

This major diplomatic breakthrough went way beyond the long-sought recognition of Israel by Arab and Muslim countries; it also opened the door to economic and people-to-people ties that have the potential to foster a new era of mutual understanding and peace in the Middle East.

President Obama was also overly cautious in dealing with China's aggression in the South China Sea and too overly deferential to China's imperialistic sensitivities toward Taiwan.

Now, do you remember that in 1979, the Taiwan Relations Act passed, and it mandated strong, if unofficial, economic and military ties, including military sales. This has been the basis of U.S. policy with Taiwan for decades.

The more you slow-walk military sales to Taiwan out of deference to China's feelings, the more China feels really empowered to dictate aspects of our bilateral relationships with Taiwan.

President Trump abandoned this weak and this dangerous Obama policy of appeasement.

President Trump imposed sanctions against the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline, which Russia was clearly pursuing to give Russia geopolitical leverage over Europe and Ukraine because supplying energy to other countries brings that leverage.

The Trump administration armed and trained the Ukrainian military and cooperated closely with our frontline allies like the Baltic nations and Poland.

The Trump administration stopped being deferential towards China. Arm sales to Taiwan became a regular occurrence, and U.S. Government officials got the blessing to interact with their Taiwanese counterparts. Can you imagine China feeling it has a right to tell Senators and people in the administration or U.S. House of Representatives Members: You can't go to Taiwan.

Now, this message that Trump sent—China got that message that it couldn't get away with breaking trade rules and pushing around our allies and partners in the region.

Most recently, President Biden's insistence on returning to failed Obama-era policies has resulted in foreign policy setbacks. The cascade of countries joining the Abraham Accords would likely have continued, to include even Saudi Arabia, but the Biden administration's repeated efforts to resurrect the defunct Iran nuclear deal once again damaged the trust of our regional allies and our partners—at the same time, empowering Iran.

President Biden promised to repair relations with our European allies. What he meant became clear when he dropped sanctions on the Nord Stream 2 Pipeline. This was a sign of deference towards Germany at the expense of our Eastern European allies. Germany is indeed a close ally in Europe, but Germany is not all of Europe.

Also, while it is known that there was a personality conflict between

President Trump and former Chancellor Merkel of Germany, our alliance with Germany is deep enough to survive both personality conflicts and differences over Nord Stream 2.

In hindsight, everyone, even including the Germans, can see the folly in giving Vladimir Putin the ability to turn the heat on and the lights off throughout all of Europe. And he would be glad to have that power. This gesture of good will towards Germany was certainly not worth bolstering Putin and upsetting several Central and Eastern European allies, who saw clearly what was at stake if you gave Putin that power.

Let's face it: Trump does ruffle feathers. But his policies—including pushing delinquent NATO members to spend the agreed amount on defense that they are obligated to spend on NATO security—these countries were better for it, and European security was better for it than the Obama and Biden policies that simply sought applause from certain European leaders.

There are those strongly backing Trump and then, as we know, those strongly opposed to Trump—both claiming, though, to know what he would do in a second term. I do not have much time for pontificating and political prognosticating based upon speculation. I prefer to look at the record, and I hope I have reminded people of that record.

We should demand a foreign policy based on American strength. Sometimes we talk about peace through strength, or sometimes we forget to remind people that a strong American military is the best tool to bring about world peace. So we should demand a foreign policy based upon that strength.

And we should also be on guard to not accept a failure of American leadership spun as a more collaborative approach with our allies. Our allies who are closest to the threats from Russia and China really want strong American leadership and need us to push our more reluctant allies to do what it takes to defend the free world.

That is what we saw in the first Trump administration, and it is the kind of leadership we badly, badly need right now.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

#### MEASURE READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 4541

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I understand that there is a bill at the desk, and I ask for its first reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the first time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4541) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make certain provisions with respect to qualified ABLE programs permanent.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I now ask for a second reading, and in order to place the bill on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to my own request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

The bill will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

#### GLIOBLASTOMA AWARENESS DAY

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 735, which is at the desk.

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

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 735) designating July 17, 2024, as "Glioblastoma Awareness Day".

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 735) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

#### FOREIGN EXTORTION PREVENTION TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 4548 introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 4548) to make a technical correction to the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 by repealing section 5101 and enacting an updated version of the Foreign Extortion Prevention Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

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

The bill (S. 4548) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 4548

*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 "Foreign Extortion Prevention Technical Corrections Act".

#### SEC. 2. TECHNICAL CORRECTION TO 2024 NDAA.

(a) REPEAL OF PREVIOUS VERSION OF FEPA.—Section 5101 of the National Defense

Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2024 (Public Law 118-31) is repealed, and each provision of law amended by that section is amended to read as it read on the day before the date of enactment of that Act.

(b) PROHIBITION OF DEMAND FOR BRIBE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

**“§1352. Demands by foreign officials for bribes**

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) FOREIGN OFFICIAL.—The term ‘foreign official’ means—

“(A)(i) any official or employee of a foreign government or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof; or

“(ii) any senior foreign political figure, as defined in section 1010.605 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, or any successor regulation;

“(B) any official or employee of a public international organization;

“(C) any person acting in an official capacity for or on behalf of—

“(i) a government, department, agency, or instrumentality described in subparagraph (A)(i); or

“(ii) a public international organization.

“(2) PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION.—The term ‘public international organization’ means—

“(A) an organization that is designated by Executive order pursuant to section 1 of the International Organizations Immunities Act (22 U.S.C. 288); or

“(B) any other international organization that is designated by the President by Executive order for the purposes of this section, effective as of the date of publication of the order in the Federal Register.

“(b) PROHIBITION OF DEMAND FOR A BRIBE.—

“(1) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful for any foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official to corruptly demand, seek, receive, accept, or agree to receive or accept, directly or indirectly, anything of value personally or for any other person or non-governmental entity, by making use of the mails or any means or instrumentality of interstate commerce—

“(A) from—

“(i) any person (as defined in section 104A of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (15 U.S.C. 78dd-3), except that that definition shall be applied without regard to whether the person is an offender) while the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official, or a person acting on behalf of the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official, is in the territory of the United States;

“(ii) an issuer (as defined in section 3(a) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78c(a))), or any officer, director, employee, or agent of an issuer or any stockholder thereof acting on behalf of the issuer; or

“(iii) a domestic concern (as defined in section 104 of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (15 U.S.C. 78dd-2)), or any officer, director, employee, or agent of a domestic concern or any stockholder thereof acting on behalf of the domestic concern; and

“(B) in return for—

“(i) being influenced in the performance of any act or decision of the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official in the official capacity of the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official;

“(ii) being induced to do or omit to do any act in violation of the lawful duty of the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official;

“(iii) conferring any improper advantage; or

“(iv) using the influence of the foreign official or person selected to be a foreign official

with a foreign government or instrumentality thereof to affect or influence any act or decision of that government or instrumentality,

in connection with obtaining or retaining business for or with, or directing business to, any person.

“(2) PENALTIES.—Any person who violates paragraph (1) shall be fined not more than \$250,000 or 3 times the monetary equivalent of the thing of value, imprisoned for not more than 15 years, or both.

“(3) JURISDICTION.—An offense under paragraph (1) shall be subject to extraterritorial Federal jurisdiction.

“(4) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, and annually thereafter, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of State as relevant, shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, and post on the publicly available website of the Department of Justice, a report—

“(A) focusing, in part, on demands by foreign officials for bribes from entities domiciled or incorporated in the United States, and the efforts of foreign governments to prosecute such cases;

“(B) addressing United States diplomatic efforts to protect entities domiciled or incorporated in the United States from foreign bribery, and the effectiveness of those efforts in protecting such entities;

“(C) summarizing major actions taken under this section in the previous year, including enforcement actions taken and penalties imposed;

“(D) evaluating the effectiveness of the Department of Justice in enforcing this section; and

“(E) detailing what resources or legislative action the Department of Justice needs to ensure adequate enforcement of this section.

“(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—This subsection shall not be construed as encompassing conduct that would violate section 30A of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. 78dd-1) or section 104 or 104A of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 (15 U.S.C. 78dd-2; 15 U.S.C. 78dd-3) whether pursuant to a theory of direct liability, conspiracy, complicity, or otherwise.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 63 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“1352. Demands by foreign officials for bribes.”.

**ORDERS FOR MONDAY, JUNE 17, 2024**

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand adjourned until 3 p.m. on Monday, June 17; that following the prayer and pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; following the conclusion of morning business, the Senate proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the Oler nomination; further, that the cloture motions filed during today's session ripen at 5:30 p.m. on Monday.

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

**ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following my remarks.

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

(Mr. FETTERMAN assumed the Chair.)

**ANNIVERSARY OF DACA**

Ms. CORTEZ MASTO. Mr. President, I rise today because this Saturday marks the 12th anniversary of the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals policy, or DACA, as many know it.

This policy has given hope to so many hard-working individuals who call America home. It has allowed children of immigrants who were brought here as kids to flourish, strengthen our economy, and remain in the only country they have ever really known. These are our children.

When President Obama created DACA in 2012, it was a temporary solution focused on helping young people thrive. And with the establishment of DACA, we told them that if they stayed in school, they worked hard, and they contributed, we would help them stay here. That was a real promise that gave so much hope to thousands of amazing young people.

Now, it has been 12 years, and DACA recipients have done what they promised to do. They have gone to college. They have become part of our workforce. They pay billions of dollars in taxes. And listen to this: 49 percent of the initial group of DACA recipients in 2012 are college educated. As of 2023, there are over 544,000 recipients in the United States. And 10,730 of them live in my home State of Nevada.

But Dreamers aren't percentages and figures. They are people. I have had the honor of meeting many of them, and, let me tell you, these Nevadans make our State stronger. They are teachers. They are doctors, engineers, small business owners, and community leaders. And they have families. And they have spent the last 12 years holding up their end of the bargain, and it is past time for us to hold up ours.

This has been especially urgent in recent years, when litigation challenging DACA and attacks on the program by former President Trump and his allies have caused turmoil for Dreamers in this country. By failing to pass legislation to permanently protect Dreamers and put them on a path to citizenship, we are failing to fulfill our promise to these individuals. We are leaving them behind.

We know that their status in this country, their safety and stability in their homes could change soon because of lawsuits that are still making their way through the courts. Dreamers abide by our laws. They have worked hard for an education, and they contribute to their communities every single day. They have earned their place