

propose them. The President may negotiate them and even sign them, but unless or until a treaty is presented to the Senate and ratified in executive session by the Senate with a two-thirds supermajority vote—it takes 67 votes with 100 Senators—then you don't have a treaty, and you don't have that lasting, sovereign, international obligation—one that transcends one administration to another.

As far as the argument that there has been transparency and that there has been outreach by the White House to Senators and communication, that is great. It is the sort of thing that ought to happen. It is in no way sufficient to provide a substitute for or an end-run around article II, section 2 of the Constitution—requiring that treaties be presented to the Senate and ratified only with 67 votes in a 100 Member Chamber. So that doesn't do it. That can't take care of that here.

Look, the point here is that there is nothing in what I am suggesting that would necessarily close any doors in the future. What I am trying to say here is that, if we are going to do this—if we are going to close doors, as is the intention behind this agreement—close doors to future administrations and to future Congresses to bind us to some kind of a lasting obligation as a sovereign nation to one or more other sovereign nations internationally—then we have got to follow the treaty process because that is what the Constitution requires.

As to the idea that Ukraine is the frontline—the frontline of defending democracy as, I think, was one of the arguments raised here—our own obligation to protect our own sovereign borders and our own people, while at the same time containing and deterring other potential threats to the United States, such as those presented by China, have to come first. Those are the frontlines of our Republic—our own border, our own national defense, our own national security, the safety, the freedom, the security of our own people. That is the frontline that we are supposed to be focused on. That is literally our frontline, and insofar as that is incompatible with our efforts on another continent, those things have to be taken into account.

But there again, this is exactly the sort of thing that the Senate is supposed to consider not just in the abstract but in the context of a lasting, sovereign, international obligation in the context of treaty ratification proceedings, and that takes a two-thirds supermajority vote.

Executive agreements do not and constitutionally should not and cannot supersede laws passed by Congress. There is nothing in the Constitution that says that a lasting, sovereign, international obligation taken on by an Executive agreement made by the President of the United States alone, whether with or without consultation to one or more Members of Congress—there is nothing in there that says that

that satisfies the constitutional obligation.

Now, if the wording of article II, section 2 or any other provision of the Constitution reads otherwise, then we would be in a different circumstance, but alas, we are not in that universe. Quite fortunately, we are not. It is with good reason that the Founders put in there the two-thirds supermajority requirement, and we can't allow that simply to be bypassed here, not for light or casual purposes, not even for great purposes.

No matter how great our purposes are, no matter how noble one's intentions might be in the administration, in the Senate, or otherwise, one can't get around this simple fact that what we are talking about here is, for all practical purposes, a treaty, and we are being asked to treat it as such. That requires two-thirds. We don't have that here.

So no matter how much bipartisan support, no matter how much flowery rhetoric, no matter how much good that can be done, no matter how evil Vladimir Putin is, that still doesn't change our constitutional realities. We have each been sworn into office under circumstances where, pursuant to another provision of the Constitution, we are required to take an oath to the Constitution itself. Our oath requires nothing less than that we honor this and that we not pretend that we can just circumvent all of this simply by calling something an Executive agreement—no matter how justified by the circumstances we may want it to be.

Look, at the end of the day, we have to come to grapple with the fact that we are \$35 trillion in debt and that we face threats around the world, including and especially from China—China, which is gaining, increasingly, a foothold in our own hemisphere and in country after country throughout Latin America. China is gaining a physical presence, in addition to a more and more robust commercial arrangement, in addition to China's investment in so-called dual-use technologies, which in many circumstances have military purposes behind them. It is one of many policy reasons why we have got to be focused on China.

Insofar as we deplete our own resources in continuing to honor an obligation to another country in another hemisphere, we have got to take those things into account. It is one of many things that we have got to consider before taking on a treaty obligation. Make no mistake, this is a treaty obligation.

Abraham Lincoln is quoted as having asked the question rhetorically: If you count the tail of a dog as a leg, how many legs does the dog have?

People would, apparently, routinely—the uninitiated at least—respond by saying: Well, five legs.

And he would say: No. It is still four legs. Just because you call the tail of a dog a leg, it doesn't make it so.

Just because you call an Executive agreement a treaty and ask people to

treat it as if it were a treaty doesn't make it so.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARDIN). The Senator from Utah.

COMMEMORATING THE PASSAGE OF 3 YEARS SINCE THE TRAGIC BUILDING COLLAPSE IN SURFSIDE, FLORIDA, ON JUNE 24, 2021

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate now proceed to S. Res. 746.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 746) commemorating the passage of 3 years since the tragic building collapse in Surfside, Florida, on June 24, 2021.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 746) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of June 20, 2024, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

FEDERAL PRISON OVERSIGHT ACT

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration and the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 3019.

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

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3019) to establish an inspections regime for the Bureau of Prisons, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the committee was discharged, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. OSSOFF. I further ask 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 with no intervening action or debate.

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

The bill (H.R. 3019) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. OSSOFF. Mr. President, how did it come to pass that in a nation whose founding document guarantees due

process and civil rights and prohibits cruel and unusual punishment, a Federal prison in Dublin, CA, would become so notorious for the endemic sexual abuse of female inmates by prison staff that it would be known as the rape club—rape club—sexual assault and abuse of Federal inmates by the warden, by the chaplain.

Senator JOHNSON of Wisconsin and I led a bipartisan investigation of sexual assault in Federal prisons. We found that in two-thirds—two-thirds—of Federal prisons that housed female inmates, inmates had been sexually assaulted by members of prison staff.

We found that at the U.S. penitentiary in Atlanta, in my home State of Georgia, for nearly a decade, unchecked corruption and civil rights abuses had been ongoing with the knowledge of the leadership of the Bureau of Prisons, and no effective action had been taken to address them. Pretrial detainees sleeping in paper pajamas were denied access to counsel, denied access to hygiene products, denied access to fresh air—pretrial, presumptively innocent Federal detainees.

The human rights crisis behind bars in the United States is a stain on America's conscience.

We just passed the most significant Federal prison reform legislation in many years, and now it is on the way to the desk of the President of the United States. I am grateful to my colleague Senator BRAUN of Indiana for joining me in offering and introducing the Federal Prison Oversight Act, which has now been passed by the Senate and the House.

This is landmark prison reform legislation. It will require the inspector general of the Department of Justice to undertake ongoing and regular inspections of every single Federal prison in the United States.

It will establish an independent ombudsman at the Department of Justice to investigate the health, safety, welfare, and rights of incarcerated people and staff.

It will also create a secure hotline and an online forum for family members, friends, and representatives of incarcerated Americans to submit complaints and inquiries.

It will require the IG to report the findings from its routine inspections of Federal prisons and recommendations to Congress and to the public and require the Bureau of Prisons to respond to all inspection reports within 60 days with a corrective action plan.

We were able to pass this legislation because we worked together, Senator JOHNSON and I, leading multiple bipartisan investigations of human rights abuses and corruption in the Federal prison system and Senator BRAUN and I forming the Prison Policy Working Group to develop bipartisan solutions like this one.

I am grateful to my colleague from Georgia in the U.S. House, Representative MCBATH, for her tireless efforts to shepherd this bill to passage in the

U.S. House, and today, we passed it on the floor of the Senate. I am grateful for the support of my colleagues.

Let the leadership of the Bureau of Prisons know that the U.S. Congress will no longer tolerate the wanton and ongoing and widespread abuse of those who are in their custody.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. OSSOFF). The Senator from Maryland.

NATO

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, 75 years ago, a brutal Russian dictator had pushed Russia to the brink of war. Soviet-sponsored coups had removed democratically elected governments in Eastern Europe. Communist revolutionaries were trying to seek control of Greece. Authoritarian forces threatened American Allies across Europe. The peace that we fought so hard to secure during World War II was in jeopardy.

To meet these challenges, the United States and nations on both sides of the Atlantic that shared a democratic, free, and prosperous vision of the world came together and formed an alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, or NATO. President Truman signed the treaty, along with representatives from Canada, Belgium, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United Kingdom.

The heart of this treaty has always been article 5. It states that “the Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all.”

Despite the incredible changes we have seen in the world over the past 75 years, as the NATO alliance comes together for a summit here in Washington this week, the power of our solemn promise of solidarity is just as important as ever.

Vladimir Putin's invasion of Ukraine has laid bare the danger Russia once again poses to Europe. From the Baltic States and Poland to Romania and Bulgaria, NATO member countries have seen what Mr. Putin's army is capable of doing in Ukraine—targeting maternity wards and kindergartens, kidnapping and forcing children to relocate to Russia, executing innocent civilians with their hands tied behind their backs.

For those people living in Moscow's shadow, the only thing standing between a Russian invasion and such horrific war crimes is NATO. This makes the strength of our alliance vitally important.

I want to thank Secretary General Stoltenberg for his tireless efforts to guide the alliance through the last decade.

The alliance is stronger today thanks to the recent additions of Finland and Sweden; thanks to the important financial contributions of member states, especially on the eastern flank; and thanks to the leadership of the Biden administration—in particular,

Secretary Blinken and Secretary Austin.

Because of the hard work of our military and political leaders on both sides of the Atlantic, today, NATO is more unified, but there are concerns. Whether it is the former President of the United States who tells Russia to “do whatever the hell they want” or the delays in getting supplemental security funding for Ukraine passed in the House of Representatives earlier this year, diplomats on both sides of the Atlantic are asking legitimate questions: Where is our alliance headed? Can Putin be stopped in Ukraine? Will NATO continue to have our backs?

As the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I want to be crystal clear: The answer is and must be yes.

NATO has been there for the United States in tough times, whether it is defending our skies after 9/11 or providing food and medical supplies to the people of New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina.

Now more than ever, I believe the United States must stand shoulder to shoulder with our European allies. That is why I backed efforts to support Ukraine in its fight against Russia. That is why I never gave up pushing for the passage of the supplemental security assistance and was glad that it was finally enacted. That is why I am supportive of the recent bilateral security agreement between the United States and Ukraine. It is also why I support plans for NATO to take an expanded role in coordinating the defense of Ukraine, because no matter who is in the Oval Office, assistance to Ukraine must continue, defense of Europe against Russian aggression must continue, and strengthening of the NATO alliance must continue. Above all, we must not give up hope that we can succeed.

Seventy-five years ago at the NATO treaty signing, President Truman said:

For us, war is not inevitable. We do not believe there are blind tides of history which sweep men one way or another. In our own time we have seen brave men overcome obstacles that seemed insurmountable and forces that seem overwhelming. Men with courage and vision can still determine their own destiny.

I am confident that NATO's leaders—men and women meeting here in Washington this week—possess both courage and vision. There may be debates about how NATO can best engage with our allies in the Indo-Pacific, like Japan and South Korea and Australia, or how to best posture ourselves on NATO's eastern flank, but I am optimistic that NATO's future is bright because there is no question that what brings us together is our commitment to keeping authoritarian governments at bay, our commitment to democratic institutions and the protection of human rights, our commitment to peace and prosperity, and our commitment to our values.

So as we welcome NATO leaders to Washington this week and celebrate

the 75th anniversary of the NATO alliance, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support and protect NATO's military alliance that has made our world a safer place for over seven decades. Let us work together to build a future that is free and secure and peaceful for generations to come.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ANNIVERSARY OF THE 2023 VERMONT FLOOD

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, 1 year ago this very week, rain started to fall in Vermont, and, for days on end, it did not stop. The rain turned into catastrophic flooding. We had our entire usual rainfall in just days.

The damage was immense. We experienced landslides. Vermonters were stranded and had to be rescued. Three people, tragically, died. Homes, farms, and businesses were damaged and destroyed. The infrastructure and services that we take for granted and depend on—the wastewater plants, our dams, our bridges, and even our capital city's post office—were damaged by the flood. Some have not yet been repaired—many, in fact.

The statistics from Vermont are astounding. There were 214 swift water rescues—swift water rescues: people who couldn't get out of their home except by being rescued by folks on boats—and 70 evacuations. Eighteen drinking water and 33 wastewater systems were damaged. Three wastewater systems were damaged beyond repair.

Mr. President, 139 of our municipalities experienced flood damage, 64 State bridges and 46 State roads were closed, and over 6,000 tons of debris were removed by the State of Vermont. There were 6,146 FEMA Individual Assistance registrations.

It was an all-hands-on-deck moment in Vermont, just as it is in other communities where they face a major disaster, and people showed up: neighbors and volunteers, first responders, police officers, medical professionals and emergency workers, the National Guard. Local news reporters, by the way, did an incredible job keeping Vermonters informed. From every level of government and every political leaning, folks worked together for a common goal: to help.

A moment of appreciation to my colleagues, including the President, who may be listening: Nine States helped Vermont by sending personnel or resources. Thank you to the Governors and Senators in New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Michigan, Florida, and Colorado—States that supported us and colleagues who supported us. It is very reassuring, I just want to say to all of my colleagues, Re-

publican and Democrat, to hear your expressions of good will on behalf of Vermonters when we suffered that catastrophic loss.

Since the flood, I have revisited many of the communities that were hit hard last July. In every community, I have seen strength and resilience, and it gives me confidence that we will come back stronger than before. Our Vermont values—and I think they are American values; I know they are rural values—have shown the country what is possible in the times of great adversity. Our perseverance has remained long after the floodwaters have receded.

But, Mr. President, this takes a toll on folks. If it is your farm, if it is your home, if it is your business, if it is a town where you are on the select board and it is your bridge, that is tough. And it goes on.

I have come to the Senate floor many times to talk about how critical the resources are that the appropriations process has provided. But we need flexible funding dollars to actually finish the job and get past the redtape that is holding things up.

The President's revised disaster supplemental request is absolutely critical—not just for Vermont, by the way, but for many communities that have suffered catastrophic weather-related events around the country.

It would bolster the community development block grants for the disaster recovery program. That gives communities the flexibility necessary to recover, and Vermont does need substantial disaster relief money to help lower and moderate-income communities fill in the gaps of insurance and State assistance.

As I go to places in Vermont—beautiful places, really damaged, like Ludlow, Londonderry, Barre, Johnson, Hardwick, and our own capital, Montpelier—with this iconic photograph that was across the United States after our weather event—I keep hearing from the hard-working Vermonters and local leaders who would directly benefit from the disaster relief program. It could help them move out of potential flood zones or away from waterways.

And, by the way, we have to start making some of these decisions because these once-in-100-year events are once every 10 years or even more often.

It could help elevate a bridge. It could help them strengthen and repair their wastewater treatment facilities. These things really, really matter. It matters whether you are in a red State or a blue State.

I think, too often, we lose, also, the voices of the victims, those who have been hit directly. Too often we forget, in the aftermath of the initial recovery, where things go back to normal except for the people who have been really hit hard. I will give a few examples.

Marie, a Vermonter, said to me, every time it rains for several days or it comes down hard, she watches the

river behind her house and prays that it doesn't come up over the bank like it did last July.

Doug said:

Our shop and home were impacted by the flood and we had to shut down. We are still in the process of repairing our business with the hope of opening during this summer.

And the summer is here.

The impact of the flood has been traumatic on both our lives and our community.

John, another Vermonter, said:

Our entire property was flooded, and we lost everything in the cellar. We are retired on a fixed income, so these were huge losses. The future worries us, we have been flooded three times and probably will be again.

Amy said:

I appreciate the assistance from FEMA—

And I appreciate the assistance from FEMA. They were there on the job right after the flood, but the pain endures for those people directly affected. but it is nowhere near adequate. My employer was also affected hugely because our offices and warehouse flooded, and many of the farmers we work with were flooded.

By the way, those crops were just coming in. It was July. So a lot of these vegetable farmers were wiped out in Royalton, VT, as our friend knows.

We had to spend huge amounts of money to repair our space, and we lost sales because of [the loss of the crops].

So folks are still hurt, and they still need help. So, yes, we respond in the immediate aftermath of the storm, but to get the response done, we have to get people and farms and businesses back on their feet.

I talk about these Vermonters, but I want to stress to my colleagues that your State could be next. It is something we all know. Just look at the recent tragedies in Texas, Minnesota, and elsewhere.

And, of course, last year's flood was hardly isolated. We are expecting more rain this week. The remnants of Hurricane Beryl could cause flooding again tonight. Again, our brave emergency crews are out there doing everything they can.

Emergency supplemental funding will help our State and many other States, and there is no question about that. And I am working with colleagues to pass legislation that does provide that supplemental funding that is flexible and vitally needed.

After the flood, I introduced new legislation that will help rural communities in Vermont and across America hit by floods and other natural disasters.

For instance, the Rural Recovery Act streamlines and provides technical assistance. We have towns like Weston that got totally smashed. They have this beautiful Weston playhouse that people come from States all around Vermont to see great performances. It totally flooded. That town has a population of less than 600 people, so they don't have somebody on staff who knows how to deal with the various Federal programs and regulations and

so on. Our legislation would help provide technical assistance in rural communities so that they have the capacity to get what you are entitled to will be available.

Another bill is the WEATHER Act, which helps farmers—and I am talking about small farmers with vegetable crops. It would help them by having a practical crop insurance program. The crop insurance programs we have are really important and I support. They tend to be for big commodity operations. If you are a vegetable farmer in Vermont and your potato crop, your onion crop, your tomato crop got wiped out, it is incredibly complicated to try to make a claim, and it doesn't work. And you can only try to get damages for the "wholesale" value, even when many of these farmers who are the lifeblood of many of our communities sell their product at retail at local farmers' markets. We have to have a program that works for them, because whether it is in Georgia or it is in Vermont or any State, those local farmers—farm-to-table, farm-to-school—they really, really matter. We have to give them a shot at getting back on their feet when a weather event takes them down.

The BUFFER Act will help Vermont farmers take full advantage of flooding and erosion prevention programs.

I will continue in Vermont partnering with our Governor, Governor Scott, who has been on this case from day one, and my Vermont colleagues in the congressional delegation, Senator SANDERS—the senior Senator from Vermont—and Congresswoman BALINT, as well as the Biden administration and our local leaders to help Vermont recover from the flood more resiliently, prepare for the future, and recognizing the reality that these huge weather events are here to stay.

I want to thank the people of Vermont who have, as they have always done, found a way to come together and just deal with the reality of what they face.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Danny Lam Hoan Nguyen, to be Associate Justice of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia; that the Senate vote on the nomination, Calendar No. 508, without intervening action or debate; that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action; and the Senate resume legislative session.

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

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Danny Lam

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

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

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

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions: S. Res. 760, S. Res. 761, S. Res. 762.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table en bloc.

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

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

THE CALENDAR

Mr. WELCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following bills: Calendar No. 127, S. 612, Lake Tahoe Restoration Act, and Calendar No. 292, S. 912, Mining Schools Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. WELCH. I ask unanimous consent that the bills be considered read a third time en bloc.

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

The bills were ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and were read the third time en bloc.

Mr. WELCH. I know of no further debate on the bills en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate on the bills, the bills having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bills pass en bloc?

The bills were passed en bloc, as follows:

LAKE TAHOE RESTORATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

The bill (S. 612) to reauthorize the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act, and for other purposes, was passed as follows:

S. 612

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 "Lake Tahoe Restoration Reauthorization Act".

SEC. 2. REAUTHORIZATION OF THE LAKE TAHOE RESTORATION ACT.

(a) COOPERATIVE AUTHORITIES.—Section 4(f) of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506) is amended by striking "4 fiscal years following the date of enactment of the Water Resources Development Act of 2016" and inserting "period beginning on the date of enactment of this subsection and ending on the date described in section 10(a)".

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 10(a) of the Lake Tahoe Restoration Act (Public Law 106-506) is amended by striking "for a period" and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting "to remain available until September 30, 2034".

MINING SCHOOLS ACT OF 2023

The bill (S. 912) to require the Secretary of Energy to provide technology grants to strengthen domestic mining education, and for other purposes, was passed as follows:

S. 912

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 "Technology Grants to Strengthen Domestic Mining Education Act of 2023" or the "Mining Schools Act of 2023".

SEC. 2. TECHNOLOGY GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN DOMESTIC MINING EDUCATION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) BOARD.—The term "Board" means the Mining Professional Development Advisory Board established by subsection (d)(1).

(2) MINING INDUSTRY.—The term "mining industry" means the mining industry of the United States, consisting of the search for, and extraction, beneficiation, refining, smelting, and processing of, naturally occurring metal and nonmetal minerals from the earth.

(3) MINING PROFESSION.—The term "mining profession" means the body of jobs directly relevant to—

(A) the exploration, planning, execution, and remediation of metal and nonmetal mining sites; and

(B) the extraction, including the separation, refining, alloying, smelting, concentration, and processing, of mineral ores.

(4) MINING SCHOOL.—The term "mining school" means—

(A) a mining, metallurgical, geological, or mineral engineering program accredited by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology, Inc., that is located at an institution of higher education (as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001)); or

(B) a geology or engineering program or department that is located at a 4-year public institution of higher education (as so defined) located in a State the gross domestic product of which in 2021 was not less than \$2,000,000,000 in the combined categories of "Mining (except oil and gas)" and "Support activities for mining", according to the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

(5) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Energy.

(b) DOMESTIC MINING EDUCATION STRENGTHENING PROGRAM.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior (acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey), shall—

(1) establish a grant program to strengthen domestic mining education; and