

were added as cosponsors of S. 3775, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the BOLD Infrastructure for Alzheimer's Act, and for other purposes.

S. 3955

At the request of Ms. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3955, a bill to require the heads of Federal agencies to submit to Congress an annual report regarding official time authorized under title 5, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 3958

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3958, a bill to require the Interagency Working Group on Toxic Exposure to conduct research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of descendants of individuals exposed to toxic substances while serving as members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

S. 3976

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3976, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reinstate the deduction for personal casualty losses as in effect prior to the enactment of Public Law 115-97 (commonly referred to as the "Tax Cuts and Jobs Act").

S. 4001

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 4001, a bill to establish a commission to study the potential transfer of the Weitzman National Museum of American Jewish History to the Smithsonian Institution, and for other purposes.

S. 4072

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BUDD), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 4072, a bill to prohibit the use of funds to implement, administer, or enforce certain rules of the Environmental Protection Agency.

S. RES. 385

At the request of Mr. RISCH, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 385, a resolution calling for the immediate release of Evan Gershkovich, a United States citizen and journalist, who was wrongfully detained by the Government of the Russian Federation in March 2023.

S. RES. 505

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware

(Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 505, a resolution condemning the use of sexual violence and rape as a weapon of war by the terrorist group Hamas against the people of Israel.

S. RES. 620

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 620, a resolution demanding that the international community hold accountable those who perpetrated acts of sexual violence and sexual torture during and after the attack on the State of Israel on October 7, 2023.

S. RES. 622

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 622, a resolution providing for the issuance of a summons, providing for the appointment of a committee to receive and to report evidence, and establishing related procedures concerning the articles of impeachment against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas.

S. RES. 623

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BRAUN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 623, a resolution to provide for related procedures concerning the articles of impeachment against Alejandro Nicholas Mayorkas, Secretary of Homeland Security.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. MARSHALL):

S. 4081. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to provide premium support for certain plans of insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

Mr. HOEVEN. Madam President, I rise to talk about legislation that we are introducing today. It is called the FARMER Act. "FARMER" stands for Federal Agriculture Risk Management Enhancement and Resilience, and that is just exactly what this farm bill does, what this legislation does. Really, we think this is an important step to getting to a farm bill—and hopefully this year—because it is all about enhancing crop insurance.

I am very pleased to be joined here on the floor by our ranking member on the Ag Committee, Senator BOOZMAN, from Arkansas. He is cosponsoring the legislation, as are other members of our Ag Committee, including Senator ERNST of Iowa, Senator FISCHER of Nebraska, Senator GRASSLEY of Iowa, Senator HYDE-SMITH of Mississippi, and Senator MARSHALL of Kansas—all Senators who have significant ag production in their State, both in terms of crops and livestock.

And this is all about what we have right here: "Keeping the farm in the

farm bill." As a matter of fact, it is about putting more farm in the farm bill, and that is going to have to happen in order to get a farm bill accomplished this year.

Well, how do we do that? What does that mean? That means strengthening crop insurance, our farmer's No. 1 risk management tool, and also updating ARC and PLC, which is the countercyclical safety net, ARC—Ag Risk Coverage—and PLC—Price Loss Coverage, that is the countercyclical safety net that our farmers rely on; so crop insurance, the No. 1 risk management tool for farmers nationwide, combined with a countercyclical safety net, updating ARC and PLC to make it relevant given the incredible increase we have seen in input costs that our producers face.

When you look at fertilizer and all the inputs—fuel, everything else—all the inputs that our farmers and our ranchers are required to purchase now to raise that crop or for ranchers to raise those animals, those costs have gone up dramatically. And commodity prices for our food products have come down, which really puts pressure on our farmers and ranchers. That is why it is so important—so important—that we update crop insurance and the countercyclical safety net to make it relevant—to make it relevant—in terms of risk management for producers across this great Nation.

We have a huge ag industry, very diverse, across all of our States, and so this really is fundamental—fundamental—to getting a farm bill done and done right and hopefully done this year.

So this bill, as I say, focuses on the crop insurance piece. And so what does it do? Well, it does two things: One, it strengthens crop insurance by increasing the premium support and making it more affordable to purchase crop insurance and, two, it enables our farmers to insure to a higher level.

There are two ways that they do that. One is at the enterprise level. So at the farm level, they buy crop insurance. This makes it more affordable to buy up to a higher level of coverage—say, 80 or 85 percent coverage on a more affordable basis—and then they can get a second-tier policy that helps them. It is called Supplemental Coverage Option. That is actually based on a countywide average.

So they can buy that supplemental coverage to insure up to a higher level, up to 90 percent, on a realistically affordable basis.

Now, the other thing it does is it calls on the Secretary of USDA—the Secretary of Agriculture—to look at the supplemental coverage. For States that have big counties like my home State of North Dakota or Senator BOOZMAN's State of Arkansas or Texas and others, it requires that RMA—Risk Management Agency that provides crop insurance—looks at how these policies are done to make it work better for States that have large counties, which many of our States do.

So those are the kind of enhancements to crop insurance that really serve our farmers, and it is not just our farmers. We are also doing more for our ranchers and our livestock producers, but really it is much more than that. This legislation helps our farmers; it helps our taxpayers; and it helps all Americans.

And let me touch on that for just a minute. First, in terms of our farmers, obviously, they face tremendous challenges due to weather—they have no control over the weather—and prices.

You know, we have this network of family farms and ranches across this country. They are price-takers. They don't get a chance to set any prices. So crop insurance, that is why it is their No. 1 risk management tool because when they don't have a crop or they have a very substandard crop, this crop insurance enables them to stay in the game so that family farms can continue to be around for the next year, so that ranchers can continue to be around for the next year.

It is vitally important when they have no control over, like I say, weather or prices. It is to keep them in the game for the long term.

That benefits our taxpayers because we have the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world, and this is the most effective way to keep that network of family farms and ranchers out there on the land.

And that really benefits every single American every single day because what do our farmers do? They produce food, fuel, and fiber for this Nation. Well, that is national security, for sure. Food security is national security. But think about this for a minute. We have the highest quality, lowest cost food supply in the world. Every American benefits from that every day. Every time you have something to eat in this country that you buy in our great grocery stores, brought to them from the farm, from the ranch—we have the highest quality and the lowest cost.

Americans spend less of their budget on food, and they have better food than anyone else—more choices, more options, higher quality. But Americans spend less of their budget on food than any other developed country, brought to them by our farmers and ranchers.

That is a remarkable benefit. That is a benefit that every American receives every single day. And that is why it is so important that we get farm policy right. That is why we have got to get it right.

And here is the final point I want to make before I turn things over to my esteemed colleague Senator BOOZMAN. We can't take this network of farmers and ranchers that we have in this country for granted. We have about 16 million people involved in agriculture, directly or indirectly. But our food is brought to us by farms and ranches, a diverse set of family farms and ranches across this country, and we can't take that for granted.

And if we don't have this safety net, if we don't have crop insurance that they can afford to buy—which they buy—and if they can't access this countercyclical safety net, we don't have that network of farms and ranches.

Like a lot of other industries in this country, we can end up with just a few big companies. And I wonder how that is going to work out because all that competition you see from these millions of farmers and ranchers providing that highest quality, lowest cost food supply, that could change, right? So we can't take this for granted.

So when it comes to getting the farm bill done, we have got to get it right. We have got to get it right. And that is what this is all about: getting crop insurance right and making sure that our farmers can both access crop insurance and the countercyclical safety net—ARC and PLC—at the same time. They need both.

Look, this is about getting a farm bill done. This legislation needs to be included in the farm bill, and it will go a long way toward making sure that we get a farm bill done and hopefully done this year.

And I would like now to turn it over to Senator BOOZMAN for his remarks.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I want to thank my good friend from North Dakota Senator HOEVEN for his leadership on this issue. Under normal circumstances, we would have been celebrating the passage of a new farm bill by now. Unfortunately, we are not there yet, and our farmers continue to face far from normal circumstances. But we are making progress, and I am committed to meaningfully addressing the needs of farmers, ranchers, and rural communities.

Alongside bolstering the title 1 reference prices, maintaining and improving crop insurance is at the top of the list for my farm bill priorities. But more importantly, these are the top priorities of farmers across the country.

The first of many farm bill listening sessions I have participated in started with a roundtable in Senator HOEVEN's home State of North Dakota. The takeaway from that event has been echoed across the countryside and in meetings throughout Washington: We need more "farm" in the farm bill.

This next farm bill must update the risk management tools farmers and ranchers need to succeed in order to reflect the nature of the challenges under which they operate today. Here is the reality: Producers are experiencing unprecedented challenges, regulatory uncertainty, and historic volatility in the farm economy, all of which are predicted to even get worse.

A producer from Minnesota told me recently that record high input costs, coupled with declining crop prices, would mean that she would have to harvest a record yield just to break even. That is not a scenario farm families want to pass on to the next generation.

Historic inflation, rising interest rates, a record trade deficit, dev-

astating natural disasters, and global disruptions will make it more difficult for our farmers to succeed in the years to come. And with an outdated farm safety net, described by a Texas farmer as 2 inches above the concrete, agriculture is left wondering what level of crisis is necessary to compel Washington to act.

I commend Senator HOEVEN's leadership in introducing the FARMER Act and proactively addressing the needs of farmers and ranchers who have asked for improvements to the Federal Crop Insurance Program.

The FARMER Act includes critical components to modernizing the farm safety net for producers across all regions and all commodities. From wheat in North Dakota to cotton in Georgia, to peaches in New Jersey, corn in Illinois and Colorado, to apples in Vermont and soybeans in Ohio, producers in every State could reap the benefits of more affordable crop insurance options.

The strength of this approach is underscored by the endorsement of over 20 grassroots organizations representing the voices of farm families from across the country.

We can pass a farm bill that strengthens title 1 and title 11, while also making improvements across every other title and meet our shared goals.

This isn't an either-or decision. The next farm bill provides an incredible opportunity to make things right for farmers, ranchers, rural communities, and those in need. Working together we can protect and enhance voluntary conservation programs, provide investments needed to open new export markets, and expand existing markets, build on research that allows our farmers to do more with less while reducing environmental impacts, protect the health of our Nation's herds and flocks and help rural communities flourish and prosper.

Passing such a bill is never an easy task, but it is one that this body has come together to accomplish time and time again. I look forward to continuing to work with Chairman STABENOW and my Senate colleagues to pass a farm bill that achieves these goals, and I very much appreciate the work of Senator HOEVEN and his contribution to that process.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. President, I want to say thank you to the ranking member on the Senate Ag Committee, Senator BOOZMAN. And I am especially proud to be here with the Senator from the great State of North Dakota, Senator HOEVEN, and support our FARMER Act.

Crop insurance is the backbone of every farm bill. When I talk to producers back home, they tell me crop insurance is their first, second, and third priority. It is important not just to producers, but it also helps stabilize groceries on the other end by having a

good, constant supply by allowing the farmer to plant next year's crop after Mother Nature strikes. It helps keep those prices down at the grocery store as well.

You know, I am often asked why crop insurance is so important. And I want to quote the late President John F. Kennedy when he summed up the plight of the farmer pretty well. This is what President Kennedy said:

The farmer is the only person in our economy who buys everything at retail, sells everything at wholesale, and pays the freight both ways.

Look, our input costs are driving the value of our crops up, and thus the cost of crop insurance is going up along with it. Unfortunately, commodity prices don't reflect that. Instead, we are seeing an alltime drop in farming income—year over year drop that we have seen in decades.

But the FARMER Act truly puts "farm" back in the farm bill with a reasonable cost. It helps take on this added burden of crop insurance, which, again, allows the farmer to plant next year's crop and makes us the most single most important program at USDA.

I am proud to be here today urging that this body pass the FARMER Act—perhaps included on the farm bill would be a good place for it as well—to protect the economic security of rural America and keep food prices stable for American consumers.

I am happy to yield back to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. I thank Senator MARSHALL. Obviously, he speaks on behalf of a very important ag State—Kansas. I thank Senator BOOZMAN and all the cosponsors on this legislation.

As Senator MARSHALL said very well, this is the most cost-effective way to make sure that we keep our farmers and ranchers out there providing this incredible food supply that benefits every American every day.

One final point that Senator BOOZMAN referenced. We have the support already—the endorsement of virtually all of the major farm groups, you know, the farm production groups in the country representing our great farmers. Their endorsement tells you very clearly that we need to have this enhancement to crop insurance in the farm bill to get the farm bill done.

Again, on behalf of our sponsors of this legislation, I would like to thank them. We are going to work very diligently to do everything we can to work with all of our colleagues to get a farm bill done.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

S. 4092. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to implement a limitation on contracting for supplies needed for the Department of the Army for certain workload activities at arsenals of the Department of the Army, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 4092

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Arsenal Workload Sustainment Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States has a long and proud history of manufacturing defense products.

(2) Factories and arsenals of the Department of the Army that are owned and operated by the United States Government are a critical component of the organic industrial base.

(3) The 2023 National Defense Industrial Strategy recognizes the need of the Department of Defense to more strategically utilize the organic industrial base in order to maintain a competitive military advantage.

(4) Sufficient workload at arsenals of the Department of the Army that are owned and operated by the United States Government ensure cost efficiency and technical competence in peacetime, while preserving the ability to provide an effective and timely response to mobilizations, national defense contingency situations, and other emergency requirements.

SEC. 3. LIMITATION ON CONTRACTING FOR SUPPLIES NEEDED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY FOR CERTAIN WORKLOAD ACTIVITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7532 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking "The Secretary of the Army" and inserting "(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(b) TREATMENT OF WORKLOAD ACTIVITIES.—

"(1) PERCENTAGE LIMITATION.—Not more than 50 percent of the funds made available in a fiscal year for a military department or a Defense Agency for workload activities pursuant to subsection (a) may be used to contract for the performance by non-United States Government personnel of such workload for that military department or Defense Agency.

"(2) AMOUNTS FOR ACTIVITIES BY EMPLOYEES OF DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Any funds made available in a fiscal year to a military department or a Defense Agency for workload activities pursuant to subsection (a) that are not used for a contract described in paragraph (1) shall be used for the performance of those activities by employees of the Department of Defense.

"(B) TREATMENT OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.—Workload activities conducted pursuant to subsection (a) under a public-private partnership shall be deemed to be activities performed by employees of the Department of Defense for purposes of subparagraph (A).

"(3) WAIVER OF LIMITATION.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Defense may waive the limitation under paragraph (1) for a fiscal year if the Secretary determines that the waiver is necessary for reasons of national security.

"(B) EFFECT.—A waiver under subparagraph (A) shall not take effect until the date that is 30 days after the Secretary submits to the congressional defense committees a notification of the determination under such

subparagraph, together with a justification for the determination.

"(4) PREFERENCES FOR PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS IN SOURCE SELECTION PROCESSES.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall give preference to a non-public partner who has entered into a public-private partnership under section 2474 of this title in the source selection process if such partner uses an arsenal of the Department of the Army that is owned and operated by the United States Government as a partner in any type of contractual agreement with the United States Government to conduct workload activities pursuant to subsection (a), by adding 20 percent to the price of any offer that does not use an arsenal of the Department of the Army that is owned and operated by the United States Government as a partner in its bid.

"(B) NON-PUBLIC PARTNER DEFINED.—In this subparagraph, the term 'non-public partner' means a corporation, individual, university, or nonprofit organization.

"(5) CONFORMANCE.—The establishment of sustained workload conducted under subsection (a) shall be consistent with the requirement under paragraph (1) and shall be performed consistent with following:

"(A) The technical proficiencies set forth under section 2474(a) or 4841 of this title.

"(B) Fragility and criticality assessments of the Army."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 7544(c) of title 10, United States Code, is amended, in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "may be carried out at an Army industrial facility under a cooperative arrangement entered into under subsection (a) only under the following conditions" and inserting "is presumptively and conditionally approved to be carried out at an Army industrial facility under a cooperative arrangement entered into under subsection (a) unless it is demonstrated that the following conditions are not met".

(c) ANNUAL REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, with the budget of the President submitted under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, for a fiscal year a report that details the following:

(A) An outlook of expected workload at each arsenal of the Department of the Army that is owned and operated by the United States Government during the period covered by the future-years defense program submitted to Congress under section 221 of title 10, United States Code.

(B) A breakout, by relevant budget accounts, of workload that was achieved in the prior fiscal year, whether directly or through public-private partnerships.

(C) The capital investments required to be made at each arsenal of the Department of the Army that is owned and operated by the United States Government in order to ensure compliance and operational capacity.

(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term "appropriate congressional committees" means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 630—SUPPORTING THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION AND RECOGNIZING ITS 75 YEARS OF ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. RISCH (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. RICKETTS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 630

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) was founded on April 4, 1949, to “safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of [its] peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law”;

Whereas the United States Senate approved the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 on July 21, 1949, and the United States Government acceded to membership in NATO on August 24, 1949;

Whereas NATO was originally founded to ensure the collective security of its members, and stand against the Soviet threat to peace and acts collectively to promote freedom, stability, and peace in the North Atlantic region;

Whereas, since the formation of NATO, 10 rounds of enlargement have grown the alliance from 12 members to 32;

Whereas NATO is the most successful political-military alliance in history and, guided by a set of common values, provides collective defense to more than 950,000,000 people living in its member nations;

Whereas the sustained commitment of NATO to mutual defense has contributed to the democratic and economic transformation of Central and Eastern Europe;

Whereas enlargement has strengthened NATO, and the Alliance remains open to additional enlargement for European states that advance the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area, in line with Article 10 of the Treaty;

Whereas the newest members of the alliance, Finland and Sweden, contribute already interoperable militaries, including robust navies, powerful air forces, strong cyber capabilities, and large numbers of active military personnel and ready reservists to the alliance;

Whereas the allies invoked NATO’s Article 5 collective defense clause for the first and only time to offer political and military assistance to the United States in responding to the attacks of September 11, 2001;

Whereas NATO serves as a force multiplier, whose command structures, training institutions, and multilateral exercises have generated multinational contributions to United States national security priorities and enabled European and Canadian soldiers to serve with members of the United States Armed Forces in various missions;

Whereas NATO is currently involved in several operations benefitting United States national security, including NATO’s Kosovo Force (KFOR), Standing Naval Forces, Operation Sea Guardian, NATO Mission Iraq, and air policing missions in Eastern Europe;

Whereas, through the Partnership for Peace and Enhanced Forward Presence, NATO has extended opportunities for cooperation with non-NATO nations;

Whereas NATO members have stood against Russian aggression in Eastern Europe, reinforced existing battlegroups and established new ones, supported United States sanctions on the Russian Federation, and

imposed their own sanctions measures in coordination with the United States and other allies;

Whereas the NATO Wales Summit Declaration of 2014 pledged, “Allies currently meeting the NATO guideline to spend a minimum of 2 percent of their Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on defence will aim to continue to do so . . . Allies whose current proportion of GDP spent on defence is below this level will: halt any decline in defence expenditure; aim to increase defence expenditure in real terms as GDP grows; aim to move towards the 2 percent guideline within a decade with a view to meeting their NATO Capability Targets and filling NATO’s capability shortfalls.”;

Whereas 22 NATO nations have increased their military spending since the Wales Declaration of 2014;

Whereas, at the NATO Vilnius Summit in 2023, member countries affirmed their commitment to spend “at least” 2 percent of GDP on defense, and noted that “in many cases, expenditure beyond 2 percent of GDP will be needed in order to remedy existing shortfalls and meet the requirements across all domains arising from a more contested security order”;

Whereas 20 NATO members still fall short of meeting their 2 percent commitment;

Whereas collective security demands real and sustained burden sharing;

Whereas NATO members that do not meet their 2 percent goal have a responsibility to the other member states and should rapidly address their budget shortfalls and prioritize defense spending;

Whereas NATO updated its Strategic Concept planning document in 2022 to recognize emerging threats to the alliance, including from the People’s Republic of China, and begin the process of adapting our collective approach to face them in the coming generation;

Whereas, at the NATO Vilnius Summit in 2023, NATO reaffirmed its commitment to its core values and take decisive action to defend them against threats across multiple domains;

Whereas nations must put defense spending in their base budgets to provide long-term certainty to NATO planners and their partners;

Whereas the Russian Federation’s invasion of Ukraine marks the largest military conflict in Europe since World War II, representing a dramatic shift for European security and requiring NATO to change its policies to increase, modernize, and enhance its force posture and to create more strategic depth to adequately confront new challenges;

Whereas, in adapting to growing aggression by the People’s Republic of China, NATO has deepened its partnerships with Indo-Pacific allies, including South Korea, Japan, Australia, and New Zealand; and

Whereas section 1250A of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118-31) requires the advice and consent of the Senate for any President of the United States to suspend, terminate, denounce, or withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic treaty: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) lauds NATO for its 75-year maintenance of the alliance and recognizes its foundational contributions to maintaining the safety, security, and democratic systems of its members;

(2) welcomes all NATO members and observers as the United States hosts the 75th Annual Summit in July 2024, in Washington, D.C.;

(3) recognizes the key role NATO has played in enabling the most peaceful and

prosperous period in history for the North Atlantic area and also that NATO does not only benefit the defense of its own member states, but enhances security and stability beyond its borders;

(4) appreciates the burden and sacrifice made by each member nation and each service member who has acted to maintain the collective security of NATO;

(5) reaffirms that NATO members join by free choice, not by compulsion or coercion, and that sovereign nations should be free to choose with whom they associate and enter into alliances without fear of violent reprisal;

(6) continues to affirm the importance of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty;

(7) reaffirms the importance of nuclear deterrence in NATO planning and supports the modernization and development of new systems while continuing risk-reduction discussions with our adversaries;

(8) reaffirms that all NATO territory is equally under the protection of its collective defense;

(9) strongly calls on all NATO member states to immediately meet their pledges and raise their defense levels above the 2 percent GDP target, and to more fully share the security burden by focusing on meeting capabilities targets, enhancing interoperability, improving readiness, and modernization to respond to the threats that face the alliance on each of its flanks;

(10) urges all NATO member countries to meet their commitments to the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law;

(11) stands in robust support of those NATO members who spend 2 percent or more of their GDPs on defense and acknowledges the 8 countries that have met that goal since 2014;

(12) welcomes the recent additions of Finland and Sweden to the alliance;

(13) recognizes that NATO, in its planning processes, must take into account security threats to the alliance from around the world, including the People’s Republic of China;

(14) encourages NATO to build closer ties with the Indo-Pacific to confront the challenges posed by the deepening partnership and alignment between the Russian Federation and the People’s Republic of China;

(15) urges all members to consider the value that Ukraine will add to NATO’s defense and stability for Europe ahead of the Washington Summit in 2024; and

(16) reaffirms the commitment of the United States to NATO’s mission, and its belief that NATO is the most successful security alliance in our Nation’s history and one that should continue to be a cornerstone of United States national security.

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF ESCORT COMMITTEE

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Excellency Kishida Fumio, Prime Minister of Japan, into the House Chamber for the joint meeting on Thursday, April 11, 2024.

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