and use contraceptives and for health providers to provide contraception, contraception information, all free from government interference.

The Right to Contraception Act is the bill that we all need to support, and I look forward to voting for this bill this afternoon. And for these reasons, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The junior Senator from Iowa.

Ms. ERNST. Madam President, I am disheartened to see my colleague from Minnesota rise in opposition. I respect her greatly as well, and we do disagree on this issue. But, unfortunately, given the nature of this political exercise, I am not surprised.

This was never about finding real solutions. This was always about fearmongering and election-year stunts.

My effort, one that many of my Republican colleagues support, is a commonsense solution to give women more access to over-the-counter birth control options and bring accountability to government spending, not about finding loopholes so we can find a way to fund those drugs that cause abortions.

Despite attacks from the same far left that promotes drugs that endanger women, encourages the death of the unborn, I will always stand up for families. And as a mother and a grandmother, alongside my fellow Republican Senators, I will continue to protect life, while supporting policies that equip women to raise children to live the American dream.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CRUZ. Madam President, I want to thank the Senator from Iowa for her legislation, important legislation, protecting the right to birth control and making it easier for women to have access to birth control pills over the counter.

This is something we all agree on. This is something Americans across this Nation agree upon. This is a right that is protected in all 50 States.

In just a few minutes, we are going to see Democrats engage in a show vote. And there is a reason for that show vote: because Democrats in the Senate—every one of them—their views on abortion are extreme and radical. Every Democrat in this body has voted repeatedly in favor of unlimited abortion on demand, literally up until the moment of birth—partial-birth abortion in the 39th and 40th week of pregnancy. That is an extreme position. I will tell you nationally, 9 percent of Americans agree with that position. Madam President, 91 percent of Americans look at that extreme position and say: That is too far.

And, indeed, even among those Americans who call themselves pro-choice and a majority of pro-choice Americans say, Late-term abortions up until the moment of birth, that is extreme. So what do the Democrats do? They recognize that 91 percent of Americans disagree with their extreme position, so they try to change the topic. And in particular, they are trying to change the topic to birth control.

Now, all 100 Senators—every single Senator—agrees that birth control should be protected as a matter of law. And yet what did we just see? We saw Senator ERNST introducing her legislation, legislation of which I am a cosponsor. Together, we are leading the fight to protect the right to birth control, and what happened? The Democrats objected.

Why did they object? Understand why they objected. Because they want to use this as an issue in November to scare people, and they don't want to talk about their own radical record. Instead, they want to falsely claim somebody is coming to take contraception. That is deliberately false. And so when you see millions of dollars of TV ads paid for by Democrats, ask yourself one question: Why did the Democrats just block Senator ERNST's and my legislation protecting the right to birth control? Because this is not about protecting this right; it is about politics for the Democrats hiding their own radical view.

I wish we would come together. By the way, next week I predict the Democrats are going to do the same thing. I have legislation protecting in vitro fertilization, another incredible medical miracle that, again, to the best of my knowledge, all 100 Senators support. KATIE BRITT and I together have introduced that legislation, and, yet, I fully expect next week the Democrats to do

what they just did today, which is object to it because they are playing politics and they are unwilling to actually put in Federal law a real and strong protection.

I know it is campaign season, but it is unfortunate that Democrats are not willing to work together. Had they not uttered two words, "I object," Senator ERNST and my legislation protecting the right to birth control would have passed out of this body. But Senate Democrats didn't want it to.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to ask that baby to come back into the spectators' Gallery. That was the sweetest noise we have heard here for quite some time.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT

Madam President, Senate Democrats are using their power in the majority to push an alarmist and false narrative that there is a problem accessing contraception. They proposed a bill which is more about a solution to find a problem. Today's vote is nothing more than scaring and misleading, misleading, misleading the American people.

Here are the facts. Let me show this graph.

There is no State or territory that bans access to birth control pills. We made this graph. Here you see all the States that ban birth control are in orange, and all of the States that allow it are in green. As you notice, every State is green. This is not an issue. Unless—unless—your candidate for President is running behind in the polls, and there is a need to make people frightened; to turn out on a false issue; to, hopefully, improve poll numbers. But misleading and scaring voters seem to be, in their mind, the only way they can get that extra support.

But don't be mistaken, the bill goes way beyond protecting access to the routine use of birth control pills or other contraceptives. There are plenty of reasons why Republicans oppose this legislation. Here is what the bill actually does: It defines contraception so broadly that it likely also includes a right to a chemical abortion pill. It eviscerates conscience protections for healthcare providers, overriding the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, or RFRA. In fact, if enacted, this would be a first time a law explicitly waived RFRA.

Now, by the way, we are a pluralistic society. Some people are pro-life; some people are pro-choice. But we have tried to find peace on this issue. You don't find peace by eviscerating people's rights to follow their conscience, knowing that there is a provider down the street that could give the service that would be required under this law.

And, finally, the bill prioritizes abortion provider Planned Parenthood, preventing States or the Federal Government from prioritizing funding for life-affirming organizations.

This is not serious legislation. It bypassed the HELP Committee. Just kind of taken out, brought straight to the floor. Again, not seriously considered, rather a vehicle for political grandstanding. It is not a serious process but, rather, a political stunt designed to fearmonger and mislead the public in an attempt to sway voters in an election year.

Republicans should not play along. I oppose this legislation and urge my colleagues to do the same.

I also want to highlight my amendment to this flawed bill. While the bill is beyond improvement in current form, my amendment proposes to shed much needed light on another issue that has been pulled into the Democrats' political stunt of the month; that is, the fact that the Centers For Disease Control and Prevention has very little data on abortion, including on abortion survivors.

If the policy preference of the other party is to promote abortion on demand, the American people deserve accurate information on this policy's effects.

We were fortunate to meet a woman who survived two—two—abortion attempts this week. She testified in the HELP Committee.

And so as Democrats continue to push the chemical abortion pill on women, we may learn of more abortion survivors, when at-home, unsupervised abortions fail and put mothers at risk.

My proposal directs the CDC to include attempted abortions as a method of delivery and collect data on abortion survivors. It would also direct the Department of Health and Human Services to refer abortion survivors to applicable Federal programs for vulnerable and newborn children. If Democrats stand behind their abortion-on-demand stance, why would they not support this policy.

Nevertheless, I suspect the other party will not be interested in considering my proposal as part of this bill or any other political show vote that is scheduled in the coming weeks.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today to urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Right to Contraception Act. Now more than ever, it is vital to codify reproductive rights. The right to contraception is not merely a matter of health, but a matter of autonomy and equality. We must protect a women's right to access to reproductive care.

This week, the Senate will vote on the Right to Contraception Act. Since the U.S. Supreme Court overturned *Roe v. Wade*, those opposed to reproductive freedoms have consistently acted to restrict and ban access to reproductive health care, including abortion, contraception, and even IVF.

In his concurrence in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, in support of decision to overturn *Roe v. Wade*, Associate Justice Clarence Thomas directly called into question

the right to contraception as a logical outgrowth of the Dobbs decision. Since the decision came down, it has become clear that restrictions and bans on abortion are just the first step in withholding reproductive health care and access, preventing women and their healthcare providers making the best decision without government intrusion.

For almost 60 years, people have had the right to access contraception. In 1965, the Supreme Court ruled, in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, that States could not block married couples from being able to access contraception. This ruling paved the way for the 1972 Supreme Court decision in *Eisenstadt v. Baird*, expanding the right to contraception to unmarried people.

Despite these protections and 96 percent of voters supporting access to birth control, some lawmakers continue to attack this basic right. Just as with abortion, extremists are making moves to undermine and eventually eliminate women's right to access birth control.

Contraceptives offer substantial benefits to many women and families across America. Women's reproductive choices and economic opportunities are linked. Research demonstrates that when women are given more control over family planning and childbearing decisions, educational, career, and professional opportunities open up to them.

With the Supreme Court decisions on *Griswold* and *Eisenstadt*, access to the pill was associated with a 1.7 percentage-point increase in the margin of women in professional careers. The gender gap in the workplace can also be narrowed when women have access to the pill at a younger age. Women with access to contraception in their early 20s earned \$2,200 more per year by their early 40s than women who were not able to have access to contraception.

Although access to the pill correlates to an increase in women in the workforce, it is important to remember that there are an estimated 19 million women of reproductive age who live in contraceptive deserts.

Various findings on the role contraception plays in the lives of women and families reiterate the value of ensuring women continue to have full access to a range of contraceptive services and methods. It is abundantly clear that improved access to contraception contributes to economic and educational advancement of women in the United States.

As a result of the Dobbs decision and due to systemic inequalities, communities of color, young people, immigrants, low-income, and LGBTQ+ individuals face the consequences of this abortion ban. These communities are more likely to experience additional barriers to accessing reproductive health care. Birth control ensures more people can access the future they envision for themselves and their families.

I am proud that Maryland has been recognized as the first State to mandate contraceptive coverage in 1998. My State has long been a leader in supporting and protecting reproductive rights. On April 14, 2023, Governor Moore announced that the State would begin to stockpile mifepristone. Maryland remains committed to remaining a safe haven for abortion and reproductive health care access.

However, even in Maryland, where State law protects the right to choose, in April 2022, Governor Larry Hogan vetoed the Abortion Care Access Act. This act expands reproductive health care by allowing additional trained health professionals, including nurse practitioners, midwives, and physician assistants, to perform abortions.

Fortunately, Maryland's Legislature overrode this reckless veto, and the law took effect July 1, 2022. In response, Governor Hogan went on to withhold millions of dollars in State funds that was designated for the Abortion Care Clinical Training Program. Thankfully, Governor Wes Moore released those funds on his very first day in office in 2023.

This November, Marylanders have a choice to vote in favor of further protecting abortion by enshrining the right to reproductive freedom in our State's constitution. This would further impede the ability of opponents to take away abortion rights in the future.

This week, Majority Leader CHUCK SCHUMER will call a vote for the Right to Contraception Act, a bill I cosponsored that will codify the right to contraception to prevent further restrictions on reproductive health services for all Americans.

It is time to protect the right to birth control, and access to it, for all communities. The Right to Contraception Act is an especially important safeguard for these marginalized communities.

While it is urgent that we pass the Right to Contraception Act, we must also move forward other legislation, like the Women's Health Protection Act, which would codify *Roe v. Wade* and prevent States from continuing to enact restrictions of reproductive freedoms.

This Congress, the Senate has also had to reel in colleagues who put our military in jeopardy by blocking the promotions of senior members of our military to protest the Pentagon's abortion policy.

Despite the notion that the Dobbs decision would be the end of judicial action on reproductive health by handing authority to individual States, we continue to see challenges to reproductive rights elevated to the Supreme Court. Last year, I signed onto a bicameral amicus brief for Alliance for Hippocratic Medicine v. FDA to advocate for the FDA's appeal that supports nationwide access to mifepristone. In the next couple of weeks, we expect that decision, as well as one in a case chal-

lenging the legal obligation of doctors to provide life-stabilizing emergency abortion care. I am proud to have also signed an amicus brief on this case, urging Justices to ensure that emergency departments will also provide patients with the care they critically need.

Throughout my time in Congress, I have worked to dismantle barriers to women's health. The right to choose whether to have a child is fundamental, and it is a decision that should only be made by women in consultation with their healthcare provider, not with interference from Federal, State, or local governments. It is time for us to elevate the voices that truly know how much is at stake in the fight for reproductive freedoms. Lives are at risk in the generation and beyond.

We must vote to pass the Right to Contraception Act, and we must work every day until *Roe v. Wade* is the law of the land once again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, today, every Senator must take a stand: If you agree all Americans deserve access to contraception, then vote yes on the Right to Contraception Act.

This bill simply says that if you want to access birth control or if you are a healthcare provider wanting to prescribe birth control, the government has no right to interfere. This is not a show vote; it is a "show us who you are" vote. And the American people are watching.

Up to 90 percent of Americans support access to contraceptives, but today one in five adults are worried that birth control is under threat. This is just one of the consequences of overturning *Roe*, so we have every reason in the world to vote yes today.

We should all agree that in America nobody should ever question if their ability to access contraceptives will be taken away. Sadly, that is precisely the fear more and more people feel today. Passing this bill will put those fears to rest and protect people's basic civil liberties.

So, again, it is all very simple: If you agree all Americans deserve to have access to contraception, then you should support the bill.

Thank you to Senators MARKEY, HIRONO, and others for championing this legislation, and let us all vote yes.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call, with respect to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed, be waived.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the vote begin now.

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

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 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. 400, S. 4381, a bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception.

Charles E. Schumer, Edward J. Markey, Christopher Murphy, Chris Van Hollen, Richard Blumenthal, Jack Reed, Tammy Baldwin, Debbie Stabenow, Tina Smith, Tammy Duckworth, Alex Padilla, Margaret Wood Hassan, John W. Hickenlooper, Catherine Cortez Masto, Christopher A. Coons, Jeanne Shaheen, Gary C. Peters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, 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 S. 4381, a bill to protect an individual's ability to access contraceptives and to engage in contraception and to protect a health care provider's ability to provide contraceptives, contraception, and information related to contraception, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Alabama (Mrs. BRITT), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. HAGERTY), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. ROMNEY), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 51, nays 39, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 190 Leg.]

YEAS—51

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

NAYS—39

Barrasso	Cotton	Grassley
Blackburn	Cramer	Hawley
Boozman	Crapo	Hooven
Budd	Cruz	Hyde-Smith
Capito	Daines	Johnson
Cassidy	Ernst	Lankford
Cornyn	Fischer	Lee

Lummis	Risch	Scott (SC)
Marshall	Rounds	Thune
McConnell	Rubio	Tillis
Mullin	Schmitt	Tuberville
Paul	Schumer	Wicker
Ricketts	Scott (FL)	Young

NOT VOTING—10

Braun	Kennedy	Sullivan
Britt	Menendez	Vance
Graham	Moran	
Hagerty	Romney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BUTLER). On this vote, the yeas are 51, the nays are 39.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion was rejected.

The majority leader.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I enter a motion to reconsider the failed cloture vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Just so the public should know, I switched my vote so we might reconsider and possibly vote on this again.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 669.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of David Rosner, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2027.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 669, David Rosner, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2027.

Charles E. Schumer, Joe Manchin III, Sheldon Whitehouse, Martin Heinrich, Jeanne Shaheen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Alex Padilla, Mazie K. Hirono, Ben Ray Lujan, Maria Cantwell, Peter Welch, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard Blumenthal, Mark Kelly, John W. Hickenlooper.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 670.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Lindsay S. See, of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2028.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 670, Lindsay S. See, of West Virginia, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2028.

Charles E. Schumer, Joe Manchin III, Sheldon Whitehouse, Jeanne Shaheen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Alex Padilla, Mazie K. Hirono, Ben Ray Lujan, Maria Cantwell, Patty Murray, Peter Welch, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard Blumenthal, Mark Kelly, John W. Hickenlooper.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 668.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Judy W. Chang, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2029.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 668, Judy W. Chang, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission for a term expiring June 30, 2029.

Charles E. Schumer, Joe Manchin III, Sheldon Whitehouse, Martin Heinrich, Jeanne Shaheen, Catherine Cortez Masto, Alex Padilla, Mazie Hirono, Ben Ray Lujan, Maria Cantwell, Peter Welch, Jack Reed, Benjamin L. Cardin, Angus S. King, Jr., Richard Blumenthal, Mark Kelly, John W. Hickenlooper.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION ACT—
MOTION TO TABLE

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I move to table the motion to proceed to S. 4381.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

RIGHT TO IVF ACT—MOTION TO
PROCEED

Mr. SCHUMER. I move to proceed to Calendar No. 413, S. 4445.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 413, S. 4445, a bill to protect and expand nationwide access to fertility treatment, including in vitro fertilization.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

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. 413, S. 4445, a bill to protect and expand nationwide access to fertility treatment, including in vitro fertilization.

Charles E. Schumer, Tammy Duckworth, Richard Blumenthal, Alex Padilla, Tammy Baldwin, Tim Kaine, Richard J. Durbin, Jeanne Shaheen, Benjamin L. Cardin, Debbie Stabenow, Patty Murray, Catherine Cortez Masto, Tina

Smith, Elizabeth Warren, Sheldon Whitehouse, Kirsten E. Gillibrand, Christopher Murphy.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, just to inform the Members, I have just filed cloture on the IVF bill to preserve the rights of women to have IVF, and we expect a vote on that next week.

SENATE PAGES

Madam President, also, before I yield the floor, I would like to acknowledge that this is the last week for this class of Senate pages. My message to every single one of them is simple: Thank you, thank you, thank you for all your hard work.

It has been a very busy few months, but the pages have done a great job bringing the Senate to life. The pages are always here when we need them, early in the mornings, late into the evenings. They have served this institution with grace and dignity, and it was an honor to have them with us.

I hope, pages, whatever you do next, you will always look back warmly on your time spent here. It is not always easy work, and this place can get a little chaotic and difficult—it used to not be so much that way—but, by being here, you have left your mark on democracy. This is something nobody will ever be able to take away from you.

On behalf of a very grateful Senate, we say thank you, and we wish you all the best as you return home and move on to your next adventures. Godspeed.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

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

80TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I rise today in recognition of the 80th anniversary of D-Day. The size and scale of the amphibious landing at Normandy 80 years ago was simply amazing. The Allied forces, consisting of soldiers and sailors from 12 countries, numbered 156,115, nearly half of which were American servicemembers. Over 11,500 aircraft and almost 7,000 naval vessels supported the largest amphibious assault in history. There were an estimated 10,000 casualties that day as the allies fought to liberate Europe from Nazi Germany. The amphibious landing and subsequent victory at Normandy was a testament of the Allies' logistical and industrial power. D-Day opened another major front where the bulk of America's Army could at last be brought to bear. D-Day also led to the liberation of France and denied the Nazis of key U-boat ports and V-weapons sites. By the end of June 1944, over 850,000 soldiers had arrived on the beaches of Normandy and were on the

march across Europe. The Allied victory on those beaches not only meant the eventual defeat of the Nazis, but also kept the Soviet Iron Curtain at the German border instead of the English Channel.

Beyond all the facts and figures involved with the landing are the individual stories of heroism and bravery. One such story is that of Leonard Schroeder, the first American to land on the beaches of Normandy at Utah Beach. Leonard Schroeder, then a 25-year-old Army captain, was in the first wave of 20 Higgins boats. In his boat were 32 men, and they arrived at Utah Beach at 6:28 a.m. that morning, 2 minutes ahead of the scheduled H-Hour and thus ahead of their air support. Captain Schroeder led his men ashore wading the final 100 yards from their landing craft to the beach through barbed wire while under machinegun fire from the Nazis. Half of the men on Captain Schroeder's boat suffered casualties, including five fatalities. Captain Schroeder himself was shot twice, but carried on leading his men into harm's way. For his actions on D-Day, he earned the Silver Star and the Purple Heart. After the Normandy invasion, a Pentagon press release hailed him as "the first GI to invade Europe", and the Baltimore Sun wrote, "When his boot touched French soil, it was a great moment in history." Captain Schroeder's story is one of thousands of examples of selfless bravery on the beaches of Normandy that day, but I chose to highlight his story as he is a native of Maryland. Leonard Schroeder was born in Linthicum Heights and attended the University of Maryland on a full athletic scholarship. While at UMD, he joined the Reserve Officer's Training Corps—ROTC—and was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army in June 1941, months before the attack on Pearl Harbor which led the U.S. to into World War II. After World War II, Leonard Schroeder continued to serve his country ultimately serving 30 years on Active Duty and retiring as a colonel in 1971. On the 50th anniversary of D-Day, Leonard reflected upon that historic day, stating, "Today, I realize that to be the first man ashore is an immense honor, yet I do not merit it more than anyone else. Five of my men died down there at Normandy. They alone are the heroes." There are innumerable lessons to be learned from World War II and countless stories to be told, but maybe the most relevant to us today is the power of allies and partners working together to defeat authoritarian regimes. Much like the years preceding World War II, there are countries challenging democratic institutions in order to expand their regimes and suppress freedom. I urge every American to not take our democracy for granted. Millions across the globe do not have the freedoms we enjoy in the United States, which have been hard earned across generations.

The United States is the longest standing democracy in the world, but

our freedom has, does, and will come with a cost. Today is a day to remember what our American heroes accomplished on the beaches of Normandy 80 years ago; tomorrow is a day to write the next great chapter of American history, for when we come together for a common cause, we are unstoppable.

CHANGE IN PARTY IDENTIFICATION

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2024.

DEAR LEADERS SCHUMER AND MCCONNELL: I write to inform you of my change in party registration in West Virginia from Democrat to independent with no party affiliation. From this date forward, I ask that my party identification be recorded as Independent in Senate votes, Senate records, and other Senate communications.

As Chair of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, I will continue caucusing with Democrats and working with all of my colleagues to address the pressing issues facing West Virginia and our great country.

Sincerely,

JOE MANCHIN III,
U.S. Senator.

VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, on June 3, 2024, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote No. 183, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Christopher T. Hanson, of Michigan, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for the term of five years expiring June 30, 2029.

Had I been present, I would have voted yes to proceed with his nomination as a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

TRIBUTE TO LYNETTE FONTENOT

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I rise to pay tribute to Lynette Fontenot, who is retiring from the Federal Emergency Management Agency after more than 18 years of service.

Mrs. Fontenot began her tenure at FEMA in November of 2005, shortly after the devastating Hurricanes Katrina and Rita made landfall in Louisiana's southeast and southwest coasts, respectively. During her time at FEMA, Mrs. Fontenot has worked primarily as a congressional affairs specialist, assisting numerous Louisiana congressional offices over the years.

Mrs. Fontenot's contributions extend beyond responding to congressional inquiries. She served as an effective liaison between our branches of government and assisted both House and Senate Committees and Members with coordinating meetings and visits throughout Louisiana.

Mrs. Fontenot is regarded as a tremendous asset to the entire Louisiana congressional delegation. On behalf of the people of Louisiana, I extended my heartfelt thanks to Mrs. Fontenot for her dedication and selfless service to our country.

I ask that all of Louisiana join me to thank and honor Mrs. Fontenot.

RECOGNIZING BREAKTHROUGH T1D

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I rise today to commemorate this special occasion—the renaming of JDRF to Breakthrough T1D—and the leadership that this organization continues to provide in its advocacy for children and adults living with type 1 diabetes.

I am proud to have worked with Breakthrough T1D since my very first year in the Senate in 1997. They are a foundation with a singular focus: to improve the lives of every person affected by type 1 diabetes—T1D—by supporting research for treatments, cures, and ultimately a way to prevent the disease. They are the premier global organization focused on T1D research at every life stage—from stopping or slowing the progression of T1D in the newly diagnosed, reversing it in those who have lived with it for years, avoiding or reversing complications of T1D, and preventing the disease in at risk populations and in future generations.

Today's rebranding from JDRF—the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation—to Breakthrough T1D represents where we are in the world of T1D. It never has been just an affliction for the young. Anyone, at any age, can be diagnosed with T1D. Using the term “juvenile” no longer accurately reflects the organization and its mission. And “breakthrough” may speak for itself. The organization is not only at the forefront of supporting research breakthroughs for T1D, but also is breaking through the barriers to improve T1D patients' lives. Both these significant attributes are now rightly reflected in the organization's name.

Breakthrough T1D will continue to focus on the ultimate goal we all share: that no one suffers from T1D. And we must not stop until that goal is reached.

But that goal will only be achieved through more research. That is why I am proud to continue my work with Senator SHAHEEN supporting the reauthorization and funding of the Special Diabetes Program—SDP. The SDP has funded the creation of unique, innovative, and collaborative research consortia and clinical trials networks focused on the prevention, treatment, and cure of T1D for more than 25 years. SDP has enabled the National Institutes of Health to expand T1D research beyond what is possible with annual appropriations and to conduct clinical trials that likely would not be done by the private sector. SDP has been a key component of many significant breakthroughs in T1D research, and I want to highlight two.

First, the artificial pancreas. The SDP has supported key research that helped develop several glucose management technologies, including the artificial pancreas. The artificial pancreas is a life-changing advance for many with T1D because it automates insulin delivery in response to a person's blood glucose level, replacing fingerstick tests and individual insulin shots. Funding from the SDP over the past decade has revolutionized the field and increased the number of commercially available, FDA-approved artificial pancreas devices from zero to seven. Today, there are even devices available to children as young as 2.

Second, we finally have the first FDA-approved treatment to slow the progression of T1D. The critical research underpinning this treatment came from a clinical trial funded by the SDP. This treatment has now brought forward a new era of T1D clinical management by delaying onset of the disease by at least 3 years—and potentially more. That is 3 years without having to take insulin, do fingerstick tests, or deal with potential complications from the disease. While the SDP has led to countless other breakthroughs in treatment for people living with T1D, these two examples highlight the importance of the program, the success of the program, and why it needs to expand and continue until no one suffers from type 1 diabetes.

As we continue to strive toward a world where no one is afflicted by T1D, we also need to face today's reality where many Americans who need life-saving insulin cannot afford it. The rising cost of insulin presents a barrier to care for a number of Americans living with T1D. Out-of-pocket costs increase with list prices, and for people without insurance, the costs are too often untenable. That is why I am proud to work with this organization on a bill to limit out-of-pocket costs for insulin for those with T1D, address structural issues in the insulin market, and create policies to foster more competition. I will continue to work with Breakthrough T1D to ensure insulin affordability for all.

Please join me in commemorating today's exciting rebranding from JDRF to Breakthrough T1D. This organization has been a catalyst in the field of T1D research and a champion on issues of importance to this community. I am certain that Breakthrough T1D will continue breaking through the barriers toward a world where no one is afflicted with type 1 diabetes.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING AXE FORCE ONE

• Mr. RISCH. Madam President, Idaho small businesses are the backbone of our economy and our communities. These small businesses not only employ friends and neighbors, but they showcase Idaho's creativity and values.

Idaho small businesses provide invaluable goods and services and are an intrinsic element of the Gem State. These small businesses deserve to be celebrated for the integral role they play in our communities. I am proud to relaunch Support Local Gems, a statewide initiative, on June 7, to encourage Idahoans to support the small businesses that make the Gem State special. As a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am pleased to honor Axe Force One as one of Idaho's Small Businesses of the Month for June 2024.

Doug Duncan opened Axe Force One in 2019 following a business trip where he tried the thrilling sport of axe throwing for the first time. Doug knew this adrenaline-pumping pastime would be a hit in Coeur d'Alene.

Axe Force One's nine throwing lanes, arcade, pool table, and corn hole set provide plenty of activities for both first-time axe throwers and axe throwing regulars. Expert instructors assist in axe throwers' pursuit of a bullseye, while ensuring a safe experience for everyone. Axe Force One is also a gathering place for the community and church groups and is an entertaining team-building experience for north Idaho.

Congratulations to Doug Duncan and all of the employees at Axe Force One for being selected as an Idaho Small Business of the Month for June 2024. You are an outstanding example of what it means to be one of Idaho's Local Gems. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

RECOGNIZING BACKWOODS BREW

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, Idaho small businesses are the backbone of our economy and our communities. These small businesses not only employ friends and neighbors, but they showcase Idaho's creativity and values. Idaho small businesses provide invaluable goods and services and are an intrinsic element of the Gem State. These small businesses deserve to be celebrated for the integral role they play in our communities. I am proud to relaunch Support Local Gems, a statewide initiative, on June 7, to encourage Idahoans to support the small businesses that make the Gem State special. As a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am pleased to honor Backwoods Brew as one of Idaho's Small Businesses of the Month for June 2024.

Shania Woods opened Backwoods Brew in April 2022 as a walk-up coffee trailer. Lewiston coffee drinkers immediately fell in love with Shania's drinks, allowing her to expand to a drive thru just 7 months later. After just more than 2 years in business, Backwoods Brew recently announced a second brick and mortar location will open soon to fuel even more of the LC Valley.

Backwoods Brew serves coffee, teas, Italian sodas, and their well-known signature drinks. Their talented and unified team of baristas are passionate about creating a personalized experience for every customer. Shania knows, not only their delicious drinks, but their outstanding service is what keeps customers coming back for more.

Congratulations to Shania Woods and all of the employees at Backwoods Brew for being selected as an Idaho Small Business of the Month for June 2024. You are an outstanding example of what it means to be one of Idaho's Local Gems. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

RECOGNIZING HANDS ON

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, Idaho small businesses are the backbone of our economy and our communities. These small businesses not only employ friends and neighbors, but they showcase Idaho's creativity and values. Idaho small businesses provide invaluable goods and services and are an intrinsic element of the Gem State. These small businesses deserve to be celebrated for the integral role they play in our communities. I am proud to relaunch Support Local Gems, a statewide initiative, on June 7, to encourage Idahoans to support the small businesses that make the Gem State special. As a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am pleased to honor Hands On as one of Idaho's Small Businesses of the Month for June 2024.

Hands On has served as a creative outlet for Twin Falls since 2003. The corner paint-your-own pottery studio came to light following a family vacation to Italy when Robin Dober hoped to purchase ceramic pieces, but couldn't figure out how to safely travel back to Idaho with them. With no background in pottery, Robin hired a consultant and Hands On opened 3 months later. In 2016, Ashley Dubois acquired the studio.

Hands On is designed for all ages and all skill levels, offering canvas, clay making, and clay throwing courses. Last year, Hands On celebrated 20 years in business with a full day of activities for the Magic Valley. Robin and Ashley have ensured that Hands On is an accessible outlet for everyone to slow down and lean into their creative side.

Congratulations to Ashley Dubois and all of the employees at Hands On for being selected as an Idaho Small Business of the Month for June 2024. You are an outstanding example of what it means to be one of Idaho's Local Gems. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

RECOGNIZING MANWARING CHEESE

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, Idaho small businesses are the backbone of our economy and our communities. These small businesses not only employ friends and neighbors, but they showcase Idaho's creativity and values. Idaho small businesses provide invaluable goods and services and are an intrinsic element of the Gem State. These small businesses deserve to be celebrated for the integral role they play in our communities. I am proud to relaunch Support Local Gems, a statewide initiative, on June 7, to encourage Idahoans to support the small businesses that make the Gem State special. As a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am pleased to honor Manwaring Cheese as one of Idaho's Small Businesses of the Month for June 2024.

Basil Manwaring opened Manwaring Cheese in Ashton in 1955. Basil grew up on a dairy farm, working with his father Arthur and siblings to deliver milk on a horse-pulled dairy wagon. Basil met his wife Edna at a creamery in Blackfoot and later attended Utah State University, where he managed the school dairy—made ice cream, cheese, and butter. After graduating, Basil returned to Idaho to work for the Nelson-Ricks Creamery in Rexburg until he purchased the plant in Ashton.

The Manwarings operated the plant in Ashton for 16 years before building a new facility in Rigby in 1971. Basil passed away in 1972, but Edna and their children maintained operations through the late 1980s. In 2011, Basil's son, Blake, carried on the Manwaring's dairy appreciation and opened a new location in Rigby. Manwaring Cheese relocated to its current location in Idaho Falls in 2019, where it continues to provide great grilled cheeses, ice cream, cheese curds, and more.

Congratulations to the Manwarings and all of the employees at Manwaring Cheese for being selected as an Idaho Small Business of the Month for June 2024. You are an outstanding example of what it means to be one of Idaho's Local Gems. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

RECOGNIZING NEL'S BI-LO MARKET

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, Idaho small businesses are the backbone of our economy and our communities. These small businesses not only employ friends and neighbors, but they showcase Idaho's creativity and values. Idaho small businesses provide invaluable goods and services and are an intrinsic element of the Gem State. These small businesses deserve to be celebrated for the integral role they play in our communities. I am proud to relaunch Support Local Gems, a statewide initiative, on June 7, to encourage

Idahoans to support the small businesses that make the Gem State special. As a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am pleased to honor Nel's Bi-Lo Market as one of Idaho's Small Businesses of the Month for June 2024.

Nel's Bi-Lo Market has been a mainstay in Pocatello for over half a century. Originally known as "The Little Chief" in the late 1930s and 1940s, Ray Colaianni and his brother-in-law Jim Grayson took ownership and renamed the store Bilo Food Center in the mid-1940s. In 1991, after running Del Monte Meats as third generation owners, Todd and Linda Nelson bought the store. Todd learned about the business from his father Ron at the age of 9 and was a journeyman meat cutter by 15. After running Del Monte for 20 years, Todd sold the business in 1996 to devote his time and attention to Nel's Bilo Food Center. Upon his retirement, Todd's son-in-law Barry and his wife Jacque took over the business in 2009.

Under Barry and Jacque Dutton's ownership, southeast Idahoans still receive the impeccable customer service Nel's Bi-Lo Market was built on. Every customer and employee that walks into Nel's Bi-Lo Market is treated like an extension of the family. In return, they are invaluable to the Pocatello and Chubbuck community.

Congratulations to the Nelsons, Duttons, and all of the employees at Nel's Bi-Lo Market for being selected as an Idaho Small Business of the Month for June 2024. You are an outstanding example of what it means to be one of Idaho's Local Gems. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

RECOGNIZING PARMA MOTOR-VU

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, Idaho small businesses are the backbone of our economy and our communities. These small businesses not only employ friends and neighbors, but they showcase Idaho's creativity and values. Idaho small businesses provide invaluable goods and services and are an intrinsic element of the Gem State. These small businesses deserve to be celebrated for the integral role they play in our communities. I am proud to relaunch Support Local Gems, a statewide initiative, on June 7, to encourage Idahoans to support the small businesses that make the Gem State special. As a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am pleased to honor the Parma Motor-Vu as one of Idaho's Small Businesses of the Month for June 2024.

Susan Haaheim's grandparents Bill and Gladys Dobbs opened the Parma Motor-Vu in 1953, one of the first drive-in theaters in the Treasure Valley. Seventy-one years and three generations of owners later, the Parma Motor-Vu remains one of the few drive-

in theaters in the State thanks to the support from the Parma community. Through the years, the Motor-Vu adapted to the changing film industry by projecting Spanish-speaking films in the 1960s, adding radio sound in the 1970s, showing more current films in the 1990s, and going digital in the 21st century.

The Parma Motor-Vu leans into their long-standing history ensuring a family atmosphere, good entertainment, and the best popcorn popped by their over 65-year-old Manley popcorn machine. As long as it is dark, the Motor-Vu has even played Boise State football games on the big screen. The Parma Motor-Vu is a mainstay in the valley and remains fun for all ages, whether they are seeing their first drive-in movie or they remember when speakers hung from the car window.

Congratulations to the Parma Motor Vu family and all of the employees for being selected as an Idaho Small Business of the Month for June 2024. You are an outstanding example of what it means to be one of Idaho's Local Gems. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

RECOGNIZING THE EDDY

● Mr. RISCH. Madam President, Idaho small businesses are the backbone of our economy and our communities. These small businesses not only employ friends and neighbors, but they showcase Idaho's creativity and values. Idaho small businesses provide invaluable goods and services and are an intrinsic element of the Gem State. These small businesses deserve to be celebrated for the integral role they play in our communities. I am proud to relaunch Support Local Gems, a statewide initiative, on June 7, to encourage Idahoans to support the small businesses that make the Gem State special. As a member and former chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, I am pleased to honor The Eddy as one of Idaho's Small Businesses of the Month for June 2024.

Ed Lodge opened The Eddy in July 2023. As a lifelong Idahoan and avid river-sport enthusiast, Ed aspired to create a place of rest and rejuvenation for the Marsing community. The Eddy, named after the calm waters after a rapid, offers locals or visitors pastries, beer, wine, and locally sourced coffee. Hundreds of cars pass by The Eddy along Highway 55 every day; whether it is the first or last stop for people visiting Idaho or traveling from neighboring States, Ed created a place that no one will forget.

Ed's goal for The Eddy is to give back to the community and use his small business to support the small businesses around him. In addition to the local products they sell, all of the furniture, stools, and tables in the building were sourced and made by a local welder. Nearing the 1-year anni-

versary of The Eddy, Ed has big plans to create an outdoor concert space, covered patio with outdoor seating, and food truck hookups for local vendors to continue supporting an already thriving and growing community.

Congratulations to Ed Lodge and all of the employees at The Eddy for being selected as an Idaho Small Business of the Month for June 2024. You are an outstanding example of what it means to be one of Idaho's Local Gems. You make our great State proud, and I look forward to your continued growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Kelly, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:30 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Alli, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 8282. An act to impose sanctions with respect to the International Criminal Court engaged in any effort to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute any protected person of the United States and its allies.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 117-263, and jointly with the Senate Republican Leader, the Majority Leader appoints the following Member of the House of Representatives to serve as Co-Chairperson of the Commission on Reform and Modernization of the Department of State: Mr. BILL HAGERTY of Tennessee.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 4447. A bill to allow women greater access to safe and effective oral contraceptive drugs intended for routine use, and to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on Federal funding of contraceptive methods.

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-4903. A communication from the Assistant to the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Civil Penalties Inflation Adjustments; Annual Adjustments" (RIN1076-AF75) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2024; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-4904. A communication from the Regulation Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Updates to Delegations of Authority to Certain Officials" (RIN2900-AS09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2024; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4905. A communication from the Principal Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-4906. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, three (3) reports relative to data on all Federal Government procurement contract awards; and to the dollar amount and the distribution of subcontracts awarded during fiscal year 2018 with respect to the North American Industry Classification System; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-4907. A communication from the Attorney Adviser, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Notice of Funding Opportunity for Projects Located on the Northeast Corridor for the Fiscal Year 2024 Federal-State Partnership for Intercity Passenger Rail Program" (FR-FSP-24-001) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4908. 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; Lower Mississippi River, Natchez, MS" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2024-0343) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4909. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of Colored Federal Airway Blue 3 (B-3) in Western Alaska" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2103)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4910. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Saginaw, MI" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0273)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4911. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Amendment of Class E Airspace, Harrisburg, PA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-

0214)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4912. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Beaumont/Port Arthur, TX" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0269)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4913. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of United States Area Navigation (RNAV) Routes Q-30 and T-370; Eastern United State" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0696)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4914. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22734" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-1883)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4915. A communication from the Deputy Director of Economic Analysis, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2022 BE-120 Benchmark Survey of Transactions in Selected Services and Intellectual Property with Foreign Persons, and Clarifying When BE-140 and BE-180 Benchmark Surveys Are Conducted" (RIN0691-AA91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 22, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4916. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Management Systems" ((RIN2120-AL60) (Docket No. FAA-2021-0419)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 16, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4917. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4112" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31545)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4918. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments; Amendment No. 4111" ((RIN2120-AA65) (Docket No. 31544)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4919. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Air-

space; Winder, GA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2467)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4920. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Huntington, WV" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2460)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4921. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Dixon, IL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0271)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4922. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Lake Charles, LA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0270)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4923. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes; Amendment 39-22735" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0222)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4924. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turbofan Engines; Amendment 39-22722" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0030)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4925. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Deutschland Ltd & Co KG Engines; Amendment 39-22739" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0036)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4926. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus SAS Airplanes; Amendment 39-22741" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0029)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4927. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Canada Limited Partnership (Type Certificate Previously Held by C Series Aircraft Limited Partnership (CSALP); Bombardier, Inc.) Airplanes; Amendment 39-22732" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-

2023-1817)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4928. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22731" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2402)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4929. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes; Amendment 39-22730" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2023-2397)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4930. A communication from the Management Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Engines; Amendment 39-22720" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2024-0771)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4931. A communication from the Management Analyst of the Policy and Regulations Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing the Yangtze Sturgeon as an Endangered Species" (RIN1018-BC83) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4932. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Electronic Reporting for Federally Permitted Charter Vessels and Headboats in Gulf of Mexico Fisheries" (RIN0648-BH72) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4933. A communication from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Snapper Data Collaborations and Harvest Levels" (RIN0648-BL02) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4934. A communication from the Branch Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Purse Seine Observer Exemptions in the Eastern Pacific Ocean" (RIN0648-BK88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4935. A communication from the Branch Chief, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule en-

titled "Schedule of Fees for Access to NOAA Environmental Data, Information, and Related Products and Services" (RIN0648-BK67) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on March 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4936. A communication from the Communications Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Taking of Marine Mammals Incidental to Commercial Fishing Operations; Atlantic Large Whale Take Reduction Plan Regulations" (RIN0648-BL26) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4937. A communication from the Communications Specialist, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Delayed Effective Date for Final Rule Revising the Regulations for the Mandatory Use of Turtle Excluder Devices in Skimmer Trawl Vessels 40 Feet and Greater in Length" (RIN0648-BK45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4938. A communication from the Senior Attorney, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hazardous Materials: Harmonization with International Standards" (RIN2137-AF57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4939. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting legislative proposals that support the President's fiscal year 2025 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4940. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting legislative proposals that support the President's fiscal year 2025 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4941. A communication from the Attorney Adviser, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certification of Dispatchers" (RIN2130-AC91) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4942. A communication from the Attorney Adviser, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Certification of Signal Employees" (RIN2130-AC92) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-4943. A communication from the Secretary of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Capital and Financial Reporting Requirements for Swap Dealers and Major Swap Participants" (RIN3038-AF33) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2024; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4944. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medical Malpractice Claims by Members of the Uniformed Services" (RIN0790-AL70) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4945. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Legislative Affairs), transmitting legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 118th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-4946. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Additions of Entities to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AI79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4947. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Entity List Additions" (RIN0694-AJ41) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4948. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment to the Export Administration Regulations: Termination of United Arab Emirates Participation in the Arab League Boycott of Israel" (RIN0694-AI48) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4949. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Implementation of Additional Sanctions Against Russia and Belarus Under the Export Administration Regulations and Refinements to Existing Controls" (RIN0694-AI79) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4950. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Information Security Controls: Cybersecurity Items" (RIN0694-AH56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4951. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Export, Reexport, and Transfer (In-Country) Controls for Nicaragua Under the Export Administration Regulations" (RIN0694-AJ34) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4952. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Chemical Weapons Convention Regulations: Reducing the Concentration Level Above Which Mixtures Containing Schedule 2A Chemicals Are Subject to Declaration and Reporting Requirements" (RIN0694-AI54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4953. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Additions of Entities to the Entity List” (RIN0694-AJ62) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4954. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Availability of Funds and Collection of Checks” (RIN7100-AG76) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4955. A communication from the Senior Congressional Liaison, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Truth in Lending (Regulation Z); Use of Digital User Accounts to Access Buy Now, Pay Later Loans” (Docket No. CFPB-2024-0017) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 24, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4956. A communication from the Chair and President of the Export-Import Bank, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a transaction involving U.S. exports to Angola; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4957. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13288 with respect to Zimbabwe; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4958. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Existing Validated End-User Authorizations in the People’s Republic of China: Samsung China Semiconductor Co. Ltd. and SK hynix Semiconductor (China) Ltd.; Correction” (RIN0694-AJ39) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4959. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Export Control Measures Under the Export Administration Regulations To Address Iranian Unmanned Aerial Vehicles and Their Use by the Russian Federation Against Ukraine” (RIN0694-AJ12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4960. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Allied Governments Favorable Treatment: Revisions to Certain Australia Group Controls; Revisions to Certain Crime Control and Detection Controls” (RIN0694-AJ29) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4961. A communication from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Iranian Transactions and Sanctions Regulations” received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4962. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Additions to the Entity List” (RIN0694-AJ14) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4963. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List; Correction of Existing Entry on the Entity List” (RIN0694-AI52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4964. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Burma: Implementation of Sanctions” (RIN0694-AI43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4965. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Additions and Revisions to the Entity List and Conforming Removal From the Unverified List” (RIN0694-AJ04) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4966. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Export Administration Regulations for Missile Technology Items: 2018, 2019, and 2021 Missile Technology Control Regime Plenary Agreements; and License Exception Eligibility” (RIN0694-AI66) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4967. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Export Control Revisions for Australia, United Kingdom, United States Enhanced Trilateral Security Partnership; Correction” (RIN0694-AJ58) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4968. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Additions and Revisions of Entities to the Entity List” (RIN0694-AJ06) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4969. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Addition of Entities to the Entity List” (RIN0694-AI42) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4970. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Implementation of Additional Sanctions Against Russia

and Belarus Under the Export Administration Regulations and Refinements to Existing Controls” (RIN0694-AJ09) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4971. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revision of Controls for Cambodia Under the Export Administration Regulations” (RIN0694-AI65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4972. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Implementation of Additional Sanctions Against Russia and Belarus Under the Export Administration Regulations and Refinements to Existing Controls” (RIN0694-AJ17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4973. A communication from the Deputy Director of Congressional Affairs, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Export Administration Regulations: Transfer of Access Information and Release of Software (Source Code and Object Code)” (RIN0694-AJ37) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 23, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4974. A communication from the Senior Legal Advisor for Regulatory Affairs, Office of Financial Research, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Ongoing Data Collection of Non-Centrally Cleared Transactions in the United States Repurchase Agreement Market” received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4975. A communication from the Sanctions Regulations Advisor, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Reporting, Procedures and Penalties Regulations” received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4976. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Floodplain Management and Protection of Wetlands; Minimum Property Standards for Flood Hazard Exposure; Building to the Federal Flood Risk Management Standard” (RIN2506-AC54) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4977. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting legislative proposals that support the President’s fiscal year 2025 budget request for the Department of Homeland Security; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4978. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant

to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulation S-P: Privacy of Consumer Financial Information and Safeguarding Customer Information" (RIN3235-AN26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 31, 2024; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4979. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Social Security Number Fraud Prevention Act of 2017" (RIN1903-AA14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4980. A communication from the Manager of Science Support, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Revision of the Critical Habitat Designation for the Jaguar in Compliance with a Court Order" (RIN1018-BH68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4981. A communication from the Chief of Domestic Listing, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the Dunes Sagebrush Lizard" (RIN1018-BG22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 3, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4982. A communication from the Management Analyst of the Policy and Regulations Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for the Missouri Distinct Population Segment of Eastern Hellbender" (RIN1018-BD26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4983. A communication from the Management Analyst of the Policy and Regulations Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Franklin's Bumble Bee" (RIN1018-BD25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4984. A communication from the Management Analyst of the Policy and Regulations Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Bartram's Stonecrop With a Section 4(d) Rule" (RIN1018-BD35) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4985. A communication from the Management Analyst of the Policy and Regulations Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Slenderclaw Crayfish and Designation of Critical Habitat" (RIN1018-BD36) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4986. A communication from the Management Analyst of the Policy and Regulations Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered" and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status with Section 4(d) Rule for Hermes Copper Butterfly and Designation of Critical Habitat" (RIN1018-BC57) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4987. A communication from the Management Analyst of the Policy and Regulations Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for the Georgetown and Salado Salamanders" (RIN1018-BE78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4988. A communication from the Management Analyst of the Policy and Regulations Branch, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status With Section 4(d) Rule for Atlantic Pigtoe and Designation of Critical Habitat" (RIN1018-BD12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 29, 2024; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4989. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Federal Coordinated Health Care Office's fiscal year 2023 report; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4990. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Interim Report to Congress: Post-Planning Period Activities and Progress"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-4991. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Energy Conservation Standards for General Service Lamps *Note: DOE submitted this rule to the President of the Senate on April 23, 2024, consistent with 5 U.S.C. 801(a), but receipt was not recorded in the Congressional Record. DOE is resubmitting this rule out of an abundance of caution to facilitate its proper recording in the Congressional Record." (RIN1904-AF43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 30, 2024; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 930. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide public safety officer benefits for exposure-related cancers, and for other purposes.

S. 3335. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a grant program to help law enforcement agencies with civilian law enforcement tasks, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DURBIN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 4235. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reauthorize grants to support for law enforcement officers and families, and for other purposes.

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. COTTON (for himself, Mr. VANCE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. CRUZ):

S. 4459. A bill to amend section 301 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to clarify those classes of individuals born in the United States who are not nationals or citizens of the United States at birth; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FETTERMAN:

S. 4460. A bill to reduce regulatory barriers to housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. DUCKWORTH (for herself, Mr. PADILLA, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. 4461. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each State to implement a process under which individuals who are 16 years of age may apply to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, to direct the Election Assistance Commission to make grants to States to increase the involvement of minors in public election activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 4462. A bill to provide for the establishment of a National Interagency Seed and Restoration Center, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4463. A bill to abolish the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks, to repeal the Federal Reserve Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. SMITH, and Mr. WELCH):

S. 4464. A bill to require the United States Postal Service to apply certain requirements when closing a processing, shipping, delivery, or other facility supporting a post office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

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

S. 4465. A bill to reauthorize the Uyghur Human Rights Policy Act of 2020; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself and Mr. PETERS):

S. 4466. A bill to direct the Attorney General to prepare a report on the Department of Justice activities related to countering Chinese national security threats, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUBIO:

S. 4467. A bill to reauthorize the Hong Kong Human Rights and Democracy Act of 2019; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 4468. A bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to finalize, implement, or enforce the

interim final rule of the Bureau of Industry and Security of the Department of Commerce entitled "Revision of Firearms License Requirements"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 4469. A bill to improve the understanding of, and promote access to treatment for, chronic kidney disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 4470. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to provide training services linked to employment demand through skills training grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. BALDWIN:

S. 4471. A bill to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to support State implementation of Federal standards established under the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 4472. A bill to amend the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 with respect to transitioning producers from the noninsured crop assistance program to the whole farm revenue insurance plan; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 4473. A bill to limit the definition of commercial in title 9, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 4474. A bill to amend the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to eliminate the use of valid court orders to secure lockup of status offenders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 4475. A bill to establish a Special Envoy for Sudan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. KAINE (for himself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 4476. A bill to require additional disclosures with respect to nominees to serve as chiefs of mission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CRAMER, and Ms. KLOBUCHAR):

S. 4477. A bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 4478. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit access by certain individuals to certain areas of airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

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

S. 4479. A bill to require training on the Constitution of the United States for commissioned officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 4480. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to establish a program to provide to rural communities technical assistance in recovering from disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. PADILLA):

S. 4481. A bill to strengthen requirements for contracts between the Department of

Education and Federal student loan servicers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself and Ms. ERNST):

S. 4482. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to develop, in cooperation with allies and partners in the Middle East, an integrated space and satellite security capability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. RISCH):

S. 4483. A bill to extend, and repeal the waiver authority under, the Protecting Europe's Energy Security Act of 2019; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. RISCH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. CRUZ, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. RICKETTS):

S. 4484. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to foreign persons of the International Criminal Court engaged in any effort to investigate, arrest, detain, or prosecute any protected person of the United States and its allies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. LEE, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHMITT, and Mr. SCOTT of Florida):

S. 4485. A bill to amend chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for en bloc consideration in resolutions of disapproval for "midnight rules", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. SCHMITT:

S. 4486. A bill to strengthen provisions relating to employment transparency regarding individuals who perform work in the People's Republic of China; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BARRASSO, Ms. ERNST, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. HOEVEN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MULLIN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. VANCE, Mr. WICKER, Mr. YOUNG, and Ms. COLLINS):

S.J. Res. 92. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "New Source Performance Standards for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From New, Modified, and Reconstructed Fossil Fuel-Fired Electric Generating Units; Emission Guidelines for Greenhouse Gas Emissions From Existing Fossil Fuel-Fired Electric Generating Units; and Repeal of the Affordable Clean Energy Rule"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. TILLIS (for Mr. HAGERTY (for himself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. HAWLEY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. MULLIN, Mr.

RICKETTS, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. VANCE, and Mr. WICKER)):

S.J. Res. 93. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Department of Commerce relating to "Revision of Firearms License Requirements"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. JOHNSON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. HAGERTY, Mr. TUBERVILLE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BUDD, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. LUMMIS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. VANCE, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. RICKETTS, Mr. COTTON, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. HOEVEN, Ms. ERNST, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LEE, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. SCHMITT, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HAWLEY, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. THUNE, Mr. BOOZMAN, and Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina):

S.J. Res. 94. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the proposed rule submitted by the Office of Refugee Resettlement of the Administration for Children and Families of the Department of Health and Human Services relating to the Unaccompanied Children Program Foundational Rule; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULLIN (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RICKETTS, Ms. LUMMIS, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, and Mr. HOEVEN):

S.J. Res. 95. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Environmental Protection Agency relating to "Hazardous and Solid Waste Management System: Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals From Electric Utilities; Legacy CCR Surface Impoundments"; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. Res. 725. A resolution affirming the legal status of contraception following the Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, 597 U.S. 215 (2022); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. ROSEN):

S. Res. 726. A resolution designating June 6, 2024, as National Naloxone Awareness Day; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 32

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 32, a bill to increase the number of landlords participating in the Housing Choice Voucher program.

S. 495

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 495, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program to provide assisted living services for eligible veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 711

At the request of Mr. BUDD, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 711, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the invaluable service that working dogs provide to society.

S. 930

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name and the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 930, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide public safety officer benefits for exposure-related cancers, and for other purposes.

S. 1297

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HICKENLOOPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1297, a bill to ensure the right to provide reproductive health care services, and for other purposes.

S. 1358

At the request of Mr. CRAMER, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1358, a bill to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1992 and the Flood Control Act of 1968 to provide for provisions relating to collection and retention of user fees at recreation facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1408

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1408, a bill to amend title 9, United States Code, with respect to arbitration of disputes involving race discrimination.

S. 1822

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1822, a bill to require U.S. Customs and Border Protection to expand the use of non-intrusive inspection systems at land ports of entry.

S. 1950

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1950, a bill to extend the temporary order for fentanyl-related substances.

S. 2097

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2097, a bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 2014 to improve a program that provides livestock disaster assistance, and for other programs.

S. 2498

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2498, a bill to prohibit unfair and deceptive advertising of prices for hotel rooms and other places of short-term lodging, and for other purposes.

S. 2581

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2581, a bill to extend the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000.

S. 2778

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2778, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to submit to Congress a report on competition among suppliers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 3335

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name and the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 3335, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to establish a grant program to help law enforcement agencies with civilian law enforcement tasks, and for other purposes.

S. 3818

At the request of Mr. RICKETTS, the name of the Senator from South Da-

kota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3818, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act to include fuel for ocean-going vessels as additional renewable fuel for which credits may be generated under the renewable fuel program.

S. 3864

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. KELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3864, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for congenital Cytomegalovirus screening of newborns.

S. 3883

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3883, a bill to appropriate funds for the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education.

S. 4019

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4019, a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide regular updates to Livestock Indemnity Program payment rates to reflect market prices, and for other purposes.

S. 4235

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, his name and the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. OSSOFF), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), the Senator from California (Ms. BUTLER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4235, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to reauthorize grants to support for law enforcement officers and families, and for other purposes.

S. 4297

At the request of Mr. TUBERVILLE, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4297, a bill to repeal the Corporate Transparency Act.

S. 4331

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4331, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group health plans and health insurance issuers offering group or individual health insurance that provide coverage for mental health services and substance use disorder services provide such services

without the imposition of cost-sharing from the diagnosis of pregnancy through the 1-year period following such pregnancy, and for other purposes.

S. 4377

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4377, a bill to require U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services to facilitate naturalization services for non-citizen veterans who have been removed from the United States or are inadmissible.

S. 4387

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. TUBERVILLE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4387, a bill to prohibit transportation of any alien using certain methods of identification.

S. 4396

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) were added as cosponsors of S. 4396, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize an individual who is awarded the Purple Heart for service in the Armed Forces to transfer unused Post-9/11 Educational Assistance to a family member, and for other purposes.

S. 4445

At the request of Ms. DUCKWORTH, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK) were added as cosponsors of S. 4445, a bill to protect and expand nationwide access to fertility treatment, including in vitro fertilization.

S. 4447

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 4447, a bill to allow women greater access to safe and effective oral contraceptive drugs intended for routine use, and to direct the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study on Federal funding of contraceptive methods.

At the request of Mr. MARSHALL, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 4447, supra.

S.J. RES. 33

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. WARNOCK), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and the Senator from California (Mr. PADILLA) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 33, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to prohibit the use of slavery and involuntary servitude as a punishment for a crime.

S.J. RES. 82

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VANCE)

was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 82, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Food and Drug Administration relating to "Medical Devices; Laboratory Developed Tests".

S.J. RES. 91

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. RICKETTS) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) were added as cosponsors of S.J. Res. 91, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services relating to "Medicare and Medicaid Programs; Minimum Staffing Standards for Long-Term Care Facilities and Medicaid Institutional Payment Transparency Reporting".

S. RES. 569

At the request of Mr. COONS, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 569, a resolution recognizing religious freedom as a fundamental right, expressing support for international religious freedom as a cornerstone of United States foreign policy, and expressing concern over increased threats to and attacks on religious freedom around the world.

S. RES. 716

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 716, a resolution expressing support for the designation of June 7, 2024, as "National Gun Violence Awareness Day" and June 2024 as "National Gun Violence Awareness Month".

S. RES. 717

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 717, a resolution calling on the Biden Administration to pursue censure of Iran at the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), refer the issue to the United Nations Security Council, and reaffirm that all measures will be taken to prevent the regime in Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 725—AFFIRMING THE LEGAL STATUS OF CONTRACEPTION FOLLOWING THE SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IN *DOBBS V. JACKSON WOMEN'S HEALTH ORGANIZATION*, 597 U.S. 215 (2022)

Mrs. BLACKBURN (for herself, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DAINES, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mrs. BRITT, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. ROUNDS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 725

Whereas, in 2022, the United States Supreme Court issued its decision in *Dobbs v.*

Jackson Women's Health Organization, 597 U.S. 215 (2022), overturning the Court's prior decisions in *Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113 (1973), and *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833 (1992);

Whereas, in issuing *Dobbs*, the Supreme Court invalidated any Federal judicial precedent suggesting that the Constitution of the United States guarantees the right of a woman to abort her unborn child;

Whereas the Supreme Court, "to ensure that [its] decision [was] not misunderstood or mischaracterized," explicitly emphasized that the *Dobbs* decision "concern[ed] the constitutional right to abortion and no other right" and that "nothing in [its] opinion should be understood to cast doubt on precedents that do not concern abortion";

Whereas the sole effect of the decision in *Dobbs* was to return "the authority to regulate abortion . . . to the people and their elected representatives";

Whereas some, for political advantage and with the aim of sowing confusion and fear, have suggested that the Court's decision in *Dobbs* restricts the ability or legal right of women to access contraception in the several States; and

Whereas Congress has the authority, under the 14th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, "to enforce, by appropriate legislation," the rights belonging to the People of the United States, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) construes the Supreme Court's decision in *Dobbs v. Jackson Women's Health Organization*, 597 U.S. 215 (2022), as having no effect on the legal right of a woman to access contraception; and

(2) interprets *Dobbs* to in no way require the various agencies of the Federal Government to alter rules, regulations, or policies governing access to contraception.

SENATE RESOLUTION 726—DESIGNATING JUNE 6, 2024, AS NATIONAL NALOXONE AWARENESS DAY

Mr. SCOTT of Florida (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. CAPITO, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. BRAUN, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. KING, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. LUJÁN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Ms. ROSEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 726

Whereas the opioid epidemic continues to devastate communities across the United States, leading to a significant loss of life and widespread societal impact;

Whereas opioid overdoses during the 12 months preceding December of 2023 claimed a reported 81,083 lives in the United States;

Whereas fatal overdoses are often witnessed by a bystander;

Whereas, in 2023 alone, the Drug Enforcement Administration seized more than 381,000,000 doses of potentially deadly fentanyl, enough to kill every individual in the United States;

Whereas, according to data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, fentanyl-related poisonings are currently a leading cause of death for individuals in the United States between 18 and 45 years of age;

Whereas naloxone is a safe and effective medication that can reverse opioid overdoses and save lives when administered promptly by rapidly reversing the effects of opioids;

Whereas naloxone plays a vital role in preventing long-term brain damage and reducing the risk of fatality associated with opioid overdoses;

Whereas the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has declared naloxone to be a key tool in preventing opioid overdose deaths;

Whereas it is imperative to educate individuals, families, healthcare professionals, and first responders about—

(1) the benefits of naloxone, including the potential naloxone has to reduce opioid-related fatalities; and

(2) how to safely administer naloxone;

Whereas it is imperative to identify current or potential barriers, including cost, for individuals, organizations, and Federal, State, and local governments to obtain and distribute naloxone;

Whereas increasing access to naloxone can ensure that individuals struggling with opioid use disorder have a chance at recovery and a future free from the grip of opioid use disorder;

Whereas the Food and Drug Administration acted to authorize the over-the-counter sale of 4 milligram and 3 milligram doses of naloxone in 2023; and

Whereas recognizing National Naloxone Awareness Day will contribute to the ongoing efforts to educate the public, reduce stigma associated with substance use disorder, and promote access to lifesaving naloxone: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates June 6, 2024, as National Naloxone Awareness Day;

(2) recognizes the life-saving benefits of naloxone in reversing opioid overdoses and preventing unnecessary deaths;

(3) acknowledges that increased access to naloxone empowers individuals, families, healthcare professionals, and first responders to intervene in emergency situations and provide immediate assistance to those experiencing an opioid overdose;

(4) recognizes that National Naloxone Awareness Day serves as an opportunity to educate the public about the importance of recognizing the signs of opioid overdose and equipping themselves with naloxone to save lives;

(5) encourages Federal, State, and local governments, as well as private and non-profit organizations, to collaborate and allocate resources towards increasing naloxone access, education, and distribution efforts; and

(6) calls upon Federal agencies, including the Substances Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the Office of National Drug Control Policy, the Drug Enforcement Administration, and all others engaged in the National Drug Control Strategy to continue supporting public awareness of naloxone, harm reduction, and overdose and poisoning prevention.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2073. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. PETERS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2291, to establish the Northern Border Coordination Center, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2073. Mr. SCHUMER (for Mr. PETERS) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 2291, to establish the Northern Border Coordination Center, and for other purposes; as follows

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Northern Border Coordination Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CENTER.—The term “Center” means the Northern Border Coordination Center established pursuant to section 3.

(2) DEPARTMENT.—The term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) NORTHERN BORDER.—The term “northern border” means—

(A) the international border between the United States and Canada; and

(B) the maritime border between Alaska and the Russian Federation.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. NORTHERN BORDER COORDINATION CENTER.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the Northern Border Coordination Center.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Center shall be to serve as the Department’s forward deployed centralized coordination center for operations, domain awareness, information sharing, intelligence, training, and stakeholder engagement with Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners along the northern border of the United States. The Center shall be placed along the northern border at a location that is collocated with an existing U.S. Border Patrol sector headquarters, an Air and Marine Operations branch, and a United States Coast Guard air station, and other existing Department activities.

(c) COMPONENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Center shall collocate personnel and activities of—

(A) U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including U.S. Border Patrol and Air and Marine Operations;

(B) the United States Coast Guard;

(C) U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s Homeland Security Investigations;

(D) other components and offices of the Department that the Secretary determines to be necessary, including to support the training, technology testing, and development described in subsection (d); and

(E) additional Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners, as the Secretary determines to be necessary and appropriate to support the coordination of operations described in this Act.

(d) FUNCTIONS.—The Center shall perform the functions described in this subsection in addition to any other functions assigned by the Secretary.

(1) NORTHERN BORDER STRATEGY.—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall—

(A) serve as a coordination mechanism for operational components for the implementation, evaluation, and updating of the Northern Border Strategy and any successor strategy; and

(B) support the development of best practices and policies for personnel at the northern border to support such implementation.

(2) TRAINING.—The Center shall serve as a training location to support the delivery of training or exercises for Department personnel and Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners.

(3) METRICS.—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall coordinate the development and tracking of border security metrics for the northern border.

(4) RESOURCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL NEEDS AND CHALLENGES.—The Center, in collabora-

tion with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall—

(A) identify resource and technological needs or challenges affecting security along the northern border; and

(B) serve as a testing ground and demonstration location for the testing of border security technology, including determining such technology’s suitability and performance in the northern border and maritime environments.

(5) AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS.—

(A) QUICK REACTION CAPABILITIES.—In support of the Center, U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s Air and Marine Operations—

(i) shall establish and maintain capability that is collocated with the Center and available for quick deployment in support of the northern border missions, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Department, including missions in the Great Lakes region; and

(ii) in coordination with the Center and relevant offices and components of the Department, shall evaluate requirements and make recommendations to support the operations of large unmanned aircraft systems based at the Center.

(B) NORTHERN BORDER DOMAIN AWARENESS.—In order to coordinate with the Center and support its operations, the Air and Marine Operations Center shall collocate personnel and resources with the Center to enhance the Department’s capabilities to—

(i) support air and maritime domain awareness and information sharing efforts along the northern border;

(ii) provide dedicated monitoring of northern border systems; and

(iii) lead, in coordination with other U.S. Customs and Border Protection components, Federal, State, tribal, local, and international governments, and private sector partners, the Center’s efforts to track and monitor legitimate cross-border traffic involving unmanned aircraft and unmanned aircraft systems.

(6) COUNTER-UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to policies established by the Secretary, consistent with section 210G of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124n), the Center shall support counter-unmanned aircraft systems operations along the northern border to respond to the increased use of unmanned aircraft systems. Such support may involve development, testing, and evaluation of technologies.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act may be construed to provide additional authority related to detection, mitigation, research, development, or testing of unmanned aircraft systems or counter-unmanned aircraft systems.

(7) PRIVACY AND CIVIL RIGHTS.—The Center, in collaboration with the Chief Privacy Officer and the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department, shall ensure that operations and practices of the Center comply with the privacy and civil rights policies of the Department and its components.

(8) NONCONTIGUOUS NORTHERN BORDER.—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall—

(A) identify the specific challenges that exist along the noncontiguous international land border with Canada and the maritime border with Russia, including resource, technological challenges, and domain awareness;

(B) ensure that dedicated personnel, including reachback support, are working to evaluate and address the challenges identified pursuant to subparagraph (A); and

(C) determine the feasibility of establishing a satellite facility of the Center to

address the specific challenges identified pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(e) ANNUAL REPORTING.—Not later than 180 days after the establishment of the Center, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives that describes the activities of the Center during the most recently concluded fiscal year, including—

(1) personnel levels;

(2) additional resources that are needed to support the operations of the Center and northern border operations of the Department; and

(3) any additional assets or authorities that are needed to increase security and domain awareness along the northern border.

(f) TEMPORARY DUTY ASSIGNMENTS.—The Secretary shall submit a quarterly report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives regarding temporary duty assignments of U.S. Border Patrol agents during the reporting period, including—

(1) the number of agents on temporary duty assignment;

(2) the duration of the temporary duty assignment; and

(3) the sectors from which the agents were assigned.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The Center established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be established separate and distinct from the Secretary's authorities under section 708 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 348).

(h) SUNSET.—This Act shall cease to be effective on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. SCHUMER. 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 ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of

the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2024, 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 Wednesday, June 5, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2024, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a joint hearing.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2024, at 10 a.m., to conduct a joint hearing.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, June 5, 2024, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct an open hearing on a nomination

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that William LaDuca, my intern, have privileges of the floor for the balance of the day.

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

Mr. CARDIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Matthew Hackell and Josh Tupler, both fellows on the Foreign Relations Committee staff, be given floor privileges for the remainder of the 118th Congress.

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

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the following interns in my office be granted floor privileges until June 7, 2024: Ms. Allyson Moore and Mr. Charlie Hayes.

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

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that Sean Pyles be granted floor privileges for the duration of today's proceedings.

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

Mr. KELLY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to my intern on my staff for today, Humberto Nicholas Ibarra.

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

Mr. SCHUMER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

SENATE PAGES

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I first want to echo the kind words by the

majority leader for the pages. As a former Senate page myself, I know that this is a job that few people notice on the outside, but we notice it here. They make sure things run well here, and I am grateful to know these fine people. I hope they had a good time while they were with us.

And so to each of you, I wish you the very best of luck as you pursue your future careers, and I look forward to seeing some of you sitting in these chairs one day.

As I entered this Chamber, shortly after being elected to the Senate in 2010, during my orientation I was told to take a seat in the chairs. I couldn't take a seat. I couldn't figure out why. And then I remembered my training from the time when I was a page, which taught me never, ever, ever to sit in a Senator's chair—only to realize it is probably OK now because I just got elected.

I wish you the best of luck.

TRUMP TRIAL VERDICT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, the conviction of President Trump is a clear manifestation that our justice system has been weaponized against us, against the American people. This was a political persecution aimed squarely at one thing and one thing only: preventing President Trump from challenging the current administration in this Presidential election.

Now, let's just examine the facts—just the basic, irrefutable facts. The proceedings against President Trump were marred by unclear charges and irregular jury instructions, making it evident, from the very beginning, that this trial was not about the pursuit of justice. It was not about the objective demands of the law.

No, it was a choreographed act of partisan lawfare intended to dismantle the political rights of an individual who stands as the principal opponent—I would dare say the sole remaining obstacle—to President Joe Biden becoming a second-term President. He is the last person, the last man, the last object standing in the way of President Biden's second term.

And so that fact, all by itself, signals something. It signals something we haven't seen before. It signals something that I wish we never had seen in our Republic and that I certainly hope we never see again. But the hypocrisy of this is just palpable.

The Democrats and their allies in the media have long accused President Trump of undermining American norms and traditions and of all these supposedly norm-shattering actions. Yet they now champion a prosecution that reeks of the authoritarian tactics seen by the tinhorn dictators in banana republics—the same banana republics and failed systems of government that we have repeatedly sanctioned and shamed publicly with good reason.

In what country could a judge who, according to the New York Times, violated judicial ethics when he donated

to a group supporting President Biden's campaign and another called Stop Republicans—that is literally the name of the group that he donated to, Stop Republicans. In what world could that judge be allowed to preside over the trial of a former President—a former Republican President and chief political opponent of the incumbent Democratic President?

Or how about Matthew Colangelo, another key figure in this prosecution? How could that person be authorized to transition directly from a senior role in the Justice Department under President Biden to lead the political prosecution of President Trump with Manhattan DA Alvin Bragg?

This intertwining of judicial proceedings with partisan politics should alarm every single American, regardless of your age, regardless of what part of the country you call home, and, frankly, regardless of your party affiliation.

Now, let's not forget that Senator SCHUMER's brother, whose law firm has lent significant legal firepower to this prosecutorial effort—let's not forget that his brother is a partner in the law firm—the law firm of Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton and Garrison—the same firm that granted three highly paid attorneys a paid leave of absence to join the Manhattan District Attorney's Office, specifically in its targeting of Donald Trump.

We cannot stand idly by and act as if this didn't just happen and pretend that this whole endeavor hasn't changed—changed dramatically. We can't pretend that this didn't occur, nor should we. If we were observing such actions in another country, we would be discussing sanctions and shaming and perhaps a whole lot of other things, but certainly not silence. We wouldn't see that.

Now, as we prepare to honor the sacrifices made by the heroes on the beaches of Normandy, we are reminded that those brave souls fought and died, 80 years ago this week, to defeat dictators who ruthlessly wielded the power of the state, specifically to suppress and persecute their political enemies and anyone else who they thought stood in their way.

What would those American heroes say if they saw an American President cheering on a kangaroo-court attempt to imprison his political rival, his sole impediment to a second term in the Oval Office? Would they recognize the America they fought for?

It is with their sacrifice in mind that I call upon every Member of this Chamber to make it clear that we are unwilling to aid and abet this White House in its project to tear the country apart.

Now, Pandora's box is open and a sword of Damocles hangs over the neck of our great Republic. If we can muster even a fraction of the courage shown by the "greatest generation" on June 6, 1944, 80 years ago tomorrow, we may still change course. There is still time. They can still stand down on this.

There are more instances of reversible error in this case, underlying this conviction, than I have time to recite in these remarks. For that reason alone, it would be very easy for the prosecution to confess error on appeal. There is still time, but there is not much time left. Let's put this genie back where it belongs and never, ever let it come back.

I ask you, join me. Join me and fight. Push back on this while there is still time.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

MARC FOGEL

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I rise this afternoon to highlight the continued imprisonment of Marc Fogel. Marc Fogel is a teacher whose career I will describe in a moment, but he is from Oakmont, PA, Allegheny County, in the southwestern corner of our State, just near Pittsburgh.

He has been imprisoned by Russia, and I urge my colleagues in the administration to continue to prioritize his release.

On August 14, 2021, Marc Fogel was arrested by Russian authorities upon his return to Russia to teach one last year at the Anglo-American School of Moscow, after 35 years of teaching history to the children of American diplomats at international schools across the globe and teaching at the same school in Russia since 2012.

Yes, Marc had medically prescribed marijuana in his luggage to help him through the year in dealing with his chronic pain. That pain came from a hip replacement. It came from multiple back surgeries, multiple knee surgeries, and a spinal fusion, which have left Marc with a permanent limp.

Marc broke Russian law by bringing marijuana into the country. Marc's worsening medical conditions and actions to bring in less than an ounce of marijuana into Russia should not require him to serve the full 14-year sentence at a Russian penal colony—14 years of imprisonment for less than an ounce of marijuana.

It has been 1,026 days since Marc's initial arrest, over 33 months ago. At Marc's age—he will turn 63 this July—and in his poor health—terribly poor health—continuing to serve another 11 years, or 130 months, in any prison will indeed be a death sentence.

Based on a review of Marc's records from the prison hospital, Marc's treating physician has expressed grave concerns over Marc's declining health. His spinal cord and knee injuries and a prosthetic hip have combined with neuropathy, a loss of feeling, in one of his feet to make the risk of a more severe injury a lot more likely.

Marc has already fallen multiple times. Every fall—every fall—heightens the risk of a broken hip or other severe injury that Marc will struggle to recover from in prison. The 33 months

have taken a toll on Marc Fogel's mental and emotional health. Where many other younger individuals in Russian penal colonies can have great hope for decades of life after their full sentences, Marc Fogel will be almost 75 years old by the end of his current 14-year prison sentence.

I am hopeful that Russia, seeing the time that Marc has already served and fully aware of his terribly declining health, will release Marc from prison on humanitarian grounds so that he may return to his family in Pennsylvania.

Marc's support from his family has given him strength over the last few years, but the phone service they rely on to contact him is unpredictable and goes down for weeks at a time.

My thoughts and prayers—and I know that is true of so many others who have advocated on Marc's behalf—our thoughts and prayers remain with Marc and his family, but we must also act, act to bring him home. That is why I introduced a resolution with my colleague Senator DAINES calling for Marc's release and urging the Biden administration to prioritize Marc's case in all—all—of its interactions with the Russian Government.

I am proud that the resolution passed the Senate just last night. I am proud because this resolution shows the world—but more importantly Marc and his family—that while the news cycle may have forgotten Marc, the U.S. Government has not. This resolution's passage is also evidence that bringing Marc home is and will continue to be prioritized at the highest levels of our government; that the U.S. Government is continuing to explore all possible avenues to bring Marc home.

I want Marc and his family to know that we are working to bring him home; that we will continue our efforts until Marc Fogel is back having dinner with his family at his mother's home in Butler, PA, just north of where Marc lives.

ANTI-SEMITISM AWARENESS ACT

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I wanted to move to another subject, and the subject is one that I think so many Americans are concerned about: It is anti-Semitism across college campuses and in primary and in secondary schools but, of course, well beyond the boundaries of any school. It is an American problem. It is a problem across our society and even across the world.

Combating anti-Semitism has been a top priority of mine for my entire time in the Senate, and I have consistently taken strong actions to address this hate, including working to pass the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act since 2016.

Back toward the end of the calendar year 2022, I came to the Senate floor to talk about anti-Semitism, mostly through the lens of the horror of October of 2018 when a gunman killed 11

Pittsburghers and injured several others, including police officers, at the Tree of Life synagogue in Pittsburgh. That horrific moment in the history of the Jewish people and the history of the American people reminded all of us of how pernicious and how widespread anti-Semitism is. At that time, I was cataloging the numbers, the exponential rise in anti-Semitism up to that point in time, the end of the calendar year 2022, and how anti-Semitism had grown so substantially in that timeframe.

However, as we all know, since October 7 of 2023, since Hamas terrorists attacked the people of Israel and killed over 1,200 Jews in Israel, those numbers, which are high and exponentially high before, went even higher—an explosion across the country of anti-Semitism. The Anti-Defamation League has tracked the highest numbers of anti-Semitic incidents ever—ever—in the United States in 2023, and those numbers have undoubtedly continued to rise with the ongoing campus protests. There were over 8,800 instances, including 2,177 cases of vandalism and 161 assaults.

No one in this country, none of us, can tolerate any form of anti-Semitism, any form of discrimination abroad or at home, on college campuses, in the workplace, on the playground, in any setting in American life. That is why we must pass the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act, a bill that my colleague Senator TIM SCOTT and I have worked on for almost 8 years.

Our bill would mandate that the Department of Education consider a widely accepted definition of anti-Semitism in carrying out its enforcement actions, strengthening civil rights enforcement against anti-Semitism, just like that same office, the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Education, is charged with investigating incidents of racial discrimination or discrimination of any kind on a college campus that rises to a level of a hostile environment on that campus.

The House has already passed its version of the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act. They passed that recently. We must find a pathway here in the Senate to pass this bill. This bill is cosponsored by 15 Democrats and 15 Republicans all across the length and breadth of the country.

There are objections to our legislation from individual Senators on both sides of the aisle, which so far has blocked unanimous consent, but we are confident the legislation would pass if given a vote.

An additional point on this matter is relevant. I mentioned the Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights. That is the office that is charged with conducting these investigations of anti-Semitism but, as I said, also charged with the obligation to conduct investigations of racism on a campus or other forms of discrimination.

I have a separate bill that would add substantial funding, absolutely essen-

tial funding, to the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Education. That office has to hire more people to conduct these investigations, to initiate an investigation, to expeditiously gather evidence, complete the investigation, and make that fundamental determination whether there is a hostile environment on a college campus for Jewish students, just like it would make a determination with regard to a hostile environment for Black students in the case of allegations of racial animus on a campus—make that determination of hostile environment or not, making that decision. Once they make that decision, of course, the college or university would be subjected to penalties.

But the only way that can happen, that those investigations can be commenced and be completed, is to have the resources and personnel. The Office of Civil Rights needs to hire hundreds more people to do this, and I think it is a worthy investment. So I would urge Senators in both parties, both sides of the aisle, to work with us to pass that legislation.

I think most of us come to this from a very basic part of our DNA. We know that this kind of discrimination, whether it is anti-Semitism or racism or other forms of discrimination, is a scourge on the country. It is a scourge, and I think it is an insult to our country as a country of free people. We have to figure out a way to combat anti-Semitism, and we can do that by passing the Anti-Semitism Awareness Act, but also to take other actions which will stamp out this kind of discrimination in our society, throughout our country, and throughout the world.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The Senator from Vermont.

ISRAEL

Mr. WELCH. Madam President, last Friday, President Biden announced the elements of a proposed plan for a permanent cease-fire in Gaza. If accepted by both Israel and Hamas, the plan would prevent many more months of death and destruction, it would save countless lives, free the hostages, and offer a way forward to lasting peace between Israelis and Palestinians.

In order for the plan to succeed, the President will need to use the leverage that only he has as President, that leverage with Israel, with Egypt, Qatar, Jordan, and others.

I believe it will also require a very decisive change in our own policy. After 8 months of relentless bombing and shelling, the United States should

stop—should stop—supporting a war strategy that has not only caused massive death and destruction but has failed to achieve either of Prime Minister Netanyahu's key objectives: total victory over Hamas and release of the remaining hostages.

Instead, 8 months into this war, Gaza is in ruins, tens of thousands of Palestinians have been killed and many more have been injured, including thousands of women and children. Some 100 hostages remain trapped underground. They are subjected to daily abuse by their captors while bombs explode above them with no idea if they will live to see the light of day.

And on May 26, Israeli Defense Forces—using munitions provided by the United States—attacked a camp of displaced Palestinians in Rafah, where the Israeli military had ordered them to relocate to avoid bombing in the north. The attack incinerated 45 people and injured many more. Mr. Netanyahu called it a tragic mistake. In reality, it was the gruesome result of an ill-conceived, scorched-earth campaign that has gone on for far too long.

For years, Mr. Netanyahu used Hamas as an asset in his very cynical strategy to ensure the Palestinian Authority could not become an effective partner for peace. He steadily expanded Israeli settlements, roads, and other infrastructure in the West Bank to create conditions on the ground to undermine the viability of a Palestinian State.

His policies fueled hatred and violence among Israelis and Palestinians. Yet throughout those years, the United States has supported his government unconditionally.

The Israeli and Palestinian people are now paying the price for these failed policies. Today, over a million Palestinians in Gaza are suffering from acute hunger. Children are starving. The wounded are dying from lack of medical care. Children with life-threatening injuries cannot leave Gaza to obtain the surgery that they need in other countries. Hundreds of trucks carrying food, medicines, and other aid have been stalled in Egypt. And the sea pier constructed by our Department of Defense, using hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars, is in pieces.

Despite intensifying criticism around the world, Mr. Netanyahu has responded to his many critics—including Israeli citizens—with reckless defiance.

The time will come when the war ends. President Biden announced a plan to achieve through diplomacy what military force has failed to achieve. But whenever that time comes, Gaza will be uninhabitable. Two million Palestinians will be dependent on international aid for years to come.

Rather than bringing security and peace to the Middle East, I fear that the legacies of this war could be the opposite: more hatred, regardless of what is left of Hamas, more acts of violence against Israelis and Americans.

Last week, Secretary Blinken said Israel must decide if its military actions are worth the cost in civilian lives. I agree.

(Ms. Cortez Masto assumed the Chair.)

But the United States, not just Israel, must answer this question, too: Is Israel's use of our planes, our tanks, our bombs, our ammunition worth the cost in civilian lives?

Is it worth the risk of creating a new generation of terrorists, victims of bombing and shelling who saw their parents, siblings, and friends die, their homes destroyed?

Is it worth the lives of the hostages? I believe the answer is no.

The United States must stop providing offensive weapons and munitions to a polarizing foreign leader who treats billions of dollars in military aid from American taxpayers as an entitlement while he ignores the appeals of the American officials to stop bombing, shooting, and denying aid to Palestinian civilians.

The United States should stop providing offensive weapons and munitions to a foreign leader who promotes policies that are diametrically against U.S. national interests and, by doing so, sets back progress for Middle East peace and puts American lives at risk.

The United States should stop supporting a war strategy that has repeated some of our own worst mistakes in Afghanistan and Iraq.

The United States also should defend the Geneva Conventions and the international tribunals, including the International Criminal Court. Some here have denounced the chief prosecutor for bringing charges against Prime Minister Netanyahu. There is no equivalence between Israel and Hamas to be sure. But there are credible allegations of violations of the laws of war in Gaza. Attacking the Court plays into the hands of war criminals like Vladimir Putin and weakens our own credibility and the Court's legitimacy.

It undermines the universal principle that no one and no government is above the law, a cardinal principle that the United States should strongly defend.

The perpetrators of the October 7 massacre must be brought to justice. Such horrendous crimes must not go unpunished. But destroying Rafah is not going to finish off Hamas. It is not going to save the hostages. It may doom them.

President Biden has outlined a credible plan for peace. While Israel and Hamas will ultimately decide when this war ends, we, the United States, can decide when it ends for us. Secretary Blinken asked the right question, which should have been asked months ago.

The right answer is no. Israel's bombardment of Gaza is not worth the cost in civilians lives, and we should stop supporting it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. BALDWIN). The Senator from New Jersey.

TRIBUTE TO SENATE PAGES

Mr. BOOKER. Madam President, I stand here as a Senator of New Jersey, but I think I am going to be representing all 100 Senators when I mark this distinctive moment when the Senate will soon go into recess, and we will end a week in the Senate that is not a typical week. It is a week that happens once or twice every year where we say goodbye to a class of pages.

And the truth of the matter is, it is a time that is emotional. I have been to a handful of graduations. And even though the pages are spending not even half a year here, the bonds that you experience here, the friendships that you make, the fact that you are participating in something so much larger than any one American is pretty significant.

You will have many graduations, I imagine, from high school, from college, some of you from graduate school, some of you from medical school—none of you from clown college, I think, because you lack senses of humor.

But the reality is, this is a meaningful departure, a meaningful graduation. And every year, I try to come down to the floor and express my ire at the class. This one particularly has raised my dander—and it is hard to do because I am bald. But this time something different happened because of the extraordinary people who work in this institution, not the Senators but the parliamentary staff. They made the mistake of telling me that in past years, there were poetry competitions. And I figured that since this class—probably worse than any others—lacked the ability to share with me any jokes, we decided to rekindle this moment that maybe we could have a poetry competition.

Now, I was handed, about 3 weeks ago, this very formal-looking envelope that says, "From the President of the United States," which it is not—it is actually from pages—an envelope with poetry in it.

Forgive the alliteration, Madam President, but a pathetic paucity of pages participated—just a small handful. There was a smattering of page participation. It was very disappointing to me. But I had a chance to review the 10 or dozen or so poems.

And given the poetic wisdom that I have gleaned in my years of education in one poetry class in grade school, I have deemed who the winners are.

And now I would like to read the bronze medal—this is an Olympic year, after all—the silver medal, and the gold medal shining winner. And what do you win? Nothing. I mean, actually, you win the distinction before your peers of having your poem read as the gold medal poem and entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD forever, for eternity.

And so, first, I will do the third-place poem. These were all extraordinary entrants. Everybody who participated is a winner—yada, yada, yada, yada. OK.

I hope you got that, "yada, yada, yada." OK. All right.

This first one was the third-place finisher. And here we go.

Division

Scrolling through your phone,
You don't see the friendship between Senators Booker and Britt—

Sidebar. The only reason this one got into third place is because it actually named my name. You do get awards in this place for being obsequious, sycophantic, and more. Going back to the top—

Scrolling through your phone,

You don't see the friendship between Senators Booker and Britt,

Not if you are at home,

But only if you sit where we sit.

Seen as division,

But united as one.

While ideas do bring collision,

We still stand under the same sun.

Watch them argue on the news,

See them as friends on the floor.

Even when it seems win or lose,

Their debates do not mean war.

The only way to realize, is if you see it with your own eyes.

(Poem by Kathryn Murchison.)

That was actually really good. Bronze medal. Yes, we can have applause in the Chamber, which is not technically allowed.

I didn't see anything. Raise your hand if that is yours.

It was tremendous.

All right. Names will officially be read into the RECORD later. But I am going to go to No. 2.

O Capitol, Our Capitol

Here the Capitol lies

The Titan of the city

Standing to bridge divides

With many a committee

Busts and paintings they loom

And stairs trodden by masses

With halls that have seen history bloom

So quickly it all passes

Ideas come in and out

Always a deadline due

Change some bring about

But from what I know is true

The path we choose to follow

Will lead us to t'morrow

(Poem by Miriam Tsegay and Mira Murphy.)

Raise your hand if that was yours, by the way.

Oh, my gosh. Oh.

Why did you raise your hand then?

It was a collaboration. I don't know if that is fair. Not only is this page class not funny, but they cheat.

No, no, no. Collaboration is important. It is important.

All right. This is the winning poem. The Gallery is full of media—at least one person—to the tens of people watching on CSPAN at home.

No title for this one. It doesn't need it. It is the winning poem.

My country 'tis of thee.

My parents' eyes gleamed with a dream.

Red, white, and blue stretched from sea to sea.

They were told "work hard but don't run out of steam."

Late dinners to unpredictable shifts.

Staying with my grandma felt like living in a world away.

It was almost too good to notice the reality of it.

Little did I know, it was like this every single day.

Years later, I'm in a world stuffed with suits, speeches, and words that inspire.

They call me a patriot, a daughter of immigrants that walks through the Brumidi Corridor.

Oh how my future came to transpire.

The beat of pride and uncertainty trails behind in an uproar.

I trace the center of my palm before I lift my hand to my chest.

Good morning, America, another day awaits for your glorious unrest.

(Poem by Alina Hussain.)

Raise that hand. Be proud.

So, pages, this is my final farewell. I want you to know that it has been a privilege to serve with each and every one of you. They separate you on the sides of the dais, but truly you all were united in your commitment to serve this institution.

It has been an honor to serve with each and every one of you. It has been brief. But, I tell you, you guys have been gifts to us.

I asked for more, though, and you failed me. I am really shocked that you could not step up, that you are the bottom of all the page classes, in my 11 years, in humor, but you are going to be remembered by me at the top of commitment and service.

And so in honor of that and this new tradition, which I didn't know about, I want to shock you all. I am not sure if this has ever been done on the Senate floor before, but in honor of this class of pages and your paucity of poetry participation, I—the junior Senator from New Jersey—have written you a poem.

Fasten your seatbelts. Let me show the poetic pages how it is done.

But I need somebody to help me out here.

Om, I saw your hand go up first. Om, you should take this spot.

Madam President, without objection, I would like the page to stand next to me during my poetic verses.

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

Mr. BOOKER. Thank you very much.

Om, stand here. Not too close to me, Om.

When I signal to you, do what I signal. There is one moment in this whole thing, don't mess it up. All right.

This may be the first embarrassing poem a U.S. Senator has written and recited on the Senate floor. This is history, people. Here we go.

Pages!

Young wise, future sages, you have all had access passes to the Senate's back stages.

Look at you, hanging out on the Senate floor. You do more than just bring us water or open our doors.

You bring life to this August body; You bring the average age down in this place from 90.

You remind us of our virile past; a testimony to the truth that youth and hair go so darned fast.

You were told to stay silent. Though, on some days, perhaps you wanted to scream, because you went without sleep and, thus, were denied your chance to your own sweet American dream.

And yet you witnessed the sausage-making of American truth, debates, partisanship and perhaps—believe it or not—one or two Senators acting a little uncouth.

Foreign leader visits and State of the Union speeches, only to have to get up the next morning and pay attention to whatever your teacher teaches.

God, you Pages! Out of your comfortable home cages.

You jumped into this experience despite all better wisdom and a host of warnings:

You signed up for really late nights and some too many early mornings.

What were you thinking?

You are clearly too young to have been drinking.

(Laughter.)

And yet, with a full-time job and a relentless academic course load, you came; you saw; you conquered with a pace that never slowed.

You may think what you do perhaps didn't make a difference at all, but that is ridiculous because, at this end of the historic Washington Mall, Pages sit humbly in the well of the Senate, but their contributions stand tall.

Every day, I walk through those doors, to your smiles and kind spirit in this Chamber so round. Good days or bad days, you still gave me a solid pound or a smile or an earnest nod of your head. You should know you subtly remind every single Senator of what for this country is truly ahead.

Yes, a divided floor—Republican and Democrat, left and right—but you all unify us because, in you, we see that America's future is bright.

And you scramble to us after every speech. Please, may I have a copy, you beseech.

But in the very gesture of us handing you our own words, something more than symbolic occurs.

We hand tradition; we hand history; we hand off to a courier that is you.

We both stand on the stage of history, but briefly, someday soon, it will be over; for here, in the Senate, we all are just passing through.

At the doors, hurried Senators literally pass you, but in the span of time, who is actually going to pass who? For you all, each of you, will experience tomorrows that we never do.

You are leaving here, my new young friends. This is now a beginning and not an end.

You came here as individuals from all over the country. Now you are tight-knit. You witnessed history here, but now it is time for you to separate again and make it.

This Nation needs each and every one of you. It needs your artistry; it needs your compassion; it needs your genius; it needs your love.

This country needs your grit. It needs your struggle. It needs your firm belief in what is possible. And, when this Nation gets stuck, it needs your shove.

We handed you our best speeches, our best words, and you took them all. But, soon, our time will have been past, and it is up to you to make America a more perfect union, with liberty and justice for all.

So my last piece of advice—and, yes, this is an insulting poke—you guys really need to learn some much better jokes.

The truth—and this is the truth, and I am sorry it is not yet sunny—you guys are awful and not that funny.

In fact, you are like cold, wet, soggy cereal. You have given me no good jokes. It has all just been awful material.

So if this poem is going to have a final epiphany, it would be to give you this: Give the world everything you have, but never take

yourself too seriously. Always remember to laugh.

(Applause.)

This is truly, truly an honor. You guys are really, really special. I know I speak on behalf of the Senators: You will be missed, but all of us are looking forward to witnessing your rise, your contributions, and the light you are going to bring to a world that still has too much darkness.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 115-123, on behalf of the Republican Leader of the Senate, reappoints the following individual as a member of the Commission on Social Impact Partnerships: Ryan T.E. Martin of Virginia.

MISSING CHILDREN'S ASSISTANCE REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2023

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I understand the Senate has received the House message to accompany S. 2051.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask the Chair lay before the body the House message to accompany S. 2051.

The Presiding Officer laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives:

Resolved, That the bill from the Senate (S. 2051) entitled "An Act to reauthorize the Missing Children's Assistance Act, and for other purposes," do pass with an amendment.

MOTION TO CONCUR

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 2051 and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

NORTHERN BORDER COORDINATION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 257, S. 2291.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2291) to establish the Northern Border Coordination Center, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Northern Border Coordination Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CENTER.**—The term “Center” means the Northern Border Coordination Center established pursuant to section 3.

(2) **C-UAS.**—The term “C-UAS” means counter-unmanned aircraft systems.

(3) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) **NORTHERN BORDER.**—The term “northern border” means the international border between the United States and Canada.

(5) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(6) **UNMANNED AIRCRAFT; UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.**—The terms “unmanned aircraft” and “unmanned aircraft system” have the meanings given such terms in section 44801 of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 3. NORTHERN BORDER COORDINATION CENTER.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the Northern Border Coordination Center.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the Center shall be to serve as the Department’s forward deployed centralized coordination center for operations, domain awareness, information sharing, intelligence, training, and stakeholder engagement with Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners along the northern border of the United States at a location that is collocated with an existing U.S. Border Patrol sector headquarters, the U.S. Border Patrol Northern Border Coordination Center, an Air and Marine Operations branch, and a United States Coast Guard air station.

(c) **COMPONENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Center shall collocate personnel and activities of—

(A) U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including U.S. Border Patrol and Air and Marine Operations;

(B) the United States Coast Guard;

(C) Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers;

(D) the Science and Technology Directorate;

(E) other components and offices of the Department that the Secretary determines to be necessary; and

(F) additional Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners, as the Secretary determines to be necessary and appropriate to support operations described in this Act.

(d) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Center shall perform the functions described in this subsection in addition to any other functions assigned by the Secretary.

(1) **NORTHERN BORDER SECURITY STRATEGY.**—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall—

(A) serve as a coordination mechanism for operational components for the implementation, evaluation, and updating of the Northern Border Security Strategy and any successor strategy; and

(B) support the development of best practices and policies for personnel at the northern border to support such implementation.

(2) **TRAINING.**—The Center shall serve as a training location to support the delivery of training or exercises for Department personnel and Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners.

(3) **METRICS.**—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall coordinate the development and tracking of border security metrics for the northern border.

(4) **RESOURCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL NEEDS AND CHALLENGES.**—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall—

(A) identify resource and technological needs or challenges affecting security along the northern border;

(B) serve as a testing ground and demonstration location for the testing of border security technology, including determining such technology’s suitability and performance in the northern border and maritime environments; and

(C) develop and test new technological capabilities to respond to the increased use of unmanned aircraft systems, including to specifically improve domain awareness along the northern border.

(5) **AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS.**—

(A) **QUICK REACTION CAPABILITIES.**—In support of the Center, U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s Air and Marine Operations—

(i) shall establish and maintain capability that is collocated with the Center and available for quick deployment in support of the northern border missions of the Center, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Department, specifically missions in the Great Lakes region; and

(ii) in coordination with the Center and relevant offices and components of the Department, shall evaluate requirements and make recommendations to support the operations of large unmanned aircraft systems based at the Center.

(B) **NORTHERN BORDER DOMAIN AWARENESS.**—In order to coordinate with the Center and support its operations, the Air and Marine Operations Center shall establish a unit at the Center to provide the Center the capability—

(i) to support air and maritime domain awareness and information sharing efforts along the northern border;

(ii) to provide dedicated monitoring of northern border systems; and

(iii) to lead, in coordination with other U.S. Customs and Border Protection components, Federal, State, tribal, local, and international governments, and private sector partners, the Center’s efforts to track and monitor legitimate cross-border traffic involving unmanned aircraft and unmanned aircraft systems.

(6) **COUNTER-UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.**—The Center shall support counter-unmanned aircraft systems operations along the northern border to respond to the increased use of unmanned aircraft systems.

(7) **PRIVACY AND CIVIL RIGHTS.**—The Center, in collaboration with the Chief Privacy Officer and the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department, shall ensure that operations and practices of the Center comply with the privacy and civil rights policies of the Department and its components.

(e) **ANNUAL REPORTING.**—Not later than 180 days after the establishment of the Center, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that describes the activities of the Center during the most recently concluded fiscal year, including—

(1) personnel levels;

(2) additional resources that are needed to support the operations of the Center and northern border operations of the Department; and

(3) any additional assets or authorities that are needed to increase security and domain awareness along the northern border.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Northern Border Coordination Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CENTER.**—The term “Center” means the Northern Border Coordination Center established pursuant to section 3.

(2) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term “Department” means the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) **NORTHERN BORDER.**—The term “northern border” means the international border between the United States and Canada.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. NORTHERN BORDER COORDINATION CENTER.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the Northern Border Coordination Center.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the Center shall be to serve as the Department’s forward deployed centralized coordination center for operations, domain awareness, information sharing, intelligence, training, and stakeholder engagement with Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners along the northern border of the United States. The Center shall be placed along the northern border at a location that is collocated with an existing U.S. Border Patrol sector headquarters, an Air and Marine Operations branch, and a United States Coast Guard air station, and other existing Department activities.

(c) **COMPONENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Center shall collocate personnel and activities of—

(A) U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including U.S. Border Patrol and Air and Marine Operations;

(B) the United States Coast Guard;

(C) U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement’s Homeland Security Investigations;

(D) other components and offices of the Department that the Secretary determines to be necessary, including to support the training, technology testing, and development described in subsection (d); and

(E) additional Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners, as the Secretary determines to be necessary and appropriate to support the coordination of operations described in this Act.

(d) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Center shall perform the functions described in this subsection in addition to any other functions assigned by the Secretary.

(1) **NORTHERN BORDER STRATEGY.**—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall—

(A) serve as a coordination mechanism for operational components for the implementation, evaluation, and updating of the Northern Border Strategy and any successor strategy; and

(B) support the development of best practices and policies for personnel at the northern border to support such implementation.

(2) **TRAINING.**—The Center shall serve as a training location to support the delivery of training or exercises for Department personnel and Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners.

(3) **METRICS.**—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall coordinate the development and tracking of border security metrics for the northern border.

(4) **RESOURCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL NEEDS AND CHALLENGES.**—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall—

(A) identify resource and technological needs or challenges affecting security along the northern border; and

(B) serve as a testing ground and demonstration location for the testing of border security technology, including determining such technology’s suitability and performance in the northern border and maritime environments.

(5) **AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS.**—

(A) **QUICK REACTION CAPABILITIES.**—In support of the Center, U.S. Customs and Border Protection’s Air and Marine Operations—

(i) shall establish and maintain capability that is collocated with the Center and available for quick deployment in support of the northern border missions, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Department, including missions in the Great Lakes region; and

(ii) in coordination with the Center and relevant offices and components of the Department, shall evaluate requirements and make recommendations to support the operations of large unmanned aircraft systems based at the Center.

(B) **NORTHERN BORDER DOMAIN AWARENESS.**—In order to coordinate with the Center and support its operations, the Air and Marine Operations Center shall collocate personnel and resources with the Center to enhance the Department's capabilities to—

(i) support air and maritime domain awareness and information sharing efforts along the northern border;

(ii) provide dedicated monitoring of northern border systems; and

(iii) lead, in coordination with other U.S. Customs and Border Protection components, Federal, State, tribal, local, and international governments, and private sector partners, the Center's efforts to track and monitor legitimate cross-border traffic involving unmanned aircraft and unmanned aircraft systems.

(6) **COUNTER-UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.**—Pursuant to policies established by the Secretary, the Center shall support counter-unmanned aircraft systems operations along the northern border to respond to the increased use of unmanned aircraft systems. Such support may involve development, testing, and evaluation of technologies.

(7) **PRIVACY AND CIVIL RIGHTS.**—The Center, in collaboration with the Chief Privacy Officer and the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department, shall ensure that operations and practices of the Center comply with the privacy and civil rights policies of the Department and its components.

(e) **ANNUAL REPORTING.**—Not later than 180 days after the establishment of the Center, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives that describes the activities of the Center during the most recently concluded fiscal year, including—

(1) personnel levels;

(2) additional resources that are needed to support the operations of the Center and northern border operations of the Department; and

(3) any additional assets or authorities that are needed to increase security and domain awareness along the northern border.

(f) **TEMPORARY DUTY ASSIGNMENTS.**—The Secretary shall submit a quarterly report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives regarding temporary duty assignments of U.S. Border Patrol agents during the reporting period, including—

(1) the number of agents on temporary duty assignment;

(2) the duration of the temporary duty assignment; and

(3) the sectors from which the agents were assigned.

(g) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The Center established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be established separate and distinct from the Secretary's authorities under section 708 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 348).

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn; that the Peters substitute amendment, which is at the desk, be considered and agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be considered read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 2073) was agreed to as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Northern Border Coordination Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **CENTER.**—The term "Center" means the Northern Border Coordination Center established pursuant to section 3.

(2) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term "Department" means the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) **NORTHERN BORDER.**—The term "northern border" means—

(A) the international border between the United States and Canada; and

(B) the maritime border between Alaska and the Russian Federation.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 3. NORTHERN BORDER COORDINATION CENTER.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish the Northern Border Coordination Center.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the Center shall be to serve as the Department's forward deployed centralized coordination center for operations, domain awareness, information sharing, intelligence, training, and stakeholder engagement with Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners along the northern border of the United States. The Center shall be placed along the northern border at a location that is collocated with an existing U.S. Border Patrol sector headquarters, an Air and Marine Operations branch, and a United States Coast Guard air station, and other existing Department activities.

(c) **COMPONENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Center shall collocate personnel and activities of—

(A) U.S. Customs and Border Protection, including U.S. Border Patrol and Air and Marine Operations;

(B) the United States Coast Guard;

(C) U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement's Homeland Security Investigations;

(D) other components and offices of the Department that the Secretary determines to be necessary, including to support the training, technology testing, and development described in subsection (d); and

(E) additional Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners, as the Secretary determines to be necessary and appropriate to support the coordination of operations described in this Act.

(d) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Center shall perform the functions described in this subsection in addition to any other functions assigned by the Secretary.

(1) **NORTHERN BORDER STRATEGY.**—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall—

(A) serve as a coordination mechanism for operational components for the implementation, evaluation, and updating of the Northern Border Strategy and any successor strategy; and

(B) support the development of best practices and policies for personnel at the northern border to support such implementation.

(2) **TRAINING.**—The Center shall serve as a training location to support the delivery of training or exercises for Department personnel and Federal, State, tribal, local, and international government partners.

(3) **METRICS.**—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall coordinate the development and tracking of border security metrics for the northern border.

(4) **RESOURCE AND TECHNOLOGICAL NEEDS AND CHALLENGES.**—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall—

(A) identify resource and technological needs or challenges affecting security along the northern border; and

(B) serve as a testing ground and demonstration location for the testing of border security technology, including determining such technology's suitability and performance in the northern border and maritime environments.

(5) **AIR AND MARINE OPERATIONS.**—

(A) **QUICK REACTION CAPABILITIES.**—In support of the Center, U.S. Customs and Border Protection's Air and Marine Operations—

(i) shall establish and maintain capability that is collocated with the Center and available for quick deployment in support of the northern border missions, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, and the Department, including missions in the Great Lakes region; and

(ii) in coordination with the Center and relevant offices and components of the Department, shall evaluate requirements and make recommendations to support the operations of large unmanned aircraft systems based at the Center.

(B) **NORTHERN BORDER DOMAIN AWARENESS.**—In order to coordinate with the Center and support its operations, the Air and Marine Operations Center shall collocate personnel and resources with the Center to enhance the Department's capabilities to—

(i) support air and maritime domain awareness and information sharing efforts along the northern border;

(ii) provide dedicated monitoring of northern border systems; and

(iii) lead, in coordination with other U.S. Customs and Border Protection components, Federal, State, tribal, local, and international governments, and private sector partners, the Center's efforts to track and monitor legitimate cross-border traffic involving unmanned aircraft and unmanned aircraft systems.

(6) **COUNTER-UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEMS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Pursuant to policies established by the Secretary, consistent with section 210G of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 124n), the Center shall support counter-unmanned aircraft systems operations along the northern border to respond to the increased use of unmanned aircraft systems. Such support may involve development, testing, and evaluation of technologies.

(B) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act may be construed to provide additional authority related to detection, mitigation, research, development, or testing of unmanned aircraft systems or counter-unmanned aircraft systems.

(7) **PRIVACY AND CIVIL RIGHTS.**—The Center, in collaboration with the Chief Privacy Officer and the Office for Civil Rights and Civil Liberties of the Department, shall ensure that operations and practices of the Center comply with the privacy and civil rights policies of the Department and its components.

(8) **NONCONTIGUOUS NORTHERN BORDER.**—The Center, in collaboration with relevant offices and components of the Department, shall—

(A) identify the specific challenges that exist along the noncontiguous international land border with Canada and the maritime border with Russia, including resource, technological challenges, and domain awareness;

(B) ensure that dedicated personnel, including reachback support, are working to evaluate and address the challenges identified pursuant to subparagraph (A); and

(C) determine the feasibility of establishing a satellite facility of the Center to address the specific challenges identified pursuant to subparagraph (A).

(e) ANNUAL REPORTING.—Not later than 180 days after the establishment of the Center, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives that describes the activities of the Center during the most recently concluded fiscal year, including—

- (1) personnel levels;
- (2) additional resources that are needed to support the operations of the Center and northern border operations of the Department; and
- (3) any additional assets or authorities that are needed to increase security and domain awareness along the northern border.

(f) TEMPORARY DUTY ASSIGNMENTS.—The Secretary shall submit a quarterly report to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives regarding temporary duty assignments of U.S. Border Patrol agents during the reporting period, including—

- (1) the number of agents on temporary duty assignment;
- (2) the duration of the temporary duty assignment; and
- (3) the sectors from which the agents were assigned.

(g) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The Center established pursuant to subsection (a) shall be established separate and distinct from the Secretary's authorities under section 708 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 348).

(h) SUNSET.—This Act shall cease to be effective on the date that is 7 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The bill (No. 2291), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL NALOXONE AWARENESS DAY

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 726, which is at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:
A resolution (S. Res. 726) designating June 6, 2024, as National Naloxone Awareness Day.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. SCHUMER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 726) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JUNE 7, 2024, THROUGH TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 2024

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn to then convene for a pro forma session only, with no business being conducted, on Friday June 7, at 10 a.m.; further, that when the Senate adjourns on Friday, June 7, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Tuesday, June 11; that on Tuesday, 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 following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Rosner

nomination; further, that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Tuesday.

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL FRIDAY, JUNE 7, 2024, AT 10 A.M.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam 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 5:53 p.m., adjourned until Friday, June 7, 2024, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

MICHAEL G. HEATH, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MALAWI.

KIN MOY, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM.

JAMES STORY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MOZAMBIQUE.

JULIE SMITH, OF MICHIGAN, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (POLITICAL AFFAIRS), VICE VICTORIA NULAND, RESIGNED.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION

MARK G. ESKENAZI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REVIEW COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING APRIL 27, 2027, VICE JAMES J. SULLIVAN, JR., TERM EXPIRED.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 5, 2024:

THE JUDICIARY

JUDITH E. PIPE, 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.