



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 169

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 25, 2023

No. 128

## Senate

The Senate met at 3 p.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.

O God our refuge and strength, whose compassion encompasses humanity and whose mercy never fails, empower our Senators to be partners with You in Your redeeming purposes for this Earth. Remind them that the only greatness they will ever know is linked to Your transforming might.

Lord, as they strive to please You, make them seekers after peace, justice, and freedom. Transform this storied Chamber of our legislative branch into a place of vision, a lighthouse of hope, and a source of solace for those battered by life's raging storms. May the Members of this body become architects of a new order of peace and justice for our Nation and world.

We pray in Your great 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 assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, DC, July 25, 2023.

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.

### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2024—Resumed

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2226, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2226) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2024 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Schumer (for Reed-Wicker) amendment No. 935, in the nature of a substitute.

Schumer amendment No. 936 (to amendment No. 935), to add an effective date.

#### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

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

S. 2226

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I want to thank my colleagues for all of the good

work so far on the NDAA, the National Defense Authorization Act. We were very productive last week, and I hope this week can be equally so.

Today, we will begin our work by holding two floor votes, one on Senators CORNYN and CASEY's outbound investment screen amendment and then a vote on the Round-Tester farmlands amendment. Both of these amendments have been in the works for months, and I intend to vote in their favor. I urge my colleagues to do so as well.

I know there are concerns on both sides of the aisle with some of the text in both amendments. Senators CORNYN, CASEY, ROUNDS, TESTER, and I are all committed to working through these concerns in the conference process.

Tomorrow, we will vote on the Warnock-Budd amendment designed to halt debt collector harassment of our servicemembers. Again, I appreciate the cooperation of Senators on both sides as we worked to lock in these votes.

And today and tomorrow, Leader MCCONNELL, Chair REED, Ranking Member WICKER, and I will also work on assembling a second managers' package of amendments.

I hope this effort is successful. It will require everyone to work together, and we cannot let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

Concurrently, we will also keep working on additional floor votes that we might need to finish the NDAA this week. We have a chance to show the American people that the Senate can work productively on our national defense, in stark contrast to the partisan race to the bottom that we saw over in the House.

But the work isn't finished yet. We are going to keep negotiating a path forward, and the Senate will continue working on the NDAA until the job is done. I thank both sides for their efforts.

#### BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Mr. President, now on other Senate business, as we move forward with the

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



Printed on recycled paper.

S3503

NDAAs here on the floor, appropriators also continue working in committee. Last week, the Appropriations Committee marked up and approved three more bills, and, this week, they will hold another markup on Thursday. Just like the NDAA, I am proud to say the appropriations process has been largely bipartisan, precisely as it should be.

And, finally, with so much going on this week, I want to remind my colleagues that we will be holding our third all-Senators briefing on AI, following up on our classified briefing earlier this month. I thank all of my colleagues for making the time to attend these AI briefings.

Today, I also wish to recognize the efforts of the Judiciary Committee, which this afternoon is holding its own hearing on AI regulation. They join the work of many other committees that have moved quickly this year to begin focusing on AI in a very serious way.

The Senate will continue ramping up our focus on AI policy when we begin hosting our Insight Forums later this fall.

So, once again, thank you to my colleagues for their good work on this pressing matter.

#### INFLATION REDUCTION ACT

Mr. President, now on the IRA and its 1-year anniversary. We are approaching the 1-year anniversary of the passage of the Inflation Reduction Act. The Inflation Reduction Act, known as the IRA, was one of the most consequential pieces of legislation passed in decades, and in just one year it is already paying huge dividends for the American people, for our economy, and for our environment.

Since we passed the Inflation Reduction Act, costs are down for families. For the first time ever, we made it possible for Medicare to negotiate the price of prescription drugs. Vaccines are free for Medicare beneficiaries. A cap on out-of-pocket drug spending for seniors is just a few months away. No one will pay more than \$2,000 a year for expensive drugs that they need to save their lives.

And, of course, after a lot of hard work, we also capped the price of insulin for seniors on Medicare to \$35—only \$35—a month. Since then, Ely Lilly and Novo Nordisk have also lowered insulin costs for everybody.

And we hope to build on all of this work with additional legislation later this year. Every American deserves to have affordable insulin, not just those on Medicare. Let's not forget that the patent for insulin expired a long time ago. It was invented in 1921 or 1922—I believe it was—by a Canadian inventor who sold the patent for only a dollar. So there is no need to have insulin at the exorbitant high price that it is for those not on Medicare.

The Inflation Reduction Act has also helped countless Americans manage their energy costs. The tax credits and rebates on energy efficiency are helping Americans keep their homes warm-

er in the winter and cooler in the summer, all at a more affordable price, while at the same time reducing our carbon emissions.

And a few weeks ago, we saw that inflation slowed down to just 3 percent, the lowest it has been in over 2 years. In fact, since we passed the Inflation Reduction Act, inflation has been cut by more than half on an annual basis, and wage growth is still continuing to grow. It is now significantly above inflation, meaning workers are taking home more while spending less. That is the emblem of an economy that America needs.

And, of course, the IRA is also paving the way for millions—millions—of new good-paying green jobs. The IRA produced a boom in clean energy investment with nearly 80 new clean energy manufacturing facilities announced across the country.

So when you put it all together, the Inflation Reduction Act is a shining example of the Democratic agenda in action: lower costs for families, higher wages for workers, and millions—millions—of new good-paying jobs for years to come.

Democrats are proud of the progress we have made in implementing our agenda and will keep working until every American feels the benefits.

#### HONORING OFFICER JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

Mr. President, finally, on a sad anniversary, yesterday marked 25 years since Detective John Gibson and Officer Jacob Chestnut of the Capitol Police were killed in the line of duty while defending the Capitol Building.

It was a dark day in the history of the Capitol, and it would have been even darker if not for the heroics of Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut. In the face of grave danger, they acted with extreme valor and courage, undoubtedly saving the lives of many others in the building that day.

We are grateful for their sacrifice 25 years ago and grateful for the work the Capitol Police do every day to keep the Capitol Complex and those who work here safe.

And we pray that their families have some degree of peace, even though they have huge holes in their heart with these terrible losses.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I need to begin my remarks today by acknowledging two solemn anniversaries.

Yesterday marked 25 years since a deranged gunman shattered the calm of a summer afternoon here at the Capitol, 25 years since two brave members

of the United States Capitol Police—Jacob Joseph Chestnut and Detective John Michael Gibson—paid the ultimate price to keep us safe.

The senseless tragedy of July 24, 1998, robbed two families of beloved husbands and fathers. It deprived fellow officers of devoted colleagues and friends. But that day, the sacrifice of Officer Chestnut and Detective Gibson saved lives. They protected the law-makers and staff who come here to work, the tourists who come here to encounter the heart of our democracy, and the institutions of Congress themselves. And they reminded an entire nation of the vital service the men and women of the Capitol Police render honorably every day.

Time will not heal the pain of losing these fine men, but in a special way today, I know my colleagues join me in extending our sympathies to the families of Jacob Chestnut and John Gibson and to their comrades in the Capitol Police. America will never forget their service and sacrifice.

#### KENTUCKY FLOODING

Mr. President, tomorrow will mark 1 year since the brave people of Eastern Kentucky endured some of the worst flooding in the Commonwealth's history. Heavy rains and rising water caused mass evacuations and over 40 deaths, including a number of children. Roads turned to rapids, neighborhoods were swept away overnight, and families were left stranded.

In communities like Lost Creek, where I stood with Jackson Mayor Laura Thomas, not a single home was left untouched. From Lost Creek to communities and counties like Pike, Letcher, Knott, and Breathitt, I saw similar scenes of devastation and heard the painful stories of families displaced by the floods. But in the face of devastation, Kentucky's first responders rushed to help neighbors in their time of need.

As the full scope of the disaster became clear, I worked with leaders at FEMA to cut through redtape and encouraged a rapid Federal response. I made sure that Eastern Kentucky received big investments in recovery and that local leaders got more autonomy to restore communities, rebuild homes, and revitalize the economy.

Last year's tragedy tested Eastern Kentucky's resolve, and today, there is still work to be done. But Kentuckians are resilient. We rise up to the big challenges. I will continue to work with folks in Eastern Kentucky to build their communities back even stronger than before.

#### U.S. SUPREME COURT

Mr. President, on an entirely different matter, Democrats on the Judiciary Committee spent last Thursday considering the best way to reach from article I of the Constitution into article III and tell a coequal branch of government how to conduct its business.

The pretext for this latest chapter in Democrats' war on the institution of the Supreme Court was "ethics and

transparency.” They had a supposedly urgent legislative bone to pick with Justices who take vacations and publish children’s books. But for all our colleagues’ heartburn over a textualist Court that won’t reliably affirm their political preferences, for all of the baseless commotion about undue outside influence, Senate Democrats have proven themselves to be quite thoroughly influenced by the far left’s most notorious dark money advocates and discredited causes.

Here are some of the recent marching orders our colleagues have received from the activist left:

“Start taking on the court rhetorically as a political villain.”

“We’d like to amplify anyone who uses this corruption/legitimacy messaging.”

“Restrain MAGA justices immediately.”

“Rip the veil off.”

Well, Mr. President, Senate Democrats have dutifully followed their orders. In their words:

The Supreme Court is “MAGA-captured.”

We have a “stilted, illegitimate” Court.

“We need to expand the Court.”

One Senator let the cat out of the bag, saying that this supposed “ethics” inquiry is just a predicate to Court packing. Quote: “I don’t think we should foreclose that in an amendment.”

Our colleagues understand what the far left expects of them. They know that their party’s base has long since discarded any desire to achieve its goals from within our institutions. So last week, they rammed a blatant power grab through the Judiciary Committee as part of their effort to tear down a branch of government they can’t control.

Well, Senate Republicans are going to keep fighting this dangerous campaign at every step of the way, and in the meantime, our Nation’s highest Court should continue to pay it no mind.

#### UKRAINE

Mr. President, now on one final matter, Russia’s violence against civil infrastructure in Ukraine continues, but the consequences of this unilateral destruction extend far beyond Ukraine’s borders.

Just a week has passed since Vladimir Putin pulled out of the agreement that had allowed critical Ukrainian grain shipments to transit the Black Sea unharmed. But already, Russia has expanded from threatening vessels carrying the world’s grain supply to attacking grain storage in Odessa and other coastal cities.

Yesterday’s attacks are the latest in the wave of violence against agricultural infrastructure that will punish the world’s poorest and hungriest nations. Leaders in the developing world who have hesitated to cast blame in this conflict should take a careful look at Russia’s unprovoked behavior.

But Russia hasn’t limited its non-military targets to grain supplies. On Sunday, Russia struck Odessa’s largest Orthodox cathedral with a deadly missile barrage. So much for Russian propaganda efforts to present the Kremlin as a defender of the faithful. Of course, Putin, like many of his Soviet predecessors, has already done so much to corrupt and control the Russian Orthodox Church that we should not be surprised by his disrespect for religious institutions.

So let’s be very clear. A regime that exploits the clerics as propagandists and agents of influence and that destroys historical houses of worship is not—not—a friend to believers.

Now, as Ukraine’s counteroffensive makes slow progress, the United States and our allies can be sure of a few things.

First, our friends are using the munitions we have sent them, including the cluster munitions that are now hammering Russian positions in occupied Ukraine.

Second, at every step of the way, the Biden administration’s indecision and inaction have meant certain key capabilities have arrived late—late—to the battlefield.

And, third, additional long-range firearms would help Ukraine put Russian invaders on the back foot as our friends have already demonstrated by successfully using British Storm Shadow cruise missiles.

So the Biden administration needs to start moving at the speed of relevance—at the speed of relevance—and give our friends in Ukraine the lethal tools they need to finish their fight.

For our part, as we work to provide for the common defense, the Senate must invest in a defense industrial base that can sustain America’s support for Ukraine while equipping our own forces to deter further threats from Russia and China.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

HONORING OFFICER JAKE WALLIN

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. President, tomorrow, thousands of people will gather at Scheels Arena in Fargo, ND, to pay a final tribute to a hero. I wish I could be there to celebrate his life as well. It was a life that was well lived while being far too short. Fargo Police Officer Jake Wallin was laid to rest on Saturday in the small Midwest town of Pequot Lakes, MN.

Eleven days ago, on July 14, Officer Wallin was killed as he and fellow officers Andrew Dotas, Tyler Hawes, and Zachary Robinson responded to, really, a routine fender bender, where they were ambushed by an uninvolved assailant who was armed with several weapons, 1,800 rounds of ammunition, and multiple homemade explosive devices—clearly intent on going on a murder spree. Officer Robinson, the last cop standing, swiftly responded to neutralize the threat, fatally shooting the hate-filled killer.

Officer Wallin was murdered for simply being a cop, a peace officer, helping

ordinary people in need of assistance—a life-long public servant gunned down simply because of the uniform and badge that he wore. He has been, is, and will forever be a hero to our community.

Jake grew up in St. Michael, MN, and enlisted in the Minnesota National Guard after graduating from high school. He served our country on deployment to Iraq and Afghanistan before returning home and joining the Fargo Police Department in April of this year—3 months on the job.

Like so many boys and girls, Jake wanted to be a police officer more than anything. In fact, his father Jeff said in an interview that he “could never have stopped him” from joining the force. He always wanted a job with purpose behind it and said he didn’t want to work behind a desk.

He said, in fact:

I want to be doing something I can tell myself at the end of the day that I made a difference somehow.

That, colleagues, is the quote of an American hero. We need more heroes like Jake who are ready to answer the call.

In the time since Officer Wallin’s passing, Fargo hardware stores have experienced a phenomenon that many outside Minnesota would find baffling. Across the city, stores are almost completely sold out of blue light bulbs as people have rushed out to purchase them and light their porches and their homes blue in support of Jake and the Fargo Police Department’s officers.

I wish every State were like North Dakota and every American had the same respect and admiration for our law enforcement officers. In our neck of the woods, we pass these values down to our children as we teach them the importance of law and order and as we hope to inspire them to, one day, be police officers like Officer Wallin—protecting and serving their communities.

Our actions matter whether we want to acknowledge it or not. The end result of ruthless attacks on the men and women in uniform, whether with our words or actions or calls to defund the police, have never been clearer than in what transpired in Fargo just 11 days ago.

We do not know the assailant’s motives, but it is abundantly clear that he singled out the officers in his pursuit of a sick, twisted plan to wreak havoc in our community. He sought them out because of the job that they were doing.

While we are slowly learning the details of this senseless, tragic day, we know Officer Wallin is a hero who died while serving his community. Heroes like Jake bravely respond to the call and serve without hesitating, without knowing what might be around the corner or at the end of the parking lot.

Kris and I are praying for the recovery of fellow officers Andrew Dotas and Tyler Hawes, as well as bystander Karlee Koswick, the entire Fargo Police Department, and fellow officers

throughout our community, our State, and our country.

We also pray that God's peace—the peace that Scripture tells us “passes all understanding”—will come to Jake's fiancée Winter, to his parents Jeff and Amy, to his brother Brady, and to his brothers and sisters in blue as they mourn this terrible loss.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jake Wallin's obituary be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### OBITUARY

Jake Ryan Wallin, 23, died in the line of duty as a Fargo Police Officer on July 14, 2023.

He was born November 23, 1999, in South Carolina, the son of Jeff Wallin and Amy (Shuler) Wallin.

Jake grew up in St. Michael and graduated from St. Michael-Albertville High School and Alexandria Technical and Community College. He attended the American Military University. He served in the Minnesota National Guard and was deployed to Afghanistan and Iraq before returning stateside to make his home in Fargo, ND. He became a Fargo Police officer in April of 2023 and was on duty at the time of his death.

Jake wanted to live a life of purpose, where what he did meant something at the end of the day. His short adult years were spent in service to others. Not only to his country and his community, he was also dedicated to and loved dearly, his friends, family, fiancée, and his dog, Thor. His smile brightened any room. His laughter was contagious. He enjoyed life and all it had to offer. A life that was cut short doing a job he loved.

Jake is survived by his loving parents, Jeff and Amy (Shuler) Wallin, his beloved brother Brady, all of Saint Michael; his fiancée, Winter Malone, of Fargo; his grandparents John and Carolee Wallin of Pequot Lakes, Minn., and grandparents Jerry and Deborah Shuler, of Rock Hill, South Carolina, along with his aunts, uncles, and cousins.

A funeral service will take place at Pequot Lakes High School at 10:30 a.m. on Saturday, July 22, at 30805 Olson Street, Pequot Lakes, MN 56472.

A private service will be held graveside at Greenwood Cemetery in Nisswa following the service.

In lieu of flowers, please make donations to the Soldier's 6 at Soldiers6.com.

Arrangements by Kline Funeral Home, Pequot Lakes, MN.

Mr. CRAMER. I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise today and join my colleague Senator CRAMER to pay tribute to a truly exceptional young man, Fargo Police Officer Jake Wallin.

Tomorrow, the Fargo community will gather to honor Officer Wallin, who was tragically killed in the line of duty on July 14. The Senate's debate on the National Defense Authorization Act prevents both myself and Senator CRAMER from being there in person. So we wanted to do what we could to pay our respects here to Officer Wallin on the Senate floor.

As a member of the Minnesota National Guard, he served both in Afghanistan and in Iraq. His platoon captain had this to say of Officer Wallin:

Jake was that individual that you could always trust. Any time that you asked him to step up or do anything, there was no hesitation.

That dedication to service continued after his deployments to the Middle East. Following his time overseas, Jake made his home in Fargo, ND. He graduated from the Fargo Police Academy and joined the Fargo Police Department because, as he put it, “I've always wanted to work in some sort of position that had purpose behind my job. Police officer is always what came to me.”

Jake had only been on the job since April, but his impact on the community will not be forgotten. Police Chief Zibolski said that, even in his final moments, he was thinking of his fellow officers and trying to save the lives of those fellow officers.

My wife Mikey and I send our sincerest condolences also to his parents Jeff and Amy, his brother Brady, his fiancée Winter, and all of Jake's loved ones.

At the same time, we continue to pray for his fellow officers, especially Officers Andrew Dotas and Tyler Hawes, who were injured in the ambush. They were both shot as well. We are also grateful to Officer Zach Robinson, who was able to put an end to this horrific incident and whose bravery will never be forgotten. These peace officers have a long road to recovery and will continue to be in our prayers.

This tragic event is a reminder of the dangers our law enforcement officials face each and every day and of the enormous debt we owe them and their families for the sacrifices they make to keep our communities safe. We are truly grateful to our peace officers—all of them—whether they are in North Dakota or anywhere across this amazing country. We truly value them. We owe them so much, and we are truly grateful to all of them.

Particularly, we honor Officer Jake Wallin for making the ultimate sacrifice on our behalf. May God bless him and his family.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia.

#### TRIBUTE TO JOEL BRUBAKER

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, I rise today to bid farewell to a good friend, a great confidant, and a strong leader: my chief of staff of over 18 years, Joel Brubaker.

I am joined in the Galleries by many folks who have worked with him, who know him, and who love him just as I do.

Joel started with me in the year 2005, when I was just entering my third term in the U.S. House. His experience in working with Bill Shuster and Bob Walker—both Pennsylvania Representatives from Joel's home State of Pennsylvania—prepared him well to head up a growing and aggressive congressional office from West Virginia.

Joel's path to Capitol Hill started in Lancaster, PA. He was born there and

was raised by his mother Eleanor. I haven't had the chance to meet Eleanor yet, but from what Joel has told me, she is a strong and independent woman.

Joel is also the youngest of four boys. My husband and I have always said that, no matter what the problem is, big or small, Joel handles it exactly like the youngest of four boys would—calmly, for the most part, and like it is no big deal.

After graduating from high school, Joel went to Gettysburg College and, later, picked up an MBA at American University.

His talents as a legislative director for then-Congressman Shuster led me to realize that those very same talents were perfect for our office to help us make decisions, to hire people. And do you know what? The results speak for themselves.

Last week, we had a gathering of well-wishers to send Joel off. The room was full—full of folks from hockey players to former employees to co-workers to friends from West Virginia to neighbors and family, including my very own family, because our families are very much together. It was great to see so many individuals from all walks of life gathered in one place to wish Joel a good sendoff from a place that he truly loves.

Speaking of things that Joel truly loves, he has quite a few favorites in his life. First of all, Katrina, his wife of many years—who is one of my favorites too—and their two terrific children, Kat and Heath. Believe it or not, I remember Kat and Heath's births and their birthdays. Kat was a page here a couple of weeks ago, and we loved it. In fact, Katrina was 6 months pregnant with Kat when I interviewed Joel for the job of chief of staff, and now Kat is going to be away for her freshman year at Ole Miss.

Ice hockey is another one of Joel's favorite things. Whether it is pond hockey in freezing New Hampshire, going to a Caps game, watching his kids play hockey, or the Capitol Members hockey game—which, I must admit, he is a star there—he just loves the game. And he has the lineup of framed jerseys in his office to prove it.

Joel loves beef jerky; Chick-fil-A; Disney World and crazy rides; decorating his house outrageously for Halloween and Christmas—for those of you who live in Arlington, yes, that is his house—politics, especially West Virginia politics; and the Fourth of July. He always attends the national Independence Day celebration on the Capitol lawn.

That brings me to another strong attribute that we will miss about Joel. Joel loves his country and our traditional American values. He has not—and never has been—one to shy away from talking about what a great country we have. And he is grateful. He is grateful for that.

Joel has a great sense of integrity, and he is always careful—very careful—to make sure that we are all working within the boundaries of our office—and for me, especially, my oath of office. I appreciate his very keen sense of right and wrong, and I will miss the way we both see our duties through the same lens.

Now, Joel is not perfect. He will not fly into our great State of West Virginia, and he hasn't for many years. Apparently, one flight was just a little bit too much for him over those mountains, so he began to name our airlines "Air Fallujah."

He almost stayed overnight one time in my district office to fend off some very aggressive protesters, and he is known to have a camping-style cot that is very unique that he used in our campaign office once upon a time. Rumor has it the cot still exists today, despite Katrina's best efforts to get rid of it.

You could always tell you are getting under Joel's skin because his voice always raises an extra octave.

Apparently, Joel and I had three disagreements over 18 years. But do you know what? He tells me—and I am pretty sure—I think I won all of them.

Joel's sense of humor has carried us through tough times, hard campaigns, long days and nights, missed vacations, and challenges associated with larger and larger responsibilities.

I personally will always appreciate his affection for both of my parents and his compassion for the difficulties of watching them decline. Our whole family will miss Joel, because we really are parts of each other's families.

Joel has an enormous affection for West Virginia. He is a Mountaineer and holds the same sense of pride in our foundations and aspirations as if he had been there his whole life.

As I have often said in my speeches, and I will say to him: The country roads of West Virginia will always welcome you home, Joel. Good luck. We will miss you. You will always be a big part of my life and our lives. Eighteen years is a long time, but it has all been great. Thanks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii.

NOMINATION OF JULIE A. SU

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise to express my support and appreciation for Acting Secretary of Labor Julie Su and all she is doing to uplift workers and businesses across our country.

Acting Secretary Su has been leading the Department of Labor for nearly 5 months. She previously served as Deputy Secretary of Labor. In both positions, she has shown her ability to bring people together—labor and management—to resolve disputes. She did so to avert a freight railroad strike, and recently, as Acting Secretary, she helped avert a catastrophic strike at ports all across the west coast. Had major ports across our country come to a screeching halt, our country would have been subjected to massive supply

chain disruptions, costing our economy billions of dollars.

As Gene Seroka, director of the Port of Los Angeles, put it, Julie was "a constant and reassuring voice of reason that helped to keep both sides at the bargaining table and focused on resolution."

As she often does, Julie got the job done without fanfare or attention. She didn't ask for credit or recognition; she simply did the job. And that is what she has done throughout her career, whether while fighting for undocumented garment workers in California or helping the Biden-Harris administration create more than 13 million jobs.

Julie Su isn't a politician. She has dedicated her life to fighting for working people and leveling the playing field between labor and Big Business. She knows that the work of the Department of Labor isn't about her; it is about the millions of working people who keep our economy and our country moving forward.

Now, Mr. President, when I first immigrated to this country, we just had one suitcase, and our first home was a boarding house where we shared a single bed sleeping sideways.

My mother's perseverance eventually enabled her to get a job at the Honolulu Advertiser, our local newspaper. And while the job was nonunion when she was first hired, my mother and her coworkers ultimately came together to form a union. It was then that Mom's pay increased, providing the stability that allowed our family to buy our very first home, and, literally, we entered the middle class.

Unions are critical at a time when economic disparity continues to grow. We are seeing a resurgence of labor organizing across our country. From Honolulu to Hollywood and far beyond, actors, writers, teamsters, and so many others are organizing to demand fair pay, decent treatment, and basic dignity. At a time like this, we need a Labor Secretary who can bring labor and management together. Julie Su is that person.

Julie has broad support from businesses and labor alike, garnering the endorsement of groups including the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Small Business Majority, the AFL-CIO, and dozens of labor unions across the country. Given her experience, her qualifications, and those endorsements, it is hard to understand my colleagues' objections to her nomination, especially by those who voted to confirm her as Deputy Secretary of Labor in 2021.

Over the last few months, Julie has endured lies about her record, condescending questions about her qualifications, and an unprecedented campaign by special interests—some big businesses—to deny her nomination. They are going so far as to put up anti-Julie Su billboards in a number of States, all to persuade certain Senators to not vote for her confirmation.

In spite of this coordinated smear campaign, as far as I am concerned, Julie has a strong commitment to public service and to doing the job President Biden asked her to do. She will persevere.

Like millions of working people all across our country, I am grateful for Julie's perseverance and her leadership. I hope my colleagues will, at some point soon, acknowledge her record of accomplishments, her ability to do the job, and support her nomination. Julie not only deserves our support; she has earned it. In the meantime, I know that she will continue to do her job, and our country will be better for it.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa.

HUNTER BIDEN

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, today, I would like to address the unclassified, FBI-generated 1023 form that I made public last week. This is a 1023 that Director Wray refused to admit existed until I and Chairman COMER told him that we had read the document.

The FBI provided a highly redacted version to the House Committee on Oversight and in the process ignored the Senate access to that document. That version redacted references to the alleged audio recordings between then-Vice President Biden, Hunter Biden, and the foreign national. It also redacted references to text messages and financial records that allegedly existed to prove the criminal act was done. Those redactions are an obstructive conduct by the United States Government. Why? Because this was an unclassified document. It is not even marked "law enforcement sensitive."

By the way, Justice Department and FBI leaks exposed the source well before the 1023 became public.

Now there have been allegations in the media that this 1023 consists of unverified information. That didn't stop the media's breathless reporting for years about the unverified and very famous Steele dossier. But the Justice Department and the FBI have not told us what they did to investigate the 1023 document. So since the FBI hasn't told us anything about their investigation of the 1023, if they did any, how does the media then know that it is unverified?

From what I have seen, much of the media's reporting has missed the essential question. That essential question is this: Did the Justice Department and the FBI follow normal investigative process and procedures to run the information down or did they sweep this information under the rug?

Now, we have had several media outlets interviewing law enforcement sources with knowledge of the 1023 who start to answer that very question, so I am going to refer to some of these reports from the media.

One law enforcement source reported that "this was a confidential human

source that had a long relationship with the FBI, had given information that was used in multiple other investigations unrelated to Burisma or the Bidens."

That law enforcement source said there was a "fight for a month" to get the FBI handler to reinterview the FBI source. That reinterview was necessary because a separate 1023 mentioned Hunter Biden, and that reinterview ultimately produced the 1023 that I made public last week.

When seeing that, my first question was: Why the fight to reinterview the FBI source? That is the fight that supposedly took a month that I previously referred to. Then the law enforcement source said:

We got that report back and we're, like, holy smokes, this is something.

The news reports also show that the Justice Department and FBI personnel were able to validate some claims in the 1023 report without compulsory process. For example, a news report quotes a law enforcement source:

There were multiple meetings alleged overseas. Some of the confidential human source's claims were corroborated against the confidential human source travel records and contemporary knowledge from the handler about him attending meetings with Zlochevsky and other people present.

The news report also notes that public records also validate some of the 1023 claims about Zlochevsky's efforts to buy into the American energy market. A separate news report, based on a law enforcement source with knowledge, says that Weiss's team was briefed on the validations, which then begs the question, What did the investigators do to investigate?

Well, it has been reported that a law enforcement source believed U.S. Attorney Weiss was reluctant to pursue leads because of political sensitivities. More precisely, Weiss' team was concerned about investigating because it would involve then-Presidential candidate Biden. Well, that didn't stop the Justice Department when Trump was a candidate the first or second time.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention a July 25, 2022, letter that I wrote to the Justice Department and FBI. That letter talked about the FBI shutting down verified and verifiable investigative avenues into Hunter Biden separate from the ongoing U.S. Attorney Weiss' investigation and the 1023. So it is clear that even if information is verified, the FBI has shut it down in the past if it relates to the Biden family.

Former Attorney General Bill Barr has said that the 1023 was credible enough to be passed on to Delaware for "further investigation." He has also said that a review was done to ensure the 1023 wasn't disinformation before passing it on.

Director Wray, likewise, informed me and Chairman COMER of its credibility, noting that it is relevant to an ongoing investigative matter. This also took place in the phone call that COMER and

I had with Wray. Wray also didn't say that it is part of Giuliani's information, and he didn't tell me and COMER that it is the product of any disinformation.

Accordingly, I want to make clear what my oversight focus is and will be: holding the Justice Department and the FBI accountable to explain to the American people what they did to investigate and what they found. To do that, congressional oversight must focus on the Justice Department and the FBI's investigative process and whether the U.S. Attorney Weiss's scope includes bribery.

Congress and the public must get answers to these questions: What did the Justice Department and FBI do to investigate the information contained in the 1023? Did the Justice Department and FBI follow normal investigative process and procedures or try to sweep it all under the rug because of political bias? More precisely, did the FBI and DOJ seek to obtain the evidence referenced in the document? Did the DOJ and FBI seek to interview individuals relating to the 1023? If not, why not? If so, one way or the other, what did they find?

Here we are in July 2023, and we are talking about a June 2020 document. The FBI can easily answer those questions. The fact that they haven't indicates to me that the Justice Department and FBI have not followed normal investigative protocol.

Congress must also find out the true extent to which the August 2020 assessment created by Brian Auten was used to shut down the Biden family investigative leads. For example, we know that the FBI had at one time over a dozen sources who provided potentially criminal information relating to Hunter Biden. Did the August 2020 assessment shut any of them down?

In conclusion, as we prepare to celebrate National Whistleblower's Day, let's not forget that the only reason why Congress has been able to make this information public is because of brave and very patriotic whistleblowers who have approached my office.

Remember this: To date, the Justice Department and the FBI have not disputed any of their allegations. Further, remember that it includes information relating to this 1023 that I made public, and some of this information goes back to October of last year. During that period of time, the Department of Justice and the FBI haven't disputed any of that information. And a perfect chance for Christopher Wray, Director of the FBI, to do that would have been in that telephone conversation that he had with Chairman COMER and me.

Having given you all this information, that ought to tell you something about what the FBI is up to, what the DOJ is up to. And the information I have given you today ought to tell you that there is plenty out there in the media, and the media should not be questioning whether or not this information in the 1023 has any validity.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Ohio.

TRIBUTE TO AMY KAPLAN

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize longtime friend Amy Kaplan, who retired this month after a long career of service.

For the past 17 years, Amy has led the Jewish Federation of Cleveland as the vice president of external affairs. She has been a staunch advocate for Cleveland's vibrant Jewish community on a range of issues.

I was speaking to the Ambassador from Israel today, Ambassador Herzog, about the vibrancy and the reach of the Cleveland Jewish community; how proud I was to have interacted with them for so many years.

Amy, herself, followed in her parents' footsteps when she joined the Federation. Her mother was a staff member, and her father volunteered there often. Amy shares their commitment to their community and to their faith.

Her work has made a difference for so many Clevelanders in the communities the Federation serves—those who are too often overlooked and those who too often don't have a voice in our government.

She has worked with me and my staff to combat anti-Semitism, strengthen Federal resources for our seniors, and to protect Medicaid from cuts. She led advocacy efforts on bail reform, voting rights, and gun violence, and oversees the Federation's community relations work.

Amy has ensured that the issues most important to the Cleveland Jewish community are on the agenda.

She has been recognized over and over for her dedication to the community. She was named a "Difference Maker" by the Cleveland Jewish News, and she did it while caring for a family.

I hope in retirement, Amy will get to spend even more time with her husband Ira and their children and grandchildren.

Amy will be missed at the Federation. I am confident this won't be the end of her work with the Jewish community and won't be the end of her positive impact on Northeast Ohio.

In his letter from the Birmingham jail, Dr. King wrote:

Human progress never rolls in on wheels of inevitability.

Now, those were Dr. King's words, I would add, Progress rolls in because of advocates and activists like Amy Kaplan who listen, who learn, who work with communities to make a difference.

Congratulations, Amy, on your well-earned retirement. Thank you, again, for your service to our community and to our State and wish you the best in your retirement. We look forward to working with your team to keep pushing for these important priorities and to make sure that Cleveland's and all of Ohio's Jewish community continues to have a voice in our government.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARKEY). The Senator from Tennessee.

#### HUMAN TRAFFICKING

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. President, this month, millions of Americans received a very rude awakening as they saw the horrors of human trafficking playing out on the big screen.

I say that they had a rude awakening because until very recently, the fight against modern-day slavery has been an uphill battle on multiple fronts.

Transnational criminal organizations have turned the buying and selling of human beings into a \$150 billion-a-year enterprise, and current policy has made it almost impossible to catch them.

Of course, the work being done on a Federal, State, and local level to help trafficking victims hasn't been made any easier by the astonishing number of people who insist that human trafficking is a myth or that things aren't nearly as bad as advocates make it out to be.

That is some truly impressive spin. It is really quite disgusting. And right now, the American people are wondering why that is the message that, apparently, is driving this administration and, unfortunately, some of my Senate Democratic colleagues when we have so much evidence to the contrary.

Human trafficking is an epidemic. Tennesseans have asked me, and they want to know, how could this happen in this country? How could this human trafficking issue have gotten to be so bad, and what are we going to do to stop it?

I will tell you, the data does not lie. In the interest of setting the record straight, I want to start by offering to my colleagues a few statistics showing us just how bad things have gotten for the victims of human trafficking. That \$150 billion-per-year figure that I mentioned a few moments ago doesn't come from me; it doesn't come from a non-profit. This comes from this administration's Department of Homeland Security. That is their assessment. That is their number.

If you want to look it up, I encourage you. Go to the report that DHS issued in January; you are going to find that stat on page 2 of that report. Yes, indeed. Selling of human beings, trafficking of human beings is, indeed, \$150 billion-a-year business. And it is happening right here, every community, every State, all across this country. Should we accept that? Absolutely not.

Here is another one for you: DHS also estimates that there are—get this number—30 million victims of sex trafficking and forced labor around the world. The Tennessee Bureau of Investigation estimates that, on average in the United States, a child is bought or sold for sex every 2 minutes. Think about that. Every 2 minutes a child—a child—is bought or sold for sex every 2 minutes.

This is what is going on. This is what is happening right here: modern-day slavery. You better believe it is modern-day slavery.

In fiscal year 2022, DHS alone—just DHS—helped 765 confirmed victims of human trafficking. They initiated another 1,373 cases and made 3,655 arrests. As of this January, they had convicted 638 traffickers and indicted another 1,045.

In 2022, the number of investigations, arrests, indictments, and convictions all increased from the previous year, so it is safe to say the cartels and the traffickers, they are gaining ground. They are gaining power.

And, again, this is not my educated guess. You can find every bit of that information on page 6 of the report that DHS put out in January of this year.

So human trafficking is not a myth. Our concern is not overblown. These criminals—criminals—violent, vicious criminals are hiding in plain view in your cities, in your communities, in your States. They are selling human beings. They are setting a price. It is disgusting.

In 2021, the National Human Trafficking Hotline received 525 reports from good Samaritans in Tennessee concerned about potential human trafficking. That year, advocates identified 152 confirmed cases involving 217 victims. That is 217 people identified by one organization in one State. Think about that one. And that stat is 2 years old.

Human trafficking has grown from a \$500 million-a-year business about 4 years ago to \$150 billion-a-year business. And Tennessee is not the only one. There were 217 victims in Tennessee; Massachusetts had 143 victims; Michigan identified 429 victims; California, 2,122 victims; Georgia, 1,065 victims. You know, the list goes on and on. Texas, 1,702 victims. It is all there on the National Human Trafficking Hotline website.

If you drill down to the local level, you are going to see it gets even worse, because this is where the survivors come for help. The Community Coalition Against Human Trafficking, which serves survivors in the Knoxville, TN, area, handled 408 referrals in 2022. The situation was dire, or so they thought. And, yes, indeed, it is.

But guess what? This year it is worse. I know that other organizations around our State in Jackson, in Franklin, Chattanooga, Nashville, Memphis, Powell, Dayton, and Cleveland, they are all telling me the same story.

I don't know how any serious person could look at these numbers and claim that the horror stories these advocates have heard are part of some elaborate conspiracy theory to say that human trafficking is not happening; to say that, well, it is a falsehood meant to distract. No, it is happening. The stats show it.

Now, we do know for a fact that our wide-open southern border is enabling this disgusting practice. Many of the people who fall into the hands of the cartel smugglers are trafficked by their captors. Yes, indeed. Many are

women. Many are children. They are physically, mentally, emotionally, and sexually abused as they make their journey to that southern border.

But don't take my word for it; ask the Department of Homeland Security. Now, they know it is an issue, so they have allocated more than 60 million to the Counter Human Smuggler campaign and sent more than 1,300 personnel to the southern border and into Latin America to try and stop it.

DHS has identified a problem at the border, so why can't Congress put politics aside and do the same thing and admit that these children, these women, need our attention and our help. This is a humanitarian crisis. This year, I have introduced two bills that would throw a wrench in the operations of these trafficking rings and help the border patrol and the local law enforcement regain some ground in this fight that they seem to be losing.

The SAVE Girls Act would establish a \$50 million grant program for States, localities, NGOs that work to prevent the smuggling and trafficking of young women and girls.

We know that most of the innocent people who end up in the hands of sex traffickers are, indeed, young women and girls. And even if they do manage to escape, we see many of these women fall victim to domestic violence and to drug abuse.

They are trapped in a system. If the Federal Government is not going to secure that border and stop this, it ends up with local entities. That is why the SAVE Girls Act would put resources into the hands of these local law enforcement agencies and NGOs who are trying to rescue and save these women and girls from this.

Heightened border security is a necessity, but it won't save the women who have already been forced into servitude. And as I said, many of them are in your communities. They are hiding in plain sight.

Having those funds locally will help to save them. But there are also things we can do directly at the border to pull young women out of the hands of traffickers before they disappear into the country.

Last month, I reintroduced my End Child Trafficking Now Act, which would crack down on the practice of "child recycling," which is horrendous. Absolutely disgusting.

It would mandate DNA testing for migrants coming across the border with children. My bill would require up to a 10-year prison sentence for any person who lies about their familial relationship with a minor. If this sounds familiar, it is because it is an old policy that was very successful in the previous administration because of the data that was collected from that one pilot program. What we learned from that was that 30 percent of the children presenting at that southern border—30 percent—have no relation at all whatsoever to the adult who is bringing them to the border. These children are



enslaved. And what happens? That adult gets through, they send that child back to the cartel, and they attach them to another adult the cartel is trying to get into the country.

Passing the End Child Trafficking Now Act and implementing DNA testing at that border would help save lives. This is something we should do on a bipartisan basis.

The problem with human trafficking is intertwined with so many other issues that we are charged with handling every day. You can find connections to border policy, immigration law, criminal justice, and even to the NDAA and defense policies.

As many of my colleagues know, I filed the End Child Trafficking Now Act in the form of an amendment to the NDAA, and I have asked for a floor vote on this issue. The U.S. Senate should be heard on this issue. So of course I ask for support of that amendment, but no matter what people decide to do on this, I would remind my Democratic colleagues that they cannot hide from this issue just because it would force them to ask some serious questions about the policies of this administration.

The American people are figuring this out. Every 2 minutes, a child is trafficked and sold for sex. What they have seen this month has driven them to start asking questions, and I am so glad so many Tennesseans have paid attention to the media around this issue.

The Nashville Anti-Human Trafficking Coalition normally welcomes about three new volunteers every week. Now, on average, 38 new volunteers per week are reaching out and saying: Tell me what I can do to help rid our community, our State, our Nation of this problem. I hope other organizations across the State and the country are seeing the same wave of support.

Advocates who work with victims of sex and labor trafficking refer to this as modern-day slavery. If you look at the pictures and if you listen to these survivors who have been rescued tell their stories about their experience, you would see why. They have been raped, abused, stripped of their dignity. They live in fear. Many of them have been in bondage so long that they have lost their sense of self.

These people deserve better from us and from this administration and our President. At the very least, they deserve a government that recognizes that, indeed, their lives are worth saving.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

AMENDMENT NO. 931

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise today to respectfully request bipartisan support from my Senate colleagues on the Cornyn-Casey amendment No. 931, the Outbound Investment Transparency Act. This amendment would establish a program to provide

visibility on U.S. investments going to the People's Republic of China and critical supply chains and technology sectors.

Here is what the amendment does. The proposed amendment would establish a program led by the Department of the Treasury, in coordination with the Department of Commerce, that would require U.S. companies planning to invest in national security technology sectors in countries of concern to notify—notify—the Department of the Treasury before those deals are completed.

This proposal has been vetted by industry, by the Senate Banking Committee, and by the U.S.-China Economic and Security Review Commission.

Those are the fundamentals of this amendment.

We all know that this year's Defense bill that we are going to be voting on today that we started last week tackles the toughest national security issues that face our Nation, and technological competition with the People's Republic of China is certainly at the top of that list.

Right now, we are in competition with a communist government that doesn't play by the rules. The Chinese Government employs economic espionage, and it exploits the United States' open research and innovation to build up its own capabilities.

U.S. companies are sending capital, intellectual property, and innovation to the People's Republic of China, fueling its advance in dual-use critical technological areas.

A recent report by the National Security Advisor in the last administration, GEN H.R. McMaster, states as follows:

Outbound investment harms U.S. strategic interests when it facilitates inappropriate technology transfer, allows for underinvestment in domestic capabilities, or undermines the long-term competitiveness of American firms.

Testimony before the Senate Intelligence Committee—the committee on which both Senator CORNYN and I sit—noted that in 2020, U.S. companies' capital investment in China totaled over \$200 billion just in artificial intelligence, so-called AI—\$200 billion just in AI—over \$21 billion in semiconductors, and over \$50 billion in biotechnology. These numbers don't even account for the transfer of operational know-how and intellectual property. You can't even quantify those values. We need a targeted response to these risks to our national security.

Again, this amendment would require U.S. companies planning to invest in national security technology sectors in countries of concern to notify only—to notify the Department of the Treasury before those deals are completed. We need this type of outbound investment notification to understand just how much critical technology we are transferring to our adversaries via these capital flows. With this information in

hand, we can begin to take control of our own economic future. By utilizing this information, we can make determinations as to how to protect U.S. talent, U.S. technology, and U.S. supply chains.

This issue—and this is true of a lot of the Defense bill—this issue transcends party lines and gets to the heart of one of the most significant national security threats that we must confront.

I want to thank Senator CORNYN for his strong bipartisan work on this issue over the last 3 years.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of amendment No. 931.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TESTER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

FOOD SECURITY

Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, we are going to be voting on an amendment here in a few minutes that I want to rise in support of. It was introduced by my friend the Senator from South Dakota, Senator ROUNDS.

This amendment aims to protect American food security against attacks by foreign adversaries—in particular, these four foreign adversaries: China, Russia, Iran, and North Korea.

As many of you know, I am a third-generation farmer. I know firsthand that food security is national security. It is that plain. It is that simple. Allowing our foreign adversaries to invest in American farmland and agribusiness is a direct threat to our food supply.

Preventing our adversaries, our enemies from acquiring land near sensitive military sites—sites like Air Force bases, like the one in Montana, Malmstrom Air Force Base—is a no-brainer, and now we need to protect the rest of our food system.

This amendment will enable the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States—otherwise known as CFIUS—to review all significant agriculture-related foreign investments, and it will empower the Agency to prohibit future purchases of farmland by our foreign adversaries.

Our amendment also includes commonsense provisions that protect the rights of U.S. citizens and permanent residents and small farmers and business owners.

This is a critical step toward making sure we aren't handing over valuable American assets to foreign entities that want to replace us as the world's leading military and economic power.

I would urge all of my colleagues in this room and the ones who are going to come to this room to support this commonsense solution that will protect our Nation's food supply and defend our country against folks who would like to see us cease to exist.



I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### AMENDMENT NO. 931

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, is it timely for me to call up my amendment No. 931?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. CORNYN. I would do so and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment by number.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CORNYN], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 931 to amendment No. 935.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To provide for an investment screening mechanism relating to covered sectors)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, add the following:

#### SEC. 1083. PROTECTION OF COVERED SECTORS.

The Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4501 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

#### “TITLE VIII—PROTECTION OF COVERED SECTORS

##### “SEC. 801. DEFINITIONS.

“In this title:

“(1) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Financial Services, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives.

“(2) COUNTRY OF CONCERN.—The term ‘country of concern’ means, subject to such regulations as may be prescribed in accordance with section 806, a country specified in section 4872(d)(2) of title 10, United States Code.

“(3) COVERED ACTIVITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to such regulations as may be prescribed in accordance with section 806, and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘covered activity’ means any activity engaged in by a United States person in a related to a covered sector that involves—

“(i) an acquisition by such United States person of an equity interest or contingent equity interest, or monetary capital contribution, in a covered foreign entity, directly or indirectly, by contractual commitment or otherwise, with the goal of generating income or gain;

“(ii) an arrangement for an interest held by such United States person in the short- or long-term debt obligations of a covered foreign entity that includes governance rights that are characteristic of an equity investment, management, or other important rights, as defined in regulations prescribed in accordance with section 806;

“(iii) the establishment of a wholly owned subsidiary in a country of concern, such as a greenfield investment, for the purpose of production, design, testing, manufacturing, fabrication, or development related to one or more covered sectors;

“(iv) the establishment by such United States person of a joint venture in a country of concern or with a covered foreign entity for the purpose of production, design, testing, manufacturing, fabrication, or research involving one or more covered sectors, or other contractual or other commitments involving a covered foreign entity to jointly research and develop new innovation, including through the transfer of capital or intellectual property or other business proprietary information; or

“(v) the acquisition by a United States person with a covered foreign entity of—

“(I) operational cooperation, such as through supply or support arrangements;

“(II) the right to board representation (as an observer, even if limited, or as a member) or an executive role (as may be defined through regulation) in a covered foreign entity;

“(III) the ability to direct or influence such operational decisions as may be defined through such regulations;

“(IV) formal governance representation in any operating affiliate, like a portfolio company, of a covered foreign entity; or

“(V) a new relationship to share or provide business services, such as but not limited to financial services, marketing services, maintenance, or assembly functions, related to a covered sectors.

“(B) EXCEPTIONS.—The term ‘covered activity’ does not include—

“(i) any transaction the value of which the Secretary of the Treasury determines is de minimis, as defined in regulations prescribed in accordance with section 806;

“(ii) any category of transactions that the Secretary determines is in the national interest of the United States, as may be defined in regulations prescribed in accordance with section 806; or

“(iii) any ordinary or administrative business transaction as may be defined in such regulations.

“(4) COVERED FOREIGN ENTITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to regulations prescribed in accordance with section 806, and except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term ‘covered foreign entity’ means—

“(i) any entity that is incorporated in, has a principal place of business in, or is organized under the laws of a country of concern;

“(ii) any entity the equity securities of which are primarily traded in the ordinary course of business on one or more exchanges in a country of concern;

“(iii) any entity in which any entity described in subclause (i) or (ii) holds, individually or in the aggregate, directly or indirectly, an ownership interest of greater than 50 percent; or

“(iv) any other entity that is not a United States person and that meets such criteria as may be specified by the Secretary of the Treasury in such regulations.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The term ‘covered foreign entity’ does not include any entity described in subparagraph (A) that can demonstrate that a majority of the equity interest in the entity is ultimately owned by—

“(i) nationals of the United States; or

“(ii) nationals of such countries (other than countries of concern) as are identified for purposes of this subparagraph pursuant to regulations prescribed in accordance with section 806.

“(5) COVERED SECTORS.—Subject to regulations prescribed in accordance with section 806, the term ‘covered sectors’ includes sec-

tors within the following areas, as specified in such regulations:

“(A) Advanced semiconductors and microelectronics.

“(B) Artificial intelligence.

“(C) Quantum information science and technology.

“(D) Hypersonics.

“(E) Satellite-based communications.

“(F) Networked laser scanning systems with dual-use applications.

“(6) PARTY.—The term ‘party’, with respect to an activity, has the meaning given that term in regulations prescribed in accordance with section 806.

“(7) UNITED STATES.—The term ‘United States’ means the several States, the District of Columbia, and any territory or possession of the United States.

“(8) UNITED STATES PERSON.—The term ‘United States person’ means—

“(A) an individual who is a citizen or national of the United States or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence in the United States; and

“(B) any corporation, partnership, or other entity organized under the laws of the United States or the laws of any jurisdiction within the United States.

#### “SEC. 802. ADMINISTRATION OF UNITED STATES INVESTMENT NOTIFICATION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall delegate the authorities and functions under this title to the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(b) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the duties of the Secretary under this title, the Secretary shall—

“(1) coordinate with the Secretary of Commerce; and

“(2) consult with the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of State, and the Director of National Intelligence.

#### “SEC. 803. MANDATORY NOTIFICATION OF COVERED ACTIVITIES.

“(a) MANDATORY NOTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to regulations prescribed in accordance with section 806, beginning on the date that is 90 days after such regulations take effect, a United States person that plans to engage in a covered activity shall—

“(A) if such covered activity is not a secured transaction, submit to the Secretary of the Treasury a complete written notification of the activity not later than 14 days before the anticipated completion date of the activity; and

“(B) if such covered activity is a secured transaction, submit to the Secretary of the Treasury a complete written notification of the activity not later than 14 days after the completion date of the activity.

“(2) CIRCULATION OF NOTIFICATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall, upon receipt of a notification under paragraph (1), promptly inspect the notification for completeness.

“(B) INCOMPLETE NOTIFICATIONS.—If a notification submitted under paragraph (1) is incomplete, the Secretary shall promptly inform the United States person that submits the notification that the notification is not complete and provide an explanation of relevant material respects in which the notification is not complete.

“(3) IDENTIFICATION OF NON-NOTIFIED ACTIVITY.—The Secretary shall establish a process to identify covered activity for which—

“(A) a notification is not submitted to the Secretary under paragraph (1); and

“(B) information is reasonably available.

“(b) CONFIDENTIALITY OF INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), any information or documentary material filed with the Secretary of the Treasury pursuant to this section shall be

exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and no such information or documentary material may be made public by any government agency or Member of Congress.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, Deng Xiaoping often repeated a Chinese proverb:

Hide Your strength. Bide your time. Never take the lead.

As a result of that strategy, which worked beyond anybody's imagination, whether by the People's Republic of China or the Chinese Communist Party, America slumbered during the economic rise of the People's Republic of China. American companies invested. Chinese students studied here and then went home to use their new education to compete against us while intellectual property theft, forced technology transfers, and cyber crime emanating from the People's Republic of China have become rampant.

Well, I think it is fair to say that the colossus that is America has finally awakened from its slumber and realized what a challenge China is to us and to world peace.

Today, the market value of American investments in the PRC numbers in the trillions of dollars. Those are American companies that invested in China that helped them to grow their economy. It is no exaggeration to say that we have helped to build their economy into a near-peer status and helped them to finance a military that threatens us and our allies in the Indo-Pacific.

What this amendment does that Senator CASEY and I have been pursuing is to seek transparency. We need to understand as policymakers exactly what is going on. We are not asking for any sort of limitation on investments in the PRC. It just makes sense to me that we should know what is going on so that we can consider whether there are any policy options that we ought to embrace.

We policymakers need to know what American companies are doing to help finance an aggressive, authoritarian adversary. What we do know about this and what we do about this is a debate for another day. First, we need to know the facts.

I ask my colleagues to join us in supporting this commonsense amendment.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 931

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 196 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Baldwin	Hagerty	Reed
Barrasso	Hassan	Ricketts
Bennet	Hawley	Risch
Blumenthal	Heinrich	Romney
Booker	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Boozman	Hirono	Rounds
Britt	Hoeven	Rubio
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Sanders
Cantwell	Johnson	Schatz
Capito	Kaine	Schmitt
Cardin	Kelly	Schumer
Carper	Kennedy	Scott (FL)
Casey	King	Shaheen
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Smith
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Coons	Lujan	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lummis	Tester
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	Markey	Tuberville
Cramer	Marshall	Van Hollen
Crapo	McConnell	Vance
Cruz	Menendez	Warner
Daines	Merkley	Warnock
Duckworth	Moran	Warren
Ernst	Mullin	Welch
Feinstein	Murkowski	Whitehouse
Fetterman	Murphy	Wicker
Fischer	Murray	Wyden
Gillibrand	Ossoff	Young
Graham	Padilla	
Grassley	Peters	

NAYS—6

Blackburn	Lee	Sinema
Braun	Paul	Tillis

NOT VOTING—3

Budd	Durbin	Scott (SC)
------	--------	------------

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WARNOCK). On this vote, the yeas are 91, the nays are 6.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 931) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

AMENDMENT NO. 813

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 813 and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. ROUNDS], for himself and others, proposes an amendment numbered 813.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the Defense Production Act of 1950 to include the Secretary of Agriculture on the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States and require review of certain agricultural transactions)

At the end of subtitle G of title X, insert the following:

**SEC. 1083. REVIEW OF AGRICULTURE-RELATED TRANSACTIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.**

Section 721 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. 4565) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “; and” and inserting a semicolon;

(II) in clause (ii), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(III) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) any transaction described in clause (vi) or (vii) of subparagraph (B) proposed or

pending on or after the date of the enactment of this clause.”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by adding at the end the following:

“(vi) Any other investment, subject to regulations prescribed under subparagraphs (D) and (E), by a foreign person in any unaffiliated United States business that is engaged in agriculture or biotechnology related to agriculture.

“(vii) Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (E), the purchase or lease by, or a concession to, a foreign person of private real estate that is—

“(I) located in the United States;

“(II) used in agriculture; and

“(III) more than 320 acres or valued in excess of \$5,000,000.”;

(iii) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “subparagraph (B)(ii)” and inserting “clause (ii) or (vii) of subparagraph (B)”;

(iv) in subparagraph (D)—

(I) in clause (i), by striking “subparagraph (B)(iii)” and inserting “clauses (iii) and (vi) of subparagraph (B)”;

(II) in clause (iii)(I), by striking “subparagraph (B)(iii)” and inserting “clauses (iii) and (vi) of subparagraph (B)”;

(III) in clause (iv)(I), by striking “subparagraph (B)(iii)” each place it appears and inserting “clauses (iii) and (vi) of subparagraph (B)”;

(IV) in clause (v), by striking “subparagraph (B)(iii)” and inserting “clauses (iii) and (vi) of subparagraph (B)”;

(v) in subparagraph (E), by striking “clauses (ii) and (iii)” and inserting “clauses (ii), (iii), (iv), and (vii)”;

(B) by adding at the end the following:

“(14) AGRICULTURE.—The term ‘agriculture’ has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 203).”;

(2) in subsection (k)(2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (H), (I), and (J), as subparagraphs (I), (J), and (K), respectively; and

(B) inserting after subparagraph (G) the following new subparagraph:

“(H) The Secretary of Agriculture (non-voting, ex officio).”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(r) PROHIBITION WITH RESPECT TO AGRICULTURAL COMPANIES AND REAL ESTATE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, if the Committee, in conducting a review and investigation under this section, determines that a transaction described in clause (i), (vi), or (vii) of subsection (a)(4)(B) would result in control by a covered foreign person or investment by a covered foreign person in a United States business engaged in agriculture or private real estate used in agriculture, the President shall prohibit such transaction.

“(2) WAIVER.—The President may waive, on a case-by-case basis, the requirement to prohibit a transaction under paragraph (1), not less than 30 days after the President determines and reports to the relevant committees of jurisdiction that it is vital to the national security interests of the United States to waive such prohibition.

“(3) DEFINED TERMS.—In this subsection:

“(A) COVERED PERSON.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided by clause (ii), the term ‘covered person’—

“(I) has the meaning given the term ‘a person owned by, controlled by, or subject to the jurisdiction or direction of a foreign adversary’ in section 7.2 of title 15, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of the enactment of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024), except that each reference to ‘foreign adversary’ in that definition shall be deemed to be

a reference to the government of a covered country; and

“(II) includes an entity that—

“(aa) is registered in or organized under the laws of a covered country;

“(bb) has a principal place of business in a covered country; or

“(cc) has a subsidiary with a principal place of business in a covered country.

“(ii) EXCLUSIONS.—The term ‘covered person’ does not include a United States citizen or an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence to the United States.

“(B) COVERED COUNTRY.—The term ‘covered country’ means any of the following:

“(i) The People’s Republic of China.

“(ii) The Russian Federation.

“(iii) The Islamic Republic of Iran.

“(iv) The Democratic People’s Republic of Korea.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, China and Russia are our near-peer adversaries, and North Korea and Iran are no friends of the United States.

In just a few minutes, we will vote on an amendment that I proposed with Senator TESTER that would ban China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran from purchasing American farmland or ag businesses.

In recent years, our country has seen, firsthand, attempts by our near-peer competitors to acquire land adjacent to our military bases.

In 2020, a Chinese-linked company planned to build a wind energy farm project near Del Rio, TX, only miles away from Laughlin Air Force Base, where U.S. pilots are trained.

In 2022, a Chinese-linked company attempted to build a corn milling plant on farmland near a sensitive Air Force base outside Grand Forks, ND. Treasury later determined that they did not have the proper jurisdiction to take action in this case, which demonstrates the need for this amendment.

My amendment would require the Committee on Foreign Investment of the United States, CFIUS, to prohibit China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran from purchasing ag land and ag businesses in the United States and make modest reforms to the CFIUS process to improve our country’s ability to protect our national security.

I want to thank my friend from Montana, Senator TESTER, for his hard work on the amendment and our original bill, the PASS Act.

I would also like to thank our co-sponsors on this amendment: Senators DAINES, KENNEDY, LUMMIS, KRAMER, HOEVEN, ERNST, BRITT, BROWN, and CRUZ.

This is a commonsense provision that will make our homeland more secure.

I yield my time.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 813

I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate?

There being none, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) is necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT).

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 91, nays 7, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 197 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Reed
Barrasso	Graham	Ricketts
Bennet	Grassley	Risch
Blackburn	Hagerty	Romney
Blumenthal	Hassan	Rosen
Booker	Hawley	Rounds
Boozman	Heinrich	Rubio
Braun	Hickenlooper	Sanders
Britt	Hoeven	Schatz
Brown	Hyde-Smith	Schmitt
Budd	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Kaine	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kelly	Shaheen
Cardin	Kennedy	Sinema
Carper	King	Smith
Casey	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cassidy	Lankford	Sullivan
Collins	Lee	Tester
Coons	Lujan	Thune
Cornyn	Lummis	Tillis
Cortez Masto	Manchin	Tuberville
Cotton	Marshall	Van Hollen
Cramer	McConnell	Vance
Crapo	Menendez	Warner
Cruz	Merkley	Warnock
Daines	Moran	Whitehouse
Duckworth	Mullin	Wicker
Ernst	Murkowski	Wyden
Feinstein	Murray	Young
Fetterman	Ossoff	
Fischer	Peters	

NAYS—7

Hirono	Padilla	Welch
Markey	Paul	
Murphy	Warren	

NOT VOTING—2

Durbin Scott (SC)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KELLY). On this vote the yeas are 91, the nays are 7.

Under the previous order requiring 60 votes for the adoption of this amendment, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 813) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

REMEMBERING LOWELL WEICKER

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to be here today to speak in tribute to the late Lowell Weicker, a U.S. Senator from Connecticut and Governor from my State—a giant in Connecticut politics but on the national scene as well. He, sadly, passed away.

I will be introducing a resolution, with my colleague Senator MURPHY, honoring him for his service to our country, and I hope that it will be enacted overwhelmingly—in fact, unanimously—by the Senate shortly.

The most common thing said about Lowell Weicker after his passing was that he was larger than life. Certainly, he was a big man in stature. He was tall, strong, forceful, and remarkable in his physical presence. He was larger than life in his fearless and relentless championing of what he believed was right and in serving people. He might

have been a big man physically, but he cared about everyone. No matter how small they might be in power or wealth, everyone deserved a champion, in Lowell Weicker’s view.

He had a long history of service to this country. He began in the U.S. Army in 1953, and he served through 1955, reaching the rank of first lieutenant. He went on to serve in the town of Greenwich, where I live, as the first selectman and then represented Connecticut as a Member of the House of Representatives and then for three terms as a U.S. Senator.

He is probably best known here for standing up to the President of his own party, Richard Nixon. During Watergate, he had the political courage and fortitude to say no to corruption and to persevere against attacks within his own party as he insisted, as a matter of conscience and conviction, that a President who violated the law should be held accountable. He was the first Republican Senator to call for the resignation of Richard Nixon as President. It was an act of political bravery and, more importantly, a dedication to public service and the rule of law. It was a message to the American people that nobody is above the law and that nobody can defy the Constitution of this great country, not even the President.

Although we talk a lot about it now, in his day, for him to take that position and call for the resignation of a President of his own party was also an act of potential political destruction. It was very much against his self-interest, but he stood strong, he persevered, and history has vindicated him. Beyond vindication, it has honored him for that courage.

He was also a champion of many other causes and people. Throughout his tenure, he was a strong advocate for the Americans with Disabilities Act, which prohibits discrimination based on disabilities in everyday activities. One example is his standing for new laws that protected people. He was a champion of public health, of preventing cuts in funding for the National Institutes of Health, of supporting scientific medical research efforts, of securing funding for AIDS and HIV treatment.

After he left the Senate under circumstances that might have discouraged a lot of people from remaining in public service, he came back—and it was one of his finest hours—as Governor of the State of Connecticut.

I was sworn in as attorney general of our State on the same day that he became Governor, and we served together for 4 years. We had what could be called a close working relationship, not always totally amicable or not always in agreement, but I knew about Lowell Weicker that what he told me was what he believed. I returned that approach, and he respected me for it even when we disagreed. He understood that the attorney general of the State, at

least in Connecticut, was not the Governor's lawyer; he was the people's lawyer. He is elected separately, and he has to do what he thinks is right.

For me, it was always the ultimate tribute to his belief in the rule of law that he respected the attorney general of Connecticut for whatever legal opinion I would give, whatever litigation I would bring, or whatever positions I would take based on the law. And he was, again, a champion of social services to the people who needed them, of education, of the kind of fairness in our criminal justice system that distinguishes us in our respect for legal rights.

He is probably best known for securing passage of a State income tax. It was incredibly unpopular. Everybody in our State who was around at the time will remember well how he refused to go around the back way to exit the capitol, even though there was an angry crowd, even though they were going to deluge him with invectives and worse. But he was going out to face that crowd, to confront them, to speak with them, to listen to them.

He was responsible for enabling the State of Connecticut to retain those essential services that people needed because he cared, and he listened.

He also signed a ban on assault weapons, the first time in Connecticut's history. We now have had one since then. I defended it in court when it was challenged on constitutional grounds. I tried the case in a Litchfield County courthouse, a 10-day trial with evidence. I tried it myself because I thought it was so important. We won, and then I argued it when the outcome was appealed. And we won again in the State supreme court. Nobody was happier in the State of Connecticut with that result when our ban on assault weapons was upheld in the 1990s.

He was a model of courage for me, a role model in standing up, speaking out for conviction and conscience, even when others disagreed, especially when others disagreed.

He did immense good for Connecticut. He left a legacy that is lasting and large that will inspire people for decades and generations to come.

I extend my deepest condolences to his wife Claudia, all of his children—a number of them good friends of mine—and to his grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

I hope my colleagues will join me unanimously in honoring Lowell Weicker, U.S. Senator, Governor of our State.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection.

The Senator from Minnesota.

#### AFGHAN ADJUSTMENT ACT

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise today to speak to the importance of passing the Afghan Adjustment Act as an amendment to the National Defense Authorization Act, which is pending before the U.S. Senate.

This is our moment. We have been working on this for 2 years—2 years—while people who have stood with our military have been in limbo, 2 years when they don't know what their future will hold. This is their time.

This bipartisan legislation that I lead with Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM is also cosponsored by Senator COONS; Senator MORAN, who is the ranking Republican on the Veterans' Affairs Committee; Senator BLUMENTHAL; Senator MURKOWSKI; Senator SHAHEEN; Senator WICKER, who is the ranking Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee; Senator DURBIN, who is the chair of the Judiciary Committee; of course, Senator GRAHAM, who is the ranking member on the Judiciary Committee; Senator TILLIS and Senator MULLIN, with many others who support this bill.

Mr. President, this bill strengthens our national security. It does right by Afghans who worked alongside our troops. And from a broader national security perspective, as we look at the many purposes of the bill before us, this amendment shows the world that when the United States of America makes a promise, we keep it. We keep our covenant.

Nearly 80,000 Afghans who sought refuge in our country, who are in our country, are currently in limbo, including many who risked their own lives and their families' safety to protect our servicemembers. Among them are translators, humanitarian workers, and courageous members of the Afghan military who stood shoulder to shoulder with our troops.

We were right to help those people flee the Taliban and come to the United States, and it now falls on us to uphold the covenant we made to them and give them the stability and the security that they need to rebuild their life.

We know this has worked before. I know this. I have one of the biggest Hmong populations in the United States of America. They came after a war in really sad circumstances for our country and for them, but they have rebuilt their lives. They are now police officers in Minnesota. They are teachers. They are lawyers. They are legislators.

That is what we did after the revolution in Cuba. That is what we did. We took people and we gave them a status that allowed them to succeed in our country.

But in this case, we actually asked them to serve with our military, to put their lives at risk, to gather intelligence for our military.

Who do you think is going to want to help us in the future if we don't keep our covenant, if we don't keep our promise?

The bipartisan Afghan Adjustment Act creates a more thorough system for Afghan allies to apply for permanent legal status. It requires that applicants go through a vetting that is just as rigorous as the vetting they would have gone through if they came to the United States as refugees.

They get this. They are already here.

So one of the reasons that Senator GRAHAM, especially, and Senator WICKER are so interested in this bill is it actually provides more security because of the vetting that will occur that otherwise would not occur. This vetting standard is a standard that eight former Trump and George W. Bush administration national security officials called the "gold standard" of vetting.

Senator GRAHAM and I worked closely with Republicans, including Senator MORAN, and the Department of Defense to strengthen the bill's vetting standards. That is what is before us with this amendment—keeping our covenant and doing the vetting. Both ways you look at it, it is good for national security.

In addition, our legislation updates the Special Immigrant Visa Program to include groups that should never have been excluded from the program in the first place, including the female tactical teams of Afghanistan, who did so much to support our troops. The entire purpose of the Special Immigration Visa Program is to provide residency for those who have supported the United States abroad. It is clear to me that these brave women should qualify just as many of the men did.

The Afghan Adjustment Act is supported, as I noted, by a bipartisan group of 11 cosponsors. But get this: This bill has earned the backing of more than 60 organizations, including the Veterans of Foreign Wars, or, as we know them, the VFW, and the American Legion. This is one of their top priorities right now, as well as for some of our most revered military leaders, including Admirals Mike Mullen, William McRaven, and James Stavridis; and Generals Richard Myers of the Air Force, Joseph Dunford of the Marine Corps, and Stan McChrystal of the Army.

I think the Presiding Officer knows a few of these people, and he knows how they have served our country.

That is why, if you are not going to listen to me, listen to them. Listen to the leading veterans groups in this country that know how important it is for us to pass this bill. We must uphold our covenant.

That means bringing well-earned certainty to Afghans who are already here—an example, Nangialy, who began working alongside U.S. troops as an interpreter in 2007.

I want to be clear about what it meant for an interpreter to work alongside U.S. troops in Afghanistan. What did it mean? When the Taliban ambushed our soldiers with bullets, they ambushed their interpreters too.

They weren't just sitting in an office being interpreters and just sitting there and whispering in their books. They were out on the battlefield with our military. When the Taliban ambushed the soldiers, they ambushed the interpreters. When our troops were targeted with IEDs, the interpreters were targeted too.

That is what Nangialy risked, but he did it anyway. Why? To use his words, "same goals, same target, and same achievement."

Now, it wasn't just the interpreters. There is another Afghan who wants to remain anonymous because his family is still back in Afghanistan. That is the risk we are putting people in when they are in this very unclear status. He was a helicopter fighter pilot with the U.S. military. He worked with our troops to combat the Taliban in remote areas of Afghanistan for 8 years. On one mission, he was shot in the face by flying bullets. Miraculously, he survived because the bullet passed through his cheek and open mouth. He shed blood in our fight, and we should not let another day go by without keeping the covenant we made to him.

Another story: An Afghan intelligence sergeant who also wants to remain anonymous, who helped carry out several operations against the Taliban and ISIS with our military. In 2018, while working alongside a U.S. Special Forces group, he was caught in an IED explosion and lost both of his legs.

Let me repeat that.

His fight with our troops cost him both of his legs. Doesn't he deserve better than complete uncertainty and a refusal of our government to even give him a status, a provisional status, and never knowing if he is going to have to be sent back there? That is what we are doing?

Our servicemembers and veterans understand this is imperative. I know every Member in this Senate has been approached by members of our own military about this. On Veterans Day, on Memorial Day, when you are walking in a parade, they come up and they tell a story about someone who stood with them whom they got to know. Maybe that person is still somewhere in hiding in Afghanistan, but most likely, some of them are in our country, which is a good thing. But, right now, they are in our country—let me repeat. They are in our country, living in our country, but we, right now, are refusing to give them the status that we have given past people who helped us in conflicts. That is embarrassing.

Some of the most vocal advocates of the Afghan Adjustment Act have been military groups. A coalition of more than 30 military groups, including the American Legion and Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, penned a letter calling on congressional leadership to pass this bill.

They wrote this to the leaders of both Houses on both sides of the aisle:

America's veterans served with Afghans for two decades in Afghanistan. We fought

side-by-side with them, and we saw firsthand their courage and dedication. They risked their very lives to help us and made significant contributions to our mission.

Again, this is 30 military groups, including the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, the American Legion, Blue Star families, Honor the Promise, the Black Veterans Project—and I could go on and on and on.

What else did they write?

They write:

We call on Congress to pass legislation that would allow Afghan parolees who are being evacuated from Afghanistan to have an opportunity to seek lawful permanent residence in the United States.

Again, these are people who have this SIV status.

Then they go on:

We urge you to support the Afghan Adjustment Act as soon as possible. We promised to stand by our allies who, often at risk to themselves and their families, served in uniform or publicly defended women's and democratic rights. The U.S. government made a similar promise.

This is a letter from the 30 military groups of our country. They say:

The U.S. government made a similar promise; keeping it assures that the American commitments will be honored.

This is 30 military organizations telling us what it was like to serve alongside our Afghan allies. Most of us in this Chamber don't know that experience. We don't know how much they owe those Afghan interpreters—those people who gathered the intelligence. We don't know. We would go on congressional trips there, but we weren't there on the battlefield; they were. So maybe, for a change, we should listen to what they have to say about what they saw. They know that many of these people are here right now, but we just can't get out of our petty politics to try to at least give them the status that they deserve.

Many of our Nation's national security experts have also called on Congress to pass the Afghan Adjustment Act, accurately pointing out that doing so is both a moral imperative and necessary for our national security.

Here is a portion of a letter that was sent to congressional leadership by the following experts: Rick "Ozzie" Nelson, former Director, Office of Combating Terrorism; National Security Council staff under George W. Bush. He was also a U.S. Navy helicopter pilot and Afghan veteran; Gus Coldebella, former Acting General Counsel with the Department of Homeland Security; Michael Neifach, former Principal Legal Advisor for Immigration and Customs Enforcement with the Homeland Security Council staff under George W. Bush; Elizabeth Neumann, former Assistant Secretary for Threat Prevention and Security Policy for the Department of Homeland Security and former Deputy Chief of Staff for the Department of Homeland Security; Stewart Verdery, former Assistant Secretary for Policy and Planning for the Department of Homeland Security; Ross Ashley, former Assistant Admin-

istrator for the Federal Emergency Management Association, former Virginia Air National Guardsman and U.S. Air Force Reserves; Hans Miller, former Deputy Assistant Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration; and Lynden Melmed, former Chief Counsel of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services.

What does this letter say?

This letter says this:

The rationale for the Afghan Adjustment Act is clear. First, it follows through on our nation's commitment to its wartime allies by providing at risk Afghans and their families—including many that supported U.S. military and diplomatic efforts for the past 20 years—a path to permanent status in the United States.

Second, it sends a clear message to current and future allies—

And this is so key and it isn't kind of the first thing you think about here—those that are necessary for U.S. servicemembers and diplomats to perform their missions in pursuit of national security—that the United States is a reliable and trusted partner and it stands by the democratic ideals that it professes.

This is why Senator GRAHAM and I have worked on this bill for so many years. This is why we have the ranking Republicans on Veterans', on Judiciary, and on Armed Services supporting the bill.

When I first got to the Senate, honestly, I thought that would be enough to get this done; that that would be enough to bless this and give it the gold standard, just as all of these former Bush and Trump and Obama and current Biden officials have given it their stamp; that this is a good vetting process; that it is certainly a lot better than having people sit here in limbo after they have served our country.

Here is another letter from former Ambassadors to Afghanistan because it is not just military groups and national security experts. Eight former U.S. Ambassadors to Afghanistan called on us to pass the Afghan Adjustment Act. These experts served under Presidents George W. Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump, and Joe Biden, and each has an intimate understanding of the sacrifices made by our Afghan allies.

Remember, it is these diplomats, it is these military leaders who have asked these Afghans for their help. Regardless of what people think about what happened with the withdrawal—regardless of people's views on this—can't we just agree on one thing; that we should stand with the people who stood with us?

This is what the Ambassadors to Afghanistan under George W. Bush, Barack Obama, Donald Trump, and Joe Biden have said:

Without the Afghan Adjustment Act, the task of American diplomacy will be much more difficult. If the United States does not act to support its allies by passing the Afghan Adjustment Act, in the future, our allies will be less likely to support the U.S. missions if they see that our Afghan partners are abandoned.



In diplomacy, our words will have lost meaning, and in the unfortunate event of future conflict—

This is the Ambassadors writing, not me, Ambassadors who went to serve in Afghanistan and who took on that assignment under four different Presidents.

They are writing, if we don't do this, "[i]n diplomacy, our words will have lost meaning, and in the unfortunate event of future conflict, what incentive would local allies have to support our troops?"

A good question.

Finally, I want to share some words from a group of more than three dozen of our Nation's most esteemed military leaders. They are retired military leaders. As I mentioned, they are Gen. Joseph F. Dunford of the U.S. Marine Corps; ADM Mike Mullen of the U.S. Navy; Gen. Richard Myers of the U.S. Air Force; ADM Jim Stavridis of the U.S. Navy; GEN Peter W. Chiarelli of the U.S. Army; GEN Stan McChrystal of the U.S. Army; GEN David McKiernan of the U.S. Army; ADM William H. McRaven of the U.S. Navy; GEN Austin S. Miller of the U.S. Army; GEN John W. Nicholson, Jr., of the U.S. Army; GEN M. David Rodriguez of the U.S. Army; GEN Curtis Scaparrotti of the U.S. Army; GEN Raymond A. Thomas III of the U.S. Army; GEN Joseph Votel of the U.S. Army; Gen. Mark Welsh of the U.S. Air Force; Lt. Gen. John A. Bradley of the U.S. Air Force; LTG Jeff Buchanan of the U.S. Army; LTG Stephen Fogarty of the U.S. Army; LTG Benjamin C. Freakley of the U.S. Army; LTG Ben Hodges of the U.S. Army; LTG John F. Mulholland, Jr., of the U.S. Army; LTG Leopoldo A. Quintas, Jr., of the U.S. Army; LTG Mark C. Schwartz of the U.S. Army; LTG John C. Thomson of the U.S. Army; LTG Francis Wiercinski of the U.S. Army; MG Edward Dorman III of the U.S. Army; Maj. Gen. Dawn Dunlap of the U.S. Air Force; MG Paul Eaton of the U.S. Army; Maj. Gen. Buck Elton of the U.S. Air Force; Maj. Gen. Walter D. Givhan of the U.S. Air Force; MG William Hix of the U.S. Army; MG James B. Linder of the U.S. Army; MG Mark MacCarley of the U.S. Army; MG Mark R. Quantock of the U.S. Army; MG Edward Reeder of the U.S. Army; MG Patrick J. Reinert of the U.S. Army; MG Jefforey Smith of the U.S. Army; MG Tammy Smith of the U.S. Army; MG James "Boe" Young of the U.S. Army; BG Steve Anderson of the U.S. Army; BG Norvell Coots of the U.S. Army; BG Gary M. Jones of the U.S. Army; BG Richard C. Kim of the U.S. Army; and Brig. Gen. Chad T. Manske of the U.S. Air Force.

Those are only the ones who signed the letter. So I will just ask my colleagues—and perhaps we should listen to those who have led our forces in times of war. When they say that these people stood with them and when they say that if we do nothing and just let them be in limbo—and we know, just a

few weeks ago, one of them was murdered in the State of Virginia, in the middle of the night, because he was working as a Lyft driver—is that what we are going to do? Are we just going to leave them in limbo or are we going to stand with them as the top leaders in our military have suggested?

They have been resolute in their support, not just of doing something about this, but of this bill, of this amendment. We worked with the military for years on this amendment. They have signed their names to this letter. What does the letter say specifically?

It says:

If Congress fails to enact the [Afghan Adjustment Act], the United States will be less secure.

OK. There you go. We can just stand here and not want to deal with this because everyone wants to go home for August or we can actually vote on this amendment. That is all we are asking. We want to vote on this amendment.

They write:

If Congress fails to enact the [Afghan Adjustment Act], the United States will be less secure. As military professionals, it was and remains our duty to prepare for future conflicts. We assure you that in any such conflict, potential allies will remember what happens now with our Afghan allies. If we claim to support the troops and want to enable their success in wartime, we must keep our commitments today. The [Afghan Adjustment Act]—

And this isn't me talking. This is all the top brass, the top military, who led us in times of war.

They write:

The [Afghan Adjustment Act] will go a long way.

Additionally, without the fixes applied by the [Afghan Adjustment Act]—

This is them writing, not me—

our immigration system will be less capable, not more capable, of properly processing and vetting applicants.

To break from their letter, that was the point I made earlier about why Senator WICKER and Senator GRAHAM and Senator MORAN were so focused on making sure that this was the gold standard of vetting in this bill.

Back to the letter:

The enhancements that the Afghan Adjustment Act adds to the security screening process of those who were evacuated are of critical importance to our national security.

Listening?

Even if you don't agree with me on the security of our country overall in standing with our allies, at the very least, look at that. Shouldn't we be vetting people who were evacuated? Hmm. Maybe that would be a good idea. That is what they say in this letter.

Three dozen military flag officers think that without the Afghan Adjustment Act, our Nation will be less secure. Our soldiers will face new obstacles in finding allies on the battlefield, and our immigration system will be less capable of vetting applicants. Those are plenty of good reasons to support this amendment and why we have leading Senators—both on the

Democratic side and Republican side—on this critical amendment. So that is it.

We have the leading people who head the committees in this very Chamber supporting this bill. That is how much work that Senator GRAHAM and I have done to get them on board. We have got them on this.

We have got military and veterans groups. We have national security leaders. We have retired U.S. Ambassadors to Afghanistan under four different Presidents: Obama, Trump, Biden, and George W. Bush. And we have all of the top brass retired military officers, whose names I just read off.

They are not debating which bill or which amendment because we have been working on it for 2 years. They know exactly what we should do, and it is this bill, the Afghan Adjustment Act.

All of our colleagues have had at least a year to look at this bill. So I don't want to hear that. I don't want to hear that, "Oh, we have got to look at this more." Give me a break. This bill has been out there for a very, very long time. There is absolutely no reason we shouldn't have a vote.

If people want to vote against the American Legion, and the VFW, and all the top brass of the military, and all the Ambassadors who served under those Presidents, that is fine. That is their right. But we need to have a vote. That is the only way we can show that we are keeping our covenant.

Until we get this done, we are essentially asking our Afghan allies—people who took bullets in the face, who lost limbs—to rebuild their lives on top of a trapped door that could fall out from under them at any second. Without the Afghan Adjustment Act, all of it—their jobs, their homes, their safety—could disappear.

By including the amendment in the NDAA, we can strengthen the national security of our country by making our vetting program more thorough—such a top priority of many of our colleagues—while finally doing right by our Afghan allies who sacrificed for us.

Let's put aside the politics and the distractions. There are a lot of good things in this bill. We have got a lot of votes on big things and little things so far. Where is this? Who is going to object to at least allowing this vote? They can vote against it if they want, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but don't deny us a vote.

By "us," who am I talking about? Yeah, the Afghans who are here who sacrificed for us, the top military, the Ambassadors, the military in this country who have come up and talked to each and every one of us about this bill, American soldiers who are begging us to do something about it. That is "us."

The way I see it, this defense bill is about three things: one, our Nation's security; two, setting a moral example for the world; and, three, showing people everywhere that when America



makes a promise, a covenant, it will be kept. The Afghan Adjustment Act, the amendment that Senator GRAHAM and I have put forth, advances all of these objectives.

Pass this amendment. Show the world that our word, show our own military that our word and our covenant matters.

I yield the floor.

#### MORNING BUSINESS

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam President, with regards to Rounds amendment No. 813 to S. 2226, the FY24 National Defense Authorization Act, I share the sponsor's national security concerns, especially in reference to the purchase of agricultural lands by companies affiliated with the People's Republic of China, and appreciate the sponsor's effort to improve review of these sales. However, I am also deeply concerned by issues that have been raised with respect to civil liberties and want to ensure that no one is discriminated against or viewed as a national security threat simply because of where they were born.

As written, the language seems to equate individuals from the specified countries as synonymous with their governments. Under this provision, if an individual with a valid visa, who has no connection to one of the governments listed, seeks to buy agricultural property above a certain threshold, the U.S. Government would deny them the ability to proceed with the purchase simply because of their national origin. While the national security concerns this amendment seeks to address are real, we must not discriminate on individuals based on national origin, race, or ethnicity.

I voted in favor of my colleagues' amendment in order to continue the conversation on this important issue, but will not support any final provision that does not resolve these civil liberties concerns.

#### VOTE EXPLANATION

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, had I been able to vote, I would have voted yea on the Kaine amendment No. 429 to require the advice and consent of the Senate or an act of Congress to suspend, terminate, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty and authorizing related litigation, and for other purposes.

I am a cosponsor for a similar bill, S.J. Res. 37, led by Senators Kaine and Rubio, which establishes a mechanism for the United States to exit the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, NATO. Although the Constitution provides clear guidance on Congress's role in ratifying treaties, it does not say anything about Congress's role in approving or disapproving withdrawal from a treaty. I believe, together with Senator

Kaine and Senator RUBIO, that the NATO alliance is a foundational principle of U.S. national security, regardless of who is President, and the U.S. leadership role in the alliance should depend on more than the whims of any one administration.

#### HONORING OFFICER JAKE WALLIN

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, on behalf of Senator TINA SMITH of Minnesota, Senator JOHN HOEVEN of North Dakota, and Senator KEVIN CRAMER of North Dakota, I rise to honor Jake Ryan Wallin, a Fargo police officer whose life was cut tragically short in the line of duty on July 14, 2023. He lived every day of his 23 years in the service of others, and his loss is nothing short of a tragedy for his family, his community, and our country.

Jake was the beloved son of Jeff and Amy Wallin. Raised in St. Michael, MN, he was a graduate of St. Michael-Albertville High School and Alexandria Technical and Community College before attending the American Military University.

As a member of the Minnesota National Guard, he was deployed to both Afghanistan and Iraq, where he served honorably. Upon return, he found a new home in Fargo, ND, and continued his life of service with the Fargo Police Department.

At Officer Wallin's funeral, the people who knew him best emphasized that more than anything, he wanted to live a life of purpose—to do work that made a difference for people. As a servicemember and a police officer, he did that and so much more. Time and time again, Officer Wallin heard the call of duty and raised his hand to say, "Count me in." That level of selflessness, character, and patriotism is the mark of a good citizen and a good man. A world where everyone lived the values that defined Officer Wallin's life would be a better world indeed.

My heart is with Jake's parents Jeff and Amy; his brother Brady; his fiancée Winter; and everyone who called him a grandson, a nephew, a cousin, a colleague, or a friend. I wish them peace and comfort as they mourn the needless, devastating loss of an exceptional young man. While he is no longer with us, his memory will serve as an inspiration to generations of public servants who choose to follow in his brave footsteps.

#### TRIBUTE TO GRACE ABDALLAH

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Grace Abdallah, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Grace is a graduate of O'Gorman High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of Kansas in Lawrence, KS, where she is pursuing a degree in business. She is

a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Grace for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.

#### TRIBUTE TO HALEIGH BROWN

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Haleigh Brown, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Haleigh is a graduate of Roosevelt High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, she is attending the University of South Dakota in Vermillion, SD, where she is pursuing a degree in political science. She is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Haleigh for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.

#### TRIBUTE TO DILLON GESTRING

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Dillon Gestring, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Dillon is a graduate of Vermillion High School in Vermillion, SD. Currently, he is attending Grinnell College in Grinnell, IA, where he is pursuing a degree in political science. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Dillon for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

#### TRIBUTE TO CHARLIE MICKELSON

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Charlie Mickelson, an intern in my Washington, DC, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.

Charlie is a graduate of Lincoln High School in Sioux Falls, SD. Currently, he is attending Creighton University in Omaha, NE, where he is pursuing a degree in business. He is a hard worker who has been dedicated to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Charlie for all of the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.

#### TRIBUTE TO NOAH ROISUM

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, today I recognize Noah Roisum, an intern in my Rapid City, SD, office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota over the past several weeks.